

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS



FIFTH YEAR, TENTH SESSION
346th MEETING
WEDNESDAY 8 FEBRUARY 1950, AT 11 A.M.
LAKE SUCCESS, NEW YORK

President: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

Requests for hearings by non-governmental organizations

1. The PRESIDENT reminded representatives of non-governmental organizations in categories A, B and C that, in accordance with the provisions of the rules of procedure, if they wished to request a hearing by the Council on any of the items on the agenda, they must make a written request to the Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, who was the President of the Council itself, within a period of forty-eight hours after the adoption of the agenda. That period expired on 9 February at 6 p.m.

Implementation of recommendations on economic and social matters (E/1561, E/1561/Add.1, E/1561/Add.2, E/1567, E/1585, E/1585/Corr.1, E/1585/Add.1, E/1585/Add.2, E/AC.31/1)

2. The PRESIDENT gave a brief review of the question and stated that the Council should consider the draft resolutions proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Implementation of Recommendations on Economic and Social Matters, which appeared in appendix II of its report, as well as certain suggestions of the Committee in paragraphs 23 and 25 of the report.

3. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) stated that the report before the Council dealt with an extremely important question. The implementation of the resolutions of the Council was a crucial problem, on which the final success or failure of the Council would depend.

4. Like the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council could only make recommendations to governments of Member States and to specialized agencies. Obviously, if those recommendations were not carried out, the major part of the Council's work was completely useless. Accordingly, it was important to determine clearly whether the recommendations made by the Council achieved positive results.

5. The *Ad Hoc* Committee recommended certain procedures which would enable the Council to determine how much attention was given to the resolutions which it adopted. Those procedures were well worked out; they would enable the Council and the governments concerned to judge exactly how effective the work of the Council was. They would also make it easier for governments to report on the measures they had taken

in pursuance of resolutions of the Council. The number of resolutions sent to governments periodically for specific reply would be reduced. The Secretary-General would draw the attention of governments to the essential recommendations with regard to which the Council wished to know what measures had been taken. In that connexion, the guidance which the Secretary-General could give the Governments in preparing their answers would be of value to them.

6. The adoption of the procedure recommended by the *Ad Hoc* Committee would also enable the Council to determine any mistakes it might have made in adopting resolutions which, for example, were vaguely drafted.

7. Mr. Kotschnig proceeded to draw attention to the recommendations in paragraph 16 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. He considered those recommendations excellent but he thought that it would be well to add a third form of reply from governments for cases where governments had found it impossible to apply certain recommendations, owing, for instance, to constitutional difficulties, or had thought it unnecessary to do so, because of effective measures already in effect. If in such a case a government merely replied that no action had been taken, its reply would be misleading; the Council would be better informed if governments were asked to state in their reply, where necessary:

“(c) In case no action has been taken, indicate for what reason.”

8. That was a formal amendment his delegation was proposing.

9. Further he recalled that in October 1949 the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East had adopted a resolution requesting its Secretariat to make an inquiry among the governments of the members of the Commission to determine to what extent they had implemented the resolutions adopted by the Commission.¹ The United States Government feared that the result of such a resolution would be to duplicate the work of the Secretariat. In that connexion, Mr. Kotschnig asked the representative of the Secretary-General how he proposed to avoid overlapping of work.

10. In conclusion, he congratulated the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and particularly their Chairman, on the excellent report they had prepared; his delegation would vote for its adoption.

11. The PRESIDENT stated that the Secretary would reply to the question of the United States representative in due course.

¹ See document E/CN.11/SR.70.

12. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) considered that the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee had shown courage and determination and that their recommendations deserved the support of the Council. He thought that the terms of paragraph 9 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee were excellent: that paragraph appropriately reminded the Council that its recommendations should be drafted in precise form so that the governments concerned would know exactly what the Council wanted. It was true that if the resolutions of the Council were sometimes drafted in vague and general terms, it was often because the Council had tried to find a compromise. Nevertheless, the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee should be thanked for drawing the attention of the members of the Council to the fact that there must be no carelessness in that regard.

13. He supported the suggestion of the *Ad Hoc* Committee that governments should be requested to report every two years on the action they had taken in pursuance of Council resolutions. The period of two years would enable governments to study the resolutions unhurriedly and to consider what action could be taken for their implementation. It was essential to avoid any haste in that field, and satisfactory results would not be obtained if governments were asked what action they had taken before they had had time to undertake a detailed and careful study of the question. It would also be advisable to inform governments in advance of the kind of information that would be requested of them at the end of the two-year period. He noted that the timetable recommended in paragraph 12 of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report provided that the Secretariat would send governments two memoranda on the subject before the date on which replies were expected.

14. Sir Ramaswami drew the Council's attention to an administrative detail which was of great importance to governments: the amount of information requested by the various organs of the United Nations and by the specialized agencies raised a problem which many governments found it difficult to contend with. It was sometimes impossible to supply information as detailed as was requested within too short a period. Moreover, it often happened that the same information was requested in almost identical terms by several organs. For that reason the Indian delegation approved of the recommendation of the Committee at the end of paragraph 11 of its report.

15. He supported the United States proposal to amend paragraph 16 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. He would, however, suggest a slight change in the drafting of the text proposed by the United States representative, in order to soften the somewhat peremptory tone of the request. He suggested the following text:

"(c) If no action has been taken, the reasons why that has been so during the period which has elapsed."

16. He approved of the distinction which the *Ad Hoc* Committee made between information requested with regard to the implementation of resolutions and information requested concerning the application of treaties, protocols, conventions and agreements. The difference was obvious and important. In that connexion, he was disappointed to note that a number of conventions drafted in 1948 and 1949 had not yet come into force because they had not been ratified by a sufficient num-

ber of countries. A particularly striking example was the case of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization which had been adopted in April 1948 and which had so far been ratified by only two countries. It would be particularly helpful for the Council to receive a separate report on the ratification of conventions; conventions were instruments which were carefully studied and drafted and which should not be rejected lightly.

17. In conclusion, he noted that the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee contained no recommendation regarding the extension of the Committee's mandate. He asked how that question was to be considered.

18. Mr. AMANRICH (France) agreed with the United States representative that the question was most important. Three general remarks might be made in that connexion. First, as could be seen from the relevant provisions of the Charter, there was no juridical obligation in the matter; implementation was, however, based upon moral exigencies, the value of which could not be under-estimated. Secondly, any contemplated procedure must be spaced out over a period of time. It might be possible to shorten the period later, but it would not be advisable to do so for the moment. Thirdly, the recommendations of the Council were addressed to all the Member States of the United Nations, which had reached very varied stages of economic and social evolution, as was stressed in paragraph 7 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

19. In the light of those considerations certain principles could be stated: first of all, the recommendations of the Council must not be too numerous and they must be drafted as clearly as possible. Before any resolution was adopted, the activities of other United Nations organs must be borne in mind, lest the principle of not overlapping, which the General Assembly had recently urged, should be violated. Furthermore, even if the recommendations of the Council were transmitted to Member States with adequate time allowed for reply, care must be taken not to burden their administrations, and the recommendations must not, therefore, be accompanied by detailed questionnaires. If the need arose, the Secretariat could simply set out the general headings, as suggested in paragraph 16 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

20. Finally, once the Secretary-General had received the replies of the Member States, he should transmit them to the Council in a report in the form of an annotated list, as had also been recommended by the *Ad Hoc* Committee. That report could quite well be studied during the sessions of the Council: a decision on that point, which had not been settled by the *Ad Hoc* Committee, must be taken forthwith.

21. The French delegation was decidedly in favour of a committee which would meet during the sessions: it could even be the Committee on Matters relating to Co-ordination, in which case that Committee could be given terms of reference corresponding to paragraph 20 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

22. In conclusion, Mr. Amanrich declared that his delegation approved of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and that it would vote for the Committee's recommendations, in the belief that the adoption of those

recommendations would enable satisfactory progress to be made in the implementation of resolutions of the Economic and Social Council.

23. The PRESIDENT stated that, according to the rules of procedure, the amendment submitted by the United States was unacceptable, since it was impossible to amend the report of a subsidiary organ. He suggested that the United States representative should submit an amendment to the draft resolution proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

24. Sir Terence SHONE (United Kingdom) wished to associate himself with the Council members who had congratulated the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on their excellent work. The report was clear, concise and limited to consideration of essentials.

25. The United Kingdom delegation was not entirely in agreement with some of the Committee's recommendations, but, in view of the fact that the recommendations had been arrived at after prolonged discussion and in a spirit of compromise, it would not press for their amendment. He thought that, generally speaking, the Council would be well advised to adopt the Committee's report as it stood.

26. The principles upon which the Committee's recommendations were based were, in his opinion, thoroughly sound and in accordance with both the spirit and letter of the Charter. He agreed that the object of studying how the Council's resolutions had been carried out was not to denounce governments, but to assist them.

27. He could not, however, accept the argument put forward by the Polish and USSR representatives in the *Ad Hoc* Committee that governments were under no obligation, not even a moral obligation, to submit any kind of report on the action they had taken.

28. It was quite obvious that governments must be given enough time both to carry out resolutions and to report on how that had been done. It was equally sensible to allow a certain period of time to elapse between the various occasions upon which the Council would consider the outcome of its earlier decisions, so as to obtain a better perspective of the progress achieved. It was, however, absurd to claim, as had the Polish and USSR representatives, that the task should never be undertaken.

29. In his opinion, it was necessary to make a practical study of the question, with the object of helping the governments concerned to implement the resolutions, showing the Council and the Assembly whether an earlier resolution had proved unworkable, and avoiding any waste of time on the part of the Council, the Assembly and Member States by unnecessary emphasis on simple details or by mutual recrimination. That was how the *Ad Hoc* Committee had approached the question, and its practical recommendations represented a step forward.

30. In some of the Committee's practical recommendations, however, the United Kingdom Government thought the Committee had been a little too conservative; it would have preferred the cycle adopted for consideration of the implementation of resolutions to be a three-year cycle rather than the two-year period recommended by the Committee. A three-year cycle

would allow of a fairer and more thorough estimate of what had been done to put resolutions into effect and of the progress achieved in the whole economic and social field. It would also mean that a larger number of resolutions could be withdrawn from the procedure concerning implementation, thus reducing the work of the officials who had to compile the reports for the Secretary-General. His delegation did not think that a three-year cycle would involve an excessive accumulation of resolutions whose implementation would have to be considered at one and the same time, because it believed that, given suitable provisions, more resolutions could be excluded from consideration as having become out of date. In fact, the lengthening of the cycle would reduce the total work rather than increase it. The *Ad Hoc* Committee had illustrated what should be done by its deletion of forty-eight resolutions.

31. Nevertheless, the United Kingdom delegation would not contest the *Ad Hoc* Committee's recommendations. It noted that the United States representative had shown a similar spirit in not pressing for the adoption of his earlier proposal that the implementation of resolution should be reviewed every year. That proposal had been categorically rejected by the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and Sir Terence considered that to have been a felicitous decision for the success of the future work of the Council. In view of the fact that the Council would be able to reconsider that question in 1952, the United Kingdom delegation was willing to accept the *Ad Hoc* Committee's recommendations for a two-year cycle.

32. Concerning the form of the Secretary-General's report referred to in paragraphs 18 and 19 of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report, the United Kingdom representative entirely agreed with the Committee's conclusion that the Secretary-General should not be required to evaluate the substance of the replies submitted to him. He would be called upon only to state to what extent governments had not reported on implementation. No judgment would be expected of him; that would be the exclusive responsibility of the organ which had adopted the resolutions. By accepting that limited interpretation of the Secretary-General's functions, the Council would avoid thrusting upon the Secretary-General a new duty, which, from all appearances, he would not relish.

33. The Council would have to settle two secondary questions which the *Ad Hoc* Committee had not mentioned in its report. Firstly, there was the question whether the Council would need any of its committees, or an *ad hoc* committee created for that purpose, to study the question further in 1950; and secondly, whether the Council would want one of its commissions to undertake a detailed study of any particular field in 1951.

34. The United Kingdom delegation thought there was no need for the Council to ask a committee to give further consideration to the matter in 1950, but it might be useful to make provision for an *ad hoc* committee, similar to that which had prepared the report, to meet towards the end of 1951, between the thirteenth and fourteenth sessions of the Council, for the purpose of carrying out a preliminary study of the documents on implementation which were to be considered in February

1952. The Council could allow every latitude to any of its commissions which wished to call attention to the implementation of resolutions falling within its purview, but Sir Terence did not think that the Council should initiate any special study until there had been a preliminary study of the whole question.

35. In conclusion, he said that the resolutions proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee seemed to him to be satisfactory. He would vote in favour of them and of all the *Ad Hoc* Committee's proposals, as well as the United States amendment, as amended by the representative of India. He agreed with the United States representative that a solution should be found to the problem of overlapping raised by the resolution adopted by the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East to which Mr. Kotschnig had referred.

36. Mr. EUDES (Canada) said that his Government was vitally interested in the question the Council was discussing. It was convinced that the results of such solemn deliberations should not be treated lightly, and the Council should see that its recommendations were carried out. The Canadian Government, however, had been concerned over the increasing amount of time which its civil servants had to devote to preparing replies and to submitting reports in response to requests which were difficult to interpret. In his note on that subject, the Secretary-General had pointed out that the Secretariat had been confronted with a similar difficulty, and that situation must doubtless be a matter of concern to other Member States as well. There was good reason therefore to thank the experts who had so carefully analysed the problems involved and who had produced a report which would certainly facilitate the work of the Council and of the Assembly.

37. The Canadian Government had done its best to fulfil its obligations with regard to the submission of reports. Its endeavours in that matter had not been perfect but they would probably bear comparison with those of other Member States. It was rather discouraging, however, to produce exhaustive reports only to find that too few governments had carried out the measures recommended in sufficient detail to make it possible to draw any helpful general conclusions. In certain cases where governments did not reply conscientiously, that was clearly due to a reluctance on their part to give an honest description of the state of affairs in their own country. Canada felt that the Council might consider the possibility of asking those governments, if the need arose, why their reports were inadequate. In many other cases, however, it must be admitted that the rather unsatisfactory replies of governments were due to the inadequacy of their governmental machinery. Many States had only recently established their governmental institutions and they could not be blamed for lacking statistical and other facilities for carrying out a task that would prove difficult for any country.

38. Canada sincerely hoped that the programme of technical assistance to under-developed countries drawn up by the Council would enable more and more governments to supply the information requested. In the meantime it hoped the Council would bear in mind the existing circumstances, especially when it initiated inquiries.

39. He agreed with the United States proposal that a new category should be included in paragraph 16 of the report; that would make it possible for countries which had taken no action to explain why that was so.

40. On the whole the Canadian delegation endorsed the *Ad Hoc* Committee's recommendation that the Council should study the implementation of its resolutions every two years. The Committee itself had given very good reasons why annual reports were unsatisfactory. If the period were longer than two years, however, the Council might lose touch with the actual situation and might even lose interest in the matter.

41. It would be well for the Council to pay particular attention to the important provisions in paragraph 14 of the Committee's report. Under the new procedure, biennial reports would not be required when the information which those reports were to contain was already being supplied at regular intervals. Furthermore, Member States should not be asked to submit useless information. By taking those exceptions into account it would be possible to maintain the degree of flexibility necessary to achieve the desired results.

42. The supervision of implementation meant that the Council, as also the Secretary-General, would be assuming great responsibilities. The Council, for its part, would have to ensure that its resolutions indicated clearly and precisely when special reports would be required, over and above the biennial reports. Lastly, the Secretary-General would have to assume the responsibility of deciding when he had received information concerning certain resolutions which made further reports regarding them unnecessary.

43. The *Ad Hoc* Committee's suggestion concerning the clarification of recommendations should have very useful results if Member States bore them in mind when drafting resolutions and if the Secretary-General was allowed sufficient discretion in carrying out those recommendations. The Canadian delegation did not feel it was necessary to cast all resolutions in the same mould, and, as was pointed out in the report, it was possible to draft resolutions which were mere exhortations. There was no reason to adopt a rigid procedure, for both the Council and the Assembly would be confronted with an infinite variety of problems which would have to be dealt with in an equal variety of ways.

44. It was not in any desire to criticize the excellent document produced by the *Ad Hoc* Committee that he had put forward those remarks, but rather to stress certain aspects of the problem which were of particular importance in the eyes of the Canadian Government. The Canadian delegation endorsed both the substance of the recommendations the Committee had formulated and the way in which it had approached the problem.

45. Mr. MAKIN (Australia) said that his Government gave its unreserved support to the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. The proposals contained in that report would reduce the amount of information to be supplied by Member States to a minimum, while enabling the Council and the governments concerned to concentrate their attention on the most important resolutions, the implementation of which deserved a special report.

46. The document submitted by the Committee contained a clear and concise survey of the principles which

should govern all government activities in that field. The method defined in the report might, of course, have to be changed in the future; nevertheless, the principles laid down by the Committee represented a step forward, for they provided a solid basis for the measures which might be taken by the United Nations in the economic and social fields.

47. The success of the work of the Economic and Social Council obviously depended to a large extent on the co-operation of governments. He hoped, therefore, that all governments would supply the United Nations with all the necessary reports and that those reports would be as comprehensive and detailed as possible.

48. In conclusion, he expressed his readiness to support the amendment submitted by the United States representative and seconded by the Indian representative. He also wished to thank Mr. Plimsoll, the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and all the members of that Committee for the excellent and useful work they had done.

49. Mr. CHANG (China) stated that the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee was of very great importance, in that it dealt with the possible results of the decisions taken by the Economic and Social Council. He expressed full support for the report and the resolutions annexed thereto.

50. He stressed the importance of securing the co-operation of governments. The Council's purpose would not be achieved if governments refused to furnish reports on the implementation of recommendations or if they confined themselves to forwarding statements of a purely bureaucratic nature. Hence, it should be made clear that those reports should be followed by deeds and should describe effective action that had been taken. The nature of the relationship between the government and the individual was of great importance. Indeed, it might so happen that, prompted by a certain political doctrine, some government would refuse to account for its policy to an international organization or to the people it governed. It might also happen that it would be opposed to the establishment of closer contact between its people and the United Nations. Those were the difficulties with which the Council might be confronted in the discharge of its duty.

51. The future success of the Council would be gauged by the degree of loyalty shown by the peoples of the world to the United Nations. That loyalty, however, could not be won by the mere adoption of endless resolutions. Those resolutions had also to be effectively implemented. Each government had a part to play in that field.

52. The implementation of resolutions was obviously an impossible task without a certain level of education. In that connexion, the technical assistance programme which the Council had undertaken was of far-reaching importance. There would be no need for reports from any administration to gauge its success: the best proof of its success would be found in the feelings of the people who benefited from that programme.

53. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) supported the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. When that Committee

had been set up, some representatives had feared that it would take upon itself the right to supervise the activities of governments. It had since become clear that the Committee's only concern had been to improve the methods of implementation of recommendations on economic and social matters.

54. The United Nations must not confine its activities to the production of documents. It must adopt and implement effective measures. The Economic and Social Council had an important part to play in that field. It was imperative, therefore, that the Council should adopt the United States proposal to add a sentence to paragraph 16 of the report requesting Member States to explain the reasons which had prevented them from implementing any recommendation.

55. Turning to the time-table for the requests for information which the Secretary-General was to address to governments, he expressed full satisfaction with the two-year cycle envisaged by the *Ad Hoc* Committee. Since, however, the United Kingdom representative thought that it would be better to send the questionnaires every three years, the Council might examine that proposal in 1952, at the end of the first cycle.

56. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) supported the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. He was particularly grateful to its authors for mentioning the difficulties which might be encountered by under-developed countries because they lacked qualified statisticians. He hoped that the implementation of "point 4" would put an end to those difficulties.

57. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) wished to reply to the observations made by Mr. Kotschnig regarding the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

58. The Secretary-General had asked the Secretariat of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East to postpone the implementation of the Commission's resolution until it had been informed of the Council's views on the matter.

59. Mr. Owen realized that the recommendations of those two organs often overlapped, but he wondered whether the Council could cancel the decisions taken by the Commission. For that reason, he believed that the Council should authorize the secretariat of the Commission to proceed with its work, at the same time requesting it to establish contact with the Secretariat of the United Nations, so as to co-ordinate their activities. The Commission should also be asked not to request governments for information on questions which were already being investigated by the Economic and Social Council, for otherwise governments would have to reply twice to the self-same question coming from two different organs.

60. Turning to the question of an *ad hoc* committee, he said that the Secretariat often had to consult an inter-governmental organ before taking a decision on any given controversial political question. The Secretariat would be most happy if the Economic and Social Council were to set up an *ad hoc* committee. Failing that, the Secretary-General hoped that the Council would provide him with some other means for consulting governments.

61. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) thought it was essential to specify exactly what the Council could ask the members of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East to do. The Commission's resolution was not clear. It requested the Bangkok secretariat to furnish a detailed report to the Commission, but it did not state whether the secretariat should send special questionnaires to the members of the Commission or whether it should make use of the replies sent to the Secretariat at Lake Success.
62. Sir RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR (India) felt that the Commission was fully entitled to ask Member States for information on any question of a particular nature.
63. It was, however, for the Secretariat of the United Nations to ask for information relating to the implementation of recommendations. The inquiries of specialized agencies were directed by the Committee on Co-ordination. It was only logical for the Secretariat at Lake Success to centralize the activities of subsidiary United Nations organs in that field.
64. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) said that his Government's attitude on the question was the same as that of the Governments of the United States and India.
65. It was clear from Article 64 of the Charter, which dealt with the implementation of recommendations of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly on economic and social questions, that the Council itself should come to an understanding with Member States and specialized agencies in regard to obtaining reports on steps taken to implement those recommendations. The Council was therefore the competent body to deal with that matter, but that in no way implied that regional commissions could never apply directly to governments for information: it was obvious that they could do so when the inquiry they were conducting concerned a specific point. That was not the case, however, with the resolution adopted on 29 October 1949 by the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. That resolution referred to all the Commission's previous recommendations and it was quite possible that certain governments, which did not have a large enough staff at their disposal, might find it difficult to reply to both the Commission and the United Nations.
66. When a regional commission wished to undertake a large-scale inquiry on the implementation of its recommendations, it should apply to the Economic and Social Council, which would take whatever decision it thought expedient. In regard to the particular case of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, that body's attention might be drawn to the resolution which the Economic and Social Council was about to adopt, in accordance with the *Ad Hoc* Committee's recommendation.
67. Mr. CHANG (China) agreed with the three preceding speakers. All inquiries of a general nature should be undertaken by the Council itself, since a regional commission could ask governments for information on specific measures only.
68. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) pointed out that if the Council decided that all inquiries of a general nature on the implementation of regional commissions' recommendations should be conducted by the Council itself, that would, to some extent, override the decision adopted by a large majority in one of its commissions, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, which that Commission's secretariat had already put into effect. A text should therefore be found to convey the Council's decision to the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.
69. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) remarked that it would not be the first time that the Council did not approve of a decision of one of its subsidiary bodies. He suggested that the question should be held over for the moment and taken up again when the report of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East came up for consideration. The communication to be sent to that Commission could better be drafted at that time.
- It was so decided.*
70. The PRESIDENT declared the general discussion closed, and called upon the members of the Council to vote on the following United States amendment (E/L.8) to the *Ad Hoc* Committee's resolution I (E/1585, appendix II), bearing in mind the Indian representative's observations:
- "In the sub-paragraph commencing '*Decides*', add after the word '*Committee*' the words: '*with the modifications appended below*'";
- "*Appendix*: Add to paragraph 16 of the report (E/1585) the following: '*or (c) in case no action has been taken, for what reasons implementation has been found unnecessary or impossible*'."
- The amendment was adopted unanimously.*
- Resolution I, proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*
71. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) recalled that during the Council's eighth session his delegation had made certain reservations in regard to the Council's power to ask governments for reports and information.¹ Although it had voted for the *Ad Hoc* Committee's resolution I, his delegation maintained its position on that question of principle. It considered that Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter did not authorize the Economic and Social Council to ask Member States for information on questions within their domestic jurisdiction. Article 64 took those provisions into consideration, since it provided that information could be obtained only by arrangement with the governments concerned, which implied the need for the latter's consent in each separate case.
72. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the *Ad Hoc* Committee's draft resolution II.
- Resolution II was adopted unanimously.*
73. The PRESIDENT called upon the members of the Council to consider the question of the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to meet between the Council's sessions, with terms of reference similar, on the whole, to those of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Implementation of Recommendations on Economic and Social Matters. That question was dealt with in paragraph 23 of

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council*, Fourth Year, Eighth Session, 281st meeting.

the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report (E/1585) and the financial implications of establishing such a committee appeared in paragraph 3 (c) of the Secretary-General's memorandum (E/1585/Add.1).

74. Mr. AMANRICH (France) reminded the Council that he had already mentioned during the general debate that his delegation saw no need to establish an *ad hoc* committee to meet between the Council's sessions. The functions of such a committee could be perfectly well fulfilled by the Co-ordination Committee of the Council or by one of the other committees during the Council's sessions.

75. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) agreed with the French representative.

76. Replying to Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran), who wished to know why the *Ad Hoc* Committee had made no recommendations on that subject, Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia), Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, said that opinion had been divided in the Committee; it had been thought preferable to leave it to the Council to take whatever decision it deemed fit after taking note of the report as a whole.

77. Those in favour of the creation of the proposed committee had remarked that the success of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's work spoke for the establishment of a committee of the same kind. They had stressed that the question of implementation of resolutions was a purely technical one; an *ad hoc* committee meeting between sessions of the Council would be in a better position to deal with it than the Council itself. They had also pointed out that the creation of such a committee would greatly ease the Secretariat's task.

78. The main argument advanced against the creation of the proposed committee was that it would add to the already considerable number of subsidiary organs of the Council, thus leading to an undue dispersal of the Council's duties.

79. The Australian delegation adopted the same position as the delegation of France: it did not consider it necessary to create a committee which would meet between sessions of the Council. It did not believe, however, that it was essential to take a decision on the matter at the current session; it would be more advisable to await the results of the application of the procedure advocated by the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

80. Mr. CHANG (China) suggested that decision on the creation of the proposed *ad hoc* committee should be deferred to a later session of the Council.

It was so decided.

81. The PRESIDENT called upon members of the Council to consider the question of resolutions requiring further attention, which formed the subject of paragraph 25 of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report.

82. He asked the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee why the Committee had made no concrete recommendation on that subject.

83. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia), Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, replied that the Committee's suggestions regarding resolution 203 (VIII) of the Council were embodied, in their substance, in resolution II, appearing in appendix II of the report, which the Council had just adopted.

84. With regard to General Assembly resolution 125 (II), the Committee had felt that it would be of advantage to circulate its text again to Member States, since the resolution dealt with the highly important question of co-ordination of activities and work programmes of the United Nations and specialized agencies. The reason why the Committee had made no special recommendations on the subject was that it had thought that the adoption of resolution I would imply approval of the Committee's suggestions.

85. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the note by the Secretary-General (E/1585/Add.2), in which the Secretary-General pointed out that UNESCO had undertaken a study involving a detailed inquiry into the measures and machinery of governments for co-ordinating national policies in international bodies. The Secretary-General wished to know whether, in view of such action by UNESCO, the Council still deemed it necessary again to circulate the text of resolution 125 (II) of the General Assembly to all Member States or only to those not participating in the UNESCO study, or whether it would prefer to postpone any decision until the results of that study were available.

86. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) thought that resolution 125 (II) should not be circulated again to governments until the results of the UNESCO study were available.

87. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) believed that the study in question was being carried out by experts; the requests for information had not been formally addressed to governments. In his view, the fact that a study of that nature was in progress should not deter the Council, which had the main responsibility for the implementation of the General Assembly's recommendation contained in resolution 125 (II), from drawing the attention of governments once again to that resolution and asking them for detailed and recent information.

88. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) pointed out that experts worked in such close contact with governments on the subject concerned that it seemed superfluous to circulate the resolution again.

89. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) did not think UNESCO was the competent organ to deal with the question of co-ordination as a whole. It would be highly desirable to circulate resolution 125 (II) to Member States once again.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.