

United Nations
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

Nations Unies
CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

UNRESTRICTED

E/AC.24/SR.2
23 February 1948

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH

COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON MATTERS RELATING TO CO-ORDINATION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

Lake Success, New York
Friday, 20 February 1948, at 3.15 p.m.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. DAVIDSON	(Canada)
<u>Present:</u>	Australia	Mr. TANGE
	Brazil	Mr. CAMPOS
	Canada	Mr. POLLOCK
	China	Mr. CHANG
	France	Mr. de FOLIN
	Netherlands	Mr. de STOPPELAAR
	New Zealand	Mr. SUTCH
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. CHERNYSHEV
	United Kingdom	Mr. PHILLIPS
	United States of America	Mr. STINEBOWER
	later	Mr. KOTSCHNIG

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Organization	Mr. JENKS
UNESCO	Mr. THOMAS
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. OLSEN
International Civil Aviation Organization	Mr. MARLIN
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Mr. LOPEZ-HERRARTE
International Monetary Fund	Mr. WILLIAMS
World Health Organization	Mr. HILL
International Refugee Organization	Miss BIEFLE

Secretariat:

Dr. SZE

Secretary of the Committee

NOTE: Corrections of this summary record provided for in the rules of procedure should be submitted in writing within the prescribed period to Mr. Delavanay, Director, Editorial Division, Room CC-87, Lake Success. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter written on headed notepaper and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent" and bearing the appropriate symbol number.

The CHAIRMAN announced that Australian proposals (document E/AC.24/1) bearing on the United States Resolutions (document E/647) and a United Kingdom draft Resolution (document E/AC.24/2) had been received since the previous meeting.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) explained that the purpose of his delegation's proposals was to suggest a reallocation of the United States material. His delegation had omitted a number of points in the United States draft because it believed that those points would be more appropriately included in other resolutions.

Mr. CHANG (China) suggested that the Australian redraft of United States Resolution I might be taken as an amendment to the United States proposal and the sixth paragraph of the United States Resolution might be added to it.

He thought that the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the United States Resolution, dealing with "priorities" and "further steps" touched on matters of policy and should be discussed by the proposed ad hoc committee.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) observed that the only difference between the United States and Australian proposals was that the Australian proposals were in the chronological order of action to be taken while the United States proposals followed what he considered a more logical grouping according to subject-matter.

Referring to the Chinese representative's comments he pointed out that the fourth paragraph of United States Resolution I required the Secretary-General only to prepare reports for the seventh session of the Council.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) found that in some respects the United States Resolutions were at variance with the United Nations Charter. The reference to co-ordination of programmes in
/paragraph four (1).

paragraph four (1) of the United States Resolution I and in paragraph three (4) of United States Resolution II gave the impression that the Specialized Agencies and the United Nations were of equal standing. In fact, Articles 58, 62, 63 and 64 of the Charter made it clear that the United Nations should play a guiding role. That role was reflected in the agreements with the Specialized Agencies.

Mr. Chernyshev then read paragraph four (4) of United States Resolution I and asked to what "inter-governmental organizations" the paragraph referred. The Charter mentioned only two kinds of organizations -- Specialized Agencies in Article 57 and non-governmental organizations in Article 71. No other organizations were mentioned.

The ad hoc committee proposed by the United States would, Mr. Chernyshev thought, be very powerful, but he doubted whether it was necessary at the present stage. It had several times been suggested that Commissions should be given a chance to work out their own destinies; continual reviewing of their activities could only unsettle them.

Mr. Chernyshev's first opinion was therefore that the United Kingdom proposals were more acceptable and more in accord with the Charter.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) agreed with the Chinese representative that it was not for the ad hoc committee to establish priorities. The USSR representative had referred to Article 62 of the Charter, which allotted that task to the Economic and Social Council.

In answer to the USSR representative's inquiry about inter-governmental organizations, Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) recalled that the question had been dealt with in the Preparatory Commission's report. Nevertheless, he believed that it was useful to have the question brought up now, and thought that the Economic and Social Council might review it at its seventh session.

/Mr. CHERNYSHEV (USSR)

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that there was only one Charter, and the Charter text was more important than a Preparatory Commission's report.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) explained that the whole question was one of possible overlapping between the international organizations related to the United Nations as Specialized Agencies and other previously existing international organizations. With the establishment of the Food and Agriculture Organization, a Specialized Agency of the United Nations, the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome had been dissolved, and the FAO had absorbed two other smaller organizations. The International Trade Organization, now in process of formation at the Havana Conference, had to consider whether existing inter-governmental organizations of a similar character should be incorporated in it.

There were for Governments two ways of solving the problem. One way was not to belong to inter-governmental organizations already in existence; the other was to bring order into the whole field. The United States Government belonged to many of those organizations, and did not believe that it would be a violation of the Charter to consider relations between them and the United Nations.

Mr. CHANG (China) wished to make two general observations. In the first place he did not believe that the Committee should attempt to do too much; some things could well be left until after the Council's seventh session.

In the second place, the Committee should decide whether to ask the Secretary-General or the Council or the Co-ordination Committee to do certain things. It was his opinion that all three should be called upon. Some of the questions involved were questions of policy and should be considered by the Council, working through the ad hoc committee proposed in the United States Resolution.

/Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom)

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) observed that the United Kingdom proposed resolution "requested" the Co-ordination Committee to do some things and "invited" the Secretary-General to do others. There was, however, a basic difference between the United Kingdom and the United States approaches. The United Kingdom believed that a body established to perform a specific task should be allowed to proceed with that task; and for that reason the United Kingdom Resolution had not proposed to set up an ad hoc committee. The United Kingdom delegation was firmly opposed to the creation of new machinery when the machinery already in existence was adequate.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) thought that the moment had come to determine the respective functions of the bodies in existence. A question of principle arose in connection with the powers of the Co-ordination Committee. Would it be authorized to give advice or take decisions on matters of policy? The French delegation believed that its scope should be limited and another committee formed.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) supported the French representative's view that the Co-ordination Committee was not the appropriate body to take decisions involving policy.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the view that the quality of the work done would not depend upon the number of sub-organs created. The number of such organs was already great. Their cost was great. Creation of a new sub-organ would only weaken the Co-ordination machinery. The Co-ordination Committee which was an extremely useful body submitted reports to the Economic and Social Council, which could decide on the action to be taken following its work.

/Mr. KOTSCHNIG (USA)

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) observed that the so-called Co-ordination Committee -- which was in fact a standing committee of administrative officers -- would shift the responsibility for co-ordination to the Secretary-General and to the Directors-General of the Specialized Agencies. The Charter did not vest the function of co-ordination in the Secretary-General but on the Economic and Social Council itself. The United States delegation therefore laid emphasis on the co-ordinating functions of the Council, which could delegate some of its authority to an ad hoc committee, especially established for the purpose.

Mr. CHANG (China) asked what were the terms of reference of the so-called Co-ordination Committee, adding that he himself had been the first to preface the name with the description "so-called".

At the request of the Chairman, the Secretary read the resolution 13 (III) of 21 September 1946 (document E/231) establishing the Co-ordination Committee.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) noted that the first part of the Resolution referred to "an appropriate commission or... an ad hoc committee" of the Council.

Mr. CHANG (China) suggested that henceforth the so-called Co-ordination Committee be called the Higher Staff Committee.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Preparatory Commission had deferred the setting up of a Co-ordination Commission. Meanwhile the Committee now in question had been created, and accomplished a useful task in this field.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the United States delegation had not itself used the term "co-ordination committee." The editor of the resolution had probably added the term as a convenient

/title. Thereafter

title. Thereafter the General Assembly had quite legitimately picked it up.

Mr. CHANG (China) remarked that several hours' debate had clearly shown the need for an ad hoc committee to clear up a number of questions.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics representative had expressed the hope that too many sub-organs would not be created. In that connection there was an appropriate Chinese saying, "One should cut off the sixth finger." Perhaps studies made by an ad hoc committee would permit cutting off some of the Organization's sixth fingers.

The ad hoc committee might also be able to find a name for the so-called Co-ordination Committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) said that like the British Constitution, the Co-ordination Committee was an example of common law growth. Its work had begun limited to the narrow field of implementing agreements, and then had gone on to wider functions, which every member of the Council appeared to think that it had carried out with great usefulness.

Mr. CHANG (China) was unable to accept the parallel. The British Constitution had grown over the centuries. The United Nations was a young institution and had a written constitutional basis, which must not be trespassed upon. He suggested that the matter of the name "Co-ordination Committee" should be referred to the Secretary-General for a legal opinion.

The CHAIRMAN observed that representatives had dealt in general observations for five hours. He felt that the time had come for specific action. There was a certain degree of general agreement on the first part of the United States Resolution I, inasmuch as both Australia and the United Kingdom agreed with the United States that some requests should be made to the Secretary-General. He suggested that the Committee should vote on that part of the resolution and specifically on the fourth paragraph.

/Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil)

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) believed that two problems were involved. The first problem was who should make reports; the second, what should be in the reports. The Brazilian delegation had no strong feelings on the matter, but thought that the Committee might first decide on the reporting body and then on the substance of the matters to be reported. As a compromise he proposed that in the preamble to the fourth paragraph of the United States Resolution I the words "in consultation with the Co-ordination Committee" should be inserted after "the Secretary-General".

On the suggestion of Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) Mr. Campos agreed to amend his proposed addition by using the words "after consultation" instead of "in consultation".

Mr. TANGE (Australia) and Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) opposed the Brazilian proposal, in this particular wording.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the Secretary-General was Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee. The Brazilian proposal would therefore result in the Secretary-General consulting with himself. Why should he not be requested to consult with the representatives of the Specialized Agencies?

Mr. CHANG (China) agreed with the USSR representative.

In any case, he could not accept the term "Co-ordination Committee". If reference must be made to that Committee, it should be called by its proper name.

Mr. JENKS (International Labour Organization) said that the Co-ordination Committee had been established in order to facilitate co-ordination and its name used and tacitly approved by the General Assembly. To change the name without consultation would be unfortunate. The representative of the USSR and China had suggested "after consultation with the Specialized Agencies".

the Specialized Agencies". Perhaps that would offer a way out.

Mr. CHANG (China) felt that Mr. Jenks' suggestion, coming from a representative of a Specialized Agency, deserved careful consideration. He would therefore move that the words "after consultation with the Specialized Agencies whenever appropriate" should be inserted in the preamble to the fourth paragraph of United States Resolution I, after the word "Secretary-General".

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) preferred that the reference to the Co-ordination Committee should be retained. He proposed that the words "after consultation with the Co-ordinating Committee of Administrative Officers" should be inserted.

After some discussion the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment proposed by Mr. Phillips and the amendment proposed by Mr. Chang without the words "whenever appropriate"

The United Kingdom proposal was rejected by four votes to one.

The Chinese amendment was adopted by six votes to two.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.