

COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON MATTERS RELATING TO CO-ORDINATION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING

Lake Success, New York
Wednesday, 25 February 1948, at 3.00 p.m.

Present:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. DAVIDSON	(Canada)
	Australia	Mr. TANGE
	Brazil	Mr. CAMPOS
	Canada	Mr. POLLOCK
	China	Mr. CHANG
	France	Mr. de FOLIN
	Netherlands	Mr. de STOPPELAAR
	New Zealand	Mr. LENDRUM
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. CHERNYSHEV
	United Kingdom	Mr. PHILLIPS
	United States of America	Mr. VEYSEY
<u>Representatives of Specialized Agencies:</u>		Mr. KOTSCHNIG
	International Labour Organization	Mr. JENKS
	UNESCO	Mr. THOMAS
	Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. OLSEN
	later	Mr. McDOUGALL
	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 BIEHLE

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.

CONTINUATION OF CONSIDERATION OF THE UNITED STATES PROPOSAL CONCERNING
RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (E/647/Rev.1,
E/AC.24/1)

The CHAIRMAN stated that in the interim since the last meeting, the representatives of the United Kingdom and of the United States of America had met with him in an effort to reach agreement with respect to the establishment of a committee on co-ordination. They would present their views on the matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) pointed out that during the previous debate two points of view had been expressed, one emphasizing the Council's role in co-ordination, the other stressing the purely administrative arrangements as a basis for co-ordination. Those views were by no means mutually exclusive; by establishing a co-ordination committee to meet during its seventh session the Council would be free to decide at the end of that session what further steps were necessary. The text of the United Kingdom proposal was as follows:

"The Economic and Social Council

"Resolves to appoint a committee to sit during the seventh session of the Council to consider matters relating to the co-ordination of the activities of the specialized agencies and the United Nations which may be raised by members of the Council, by the Secretary-General and by the Secretary-General's Committee on Co-ordination".

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) expressed his appreciation for the spirit of compromise and understanding shown by the United Kingdom representative.

He asked Mr. Phillips whether he would agree that the committee should meet a few days before the opening of the seventh session. The difference in expenditure would be slight, but the difference in the efficiency of the work very great; if the Council was to discharge its co-ordination duties properly it should receive the report of the co-ordination committee very

/early in the

early in the session; therefore the Committee itself would have to consider the reports submitted by the specialized agencies and by the Secretary-General, analyze the material and prepare its recommendations to the Council in advance of the opening of the session. The text of his proposal was as follows:

"The Committee recommends to the Economic and Social Council that the Council appoint an ad hoc committee to convene one week in advance of the seventh session of the Council to review the reports of the Secretary-General on matters relating to co-ordination as well as the relevant reports of the specialized agencies and of the Secretary-General's Co-ordination Committee and to report thereon to the Council."

Mr. TANGE (Australia) agreed with the United Kingdom proposal. He wondered whether under the terms of the United States proposal a small committee of perhaps six or seven members was envisaged; in that case, such a committee should go out of existence at the opening of the seventh session, and its functions should be referred to a Council committee of the whole, which would be the committee provided by Mr. Phillips' resolution.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) agreed that the co-ordination committee should be a committee of the whole, thus enabling the Council to take direct action in matters of co-ordination.

Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) agreed with the United Kingdom proposal and supported the suggestion that the committee should be a committee of the whole, meeting simultaneously with the Council. He pointed out that the first few days of a session were customarily taken up with business matters such as the election of officers and appointment of committees; the Committee of the Whole could profitably use that time to prepare its report for the Council.

/Mr. KOTSCHNIG (USA)

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) thought that a Council Committee of the Whole meeting simultaneously with the Economic and Social Council would be very little different from the present Council Committee on Matters Relating to Co-ordination and would prolong the seventh session of the Council, just as the work of the present Committee would through no fault of its own, prolong the present session.

A small committee, on the other hand, consisting of from six to eight members, meeting a week prior to the opening of the seventh session of the Council, would have ample time to consider the reports, analyze them, and then report on its findings to a Committee of the Whole. That would be the most efficient procedure to follow. Mr. Kotschnig proposed that a small committee should be established to meet five to seven days before the seventh session of the Council, with terms of reference similar to those indicated in the United Kingdom proposal.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) wondered whether, in view of the similarity of the two proposals, the United States proposal could not be considered as an amendment to the United Kingdom proposal, and suggested a slight re-draft of the latter to include the words "a committee to meet seven days before the opening of the seventh session of the Council."

The CHAIRMAN observed that there were, in fact, two essential differences between the two proposals, as regards the time of the Committee's meeting, and its composition or size. Those were the points which the Committee would have to decide by a vote.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that he would agree with Mr. Phillips' proposal provided an ad hoc committee were established to meet a week before the new session. The proposals differed on that point only.

/Mr. PHILLIPS (UK)

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) agreed that the proposals differed, and suggested that his own proposal should be voted upon first.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) thought that the two proposals were supplementary, not contradictory.

The objection that the establishment of a small ad hoc committee would give the impression that the Council was shirking its responsibilities would be met if both proposals were accepted. In view of the large amount of work involved in the consideration of reports and in consulting with representatives of the specialized agencies, a small committee would render material assistance to a Committee of the Whole.

For those reasons, the Brazilian representative would vote favourably on both proposals.

Mr. de STOPPELAAR (Netherlands) stated that in the opinion of his delegation the Council should take full advantage of the co-ordination machinery already in existence before undertaking to create any new bodies. The functions of co-ordination were already being carried out by various bodies of the United Nations including the Commissions of the Economic and Social Council, the Secretary-General's Co-ordination Committee, and various subsidiary organs; by exploiting those to the fullest extent, the creation of a new committee such as that proposed by the United States would be made unnecessary. In this connection, he wished to draw the Committee's attention to the General Assembly Resolution of 20 October 1947, which states, in part, "recommends to the respective organs of the United Nations to consider carefully, before the creation of special commissions and sub-committees, whether the task to be carried out could not usefully be entrusted to the Secretariat", and suggested that the Secretary-General should be given a more active role in reporting on activities and in making recommendations to the Council.

/Mr. Stoppelaar would,

Mr. Stoppelaar would, however, not object to a committee of the whole as proposed by the United Kingdom.

Mr. CHANG (China) thought that a great deal of useful work could be accomplished by a small committee, meeting for from five to seven days. Such a committee should meet at United Nations headquarters; in the latter part of June; by that time the majority of the reports from the specialized agencies would have been submitted and the representatives on the committee could devote their fullest attention to the solution of mechanical, administrative, and perhaps even policy aspects of co-ordination.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) stated that his delegation favoured the United Kingdom proposal for it would not be very practical for delegations from distant countries to arrive five or six days in advance of the opening of the seventh session.

He wondered whether the United Kingdom intended the committee to be a committee of the whole or whether it would consist of only a limited number of representatives. In his opinion, about twelve members would be a sufficient number to carry out the task with efficiency.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) thought that the question of the size of the committee was of secondary importance; he had no definite opinion on the matter for the time being. But in the course of the discussion points of view had been expressed which indicated to him that the two proposals were in reality quite different; he would therefore insist that they should be voted upon separately.

Adding the word "only" after the word "sit", as was suggested by the Chairman, would have the effect of defeating the United States representative's intention of voting for both the United Kingdom proposal and for his own. He suggested that a clause should be added to his proposal definitely eliminating the establishment of an ad hoc committee, so that a clear cut choice would be open to the members of the committee.

/Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland)

Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) feared that in creating a small committee to meet before the seventh session, the Council would be giving the impression of creating a permanent co-ordination committee to sit in the interim between sessions of the Council.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that if Mr. Phillips' suggestion were accepted he would be forced to vote against the United Kingdom proposal.

To meet one of the objections which had been expressed, he wished to point out that the ad hoc committee he proposed was in no way a permanent committee, for the resolution definitely specified that it would convene "before the seventh session of the Council".

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) remarked that he was faced with a similar difficulty as that faced by the United States representative; he had also wanted to vote for both proposals, considering them supplementary in nature. If the two proposals were made mutually exclusive by the addition of such a clause as that proposed by the United Kingdom representative, the Canadian delegation might be forced to vote against a proposal which it would have supported otherwise.

He suggested that the United States proposal should be voted upon first, so that if rejected, the members of the committee would have an opportunity to vote favourably on the United Kingdom proposal.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) concurred, stating that he would vote against the United States proposal.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the view that the ad hoc committee proposed by the United States would merely duplicate the functions of the Committee of the Whole, since the latter would have to reconsider and rediscuss the report prepared by the former.

/He supported the

He supported the United Kingdom proposal, agreeing with the Australian representative that the committee should consist of all the members of the Council.

The United States proposal was rejected by six votes to five, with one abstention.

The United Kingdom proposal was adopted by ten votes to one, with one abstention.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) thought that the task of the Secretary-General should be clearly set out under the terms of the resolution.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) wondered whether the functions of the now defeated ad hoc committee, would be assumed by the Committee of the Whole.

He saw difficulties arising as a result of the fact that the United Kingdom resolution did not make it clear whether relationships between the Commissions, and between the Commissions and the Specialized Agencies would be considered. That function had been entrusted to the Co-ordination Committee by virtue of the General Assembly resolution No. 125 which used the phrase "subsidiary organs of the United Nations" as a convenient condensed appellation for the Council's Commissions and sub-committees. Since the United States resolution had been defeated, no appropriate preparatory machinery was provided to consider those matters.

That question was important and merited serious consideration.

Mr. CHANG (China) suggested the deletion of the words "further" and "which should be" on page 3, line 14 of document E/647/Rev.1, and of the words "and its subsidiary organs" on line 16 of the same page.

Mr. CIERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the Chinese amendment served to emphasize the inherent ambiguity of paragraph 1; he suggested that to avoid varied interpretations, the paragraph should be re-worded so as to read "The action taken in pursuance of the Agreements with the specialized agencies to develop...etc".

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a very similar suggestion had already been made by Mr. Stinebower at a previous meeting.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) thought that Mr. Stinebower had made the suggestion believing that the function of making recommendations to the Council would be assumed by the ad hoc committee; in the absence of that committee, removing those functions from the Secretary-General would create a serious gap. The Australian representative favoured retention of the original wording.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) accepted both the Chinese and the USSR amendments, and in reply to the representative of Australia, stated that the question he had raised would be adequately covered by point 4 of the second resolution.

Paragraph 1 of the United States resolution was adopted unanimously as amended (E/AC.24/W.1, lines 407-410).

The CHAIRMAN called attention to the last Australian resolution in document E/AC 24/1/Rev.1 (lines 260 to 269 inclusive), which was intended to replace paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 (lines 18 to 35 inclusive) in the United States resolution. As paragraph 1 of the Australian text was a substitute for paragraph 2 of the United States text, it could be dealt with separately.

Mr. de FOLIN (France), and Mr. CHERNYSHCHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed approval of paragraph 1 of the Australian text.

Mr. VEYSEY (United Kingdom) felt that paragraph 1 should be deleted; it was not necessary to ask the Secretary-General to prepare a report on purely administrative matters.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) withdrew paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of his text in favour of the Australian proposal. He stressed that
/administrative matters,

administrative matters, and in particular the facilities available for specialized agencies at headquarters, were of considerable importance.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that Agreements with the specialized agencies contained an article dealing with the location of the agencies' headquarters. He suggested that some such phrase as "in accordance with Agreements" should be inserted in paragraph 1.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that not all the Agreements contained such a clause.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) observed that in his text the Secretary-General was merely asked to report on what facilities were available at the United Nations headquarters; that report would provide valuable information when decisions of policy regarding the location of specialized agencies were taken. The Secretary-General had full authority to supply such information; reference to Agreements with the specialized agencies was therefore unnecessary at this point, though it would be relevant when the location of the specialized agencies was discussed. He therefore did not accept the USSR amendment.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) withdrew his amendment. He pointed out, however, that all relations with the specialized agencies were governed by the Agreements concluded with those agencies, and that any measures or negotiations undertaken in respect to headquarters must conform to the Agreements.

Paragraph 1 of the Australian resolution (document E/AC.24/1/Rev.1, lines 264 to 267 inclusive) was adopted by four votes to one, with four abstentions.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) inquired precisely what organizations were referred to in paragraph 2 of the Australian text. The Charter recognized only two types of organizations with which the United Nations could enter into relationship; they were the specialized

/agencies and

agencies and the non-governmental organizations. Paragraph 2 did not appear to be in the spirit of the Charter.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) replied that, at the previous meeting, the United States representative had adduced very convincing arguments in favour of obtaining information regarding inter-governmental organizations. He pointed out that paragraph 2 of the Australian text was very limited in scope. The Secretary-General was requested merely to supply information, not to make recommendations on the merger or dissolution of those organizations. There was nothing in the Charter to prevent the Secretary-General from supplying to the Council information on names, composition and functions of inter-governmental organizations -- information which the Council might well find useful, especially if, as permitted under Article 59 of the Charter, it wished to initiate negotiations for the creation of a new specialized agency.

In reply to Mr. SZE (Secretary of the Committee) he said that he would be willing to amend paragraph 2 to read: "Inter-governmental organizations having responsibilities similar to those of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the economic, social, cultural, educational, health and related fields." That would reproduce the language of Article 57 of the Charter which applied to the specialized agencies.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that there existed scores of inter-governmental organizations, all of them supported by Governments, and operating in highly diversified fields. Government officials and national legislatures found the task of dealing with such organizations a complex one. Some organizations were merely a burden on national treasuries, while others, which were doing useful work, should be brought into a closer relationship with the specialized agencies or the Council itself. It was clearly necessary for the Council to survey the situation with a view to fitting some of those organizations into the pattern of the United Nations.

/In reply to

In reply to the suggestion of the New Zealand representative that information should be supplied only as regards inter-governmental organizations "effective in" their respective fields, Mr. Kotschnig remarked that it was equally important to obtain information concerning organizations that might well be dissolved.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) suggested that the phrase "in the economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields" should be placed after the words "Inter-governmental organizations".

Mr. MARLIN (International Civil Aviation Organizations) observed that the effect of the Canadian amendment would be to restrict the number of organizations in respect to which information would be supplied.

The Canadian amendment was accepted.

Paragraph 2 of the Australian text (document E/AC.24/1/Rev.1, lines 268 and 269), as amended, was accepted, the USSR representative abstaining.

The Committee then proceeded to consider lines 36 to 40 inclusive of the United States resolution (document E/647/Rev.1)

Mr. TANGE (Australia) said that, from the point of view of presentation, it would be better to have the paragraph in question, which dealt with priorities and was not specifically related to preparations for the seventh session of the Council, appear as a separate resolution establishing long-term principles and arrangements.

He believed that references to the specialized agencies and to the Secretary-General should be deleted. As far as the specialized agencies were concerned, the provisions of the paragraph in question represented no progress over those of the General Assembly resolution 125 (II); the Council should wait until it had something concrete to suggest. The Secretary-General should not be held answerable to the Council for establishing priorities; in the main, he had to follow the priorities established by the General Assembly and by the Councils, within the limitations of his budget.

/As regards the

As regards the commissions of the Council, they should be asked not only to establish priorities of work, but to indicate such priorities in their reports to the Council.

The Australian representative consequently moved the deletion, in the paragraph under consideration, of the words "the Secretary-General" and "and to indicate these priorities in their reports to the Council."

The representatives of Canada, the United Kingdom and France supported the Australian amendments.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) agreed with the Australian amendments, with the exception of the proposed deletion of the words, "and the specialized agencies". The specialized agencies had bigger budgets and a wider field of operations than the commissions. The Council had equal responsibilities towards both, and should ask both of them to establish, and report on, priorities of work.

The Australian amendment, that the words "the Secretary-General" should be deleted, was accepted.

The addition of the words "and to indicate these priorities in their reports to the Council", as suggested by the Australian representative was accepted.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) suggested that the Brazilian representative's point might be met by the addition, in line 80 of the United States resolution dealing with reports from specialized agencies (document E/647/Rev.1) of the phrase: "and indicating, if possible, any priorities of work established".

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) agreed that, in that case, the words "and the specialized agencies" might be deleted from the paragraph under discussion.

The Australian amendment, that the words "and the specialized agencies" should be deleted, was accepted.

At the CHAIRMAN'S suggestion, the words, "economic and social" were replaced by "respective".

The paragraph (lines 36 to 40 inclusive), as amended, was adopted.

/Mr. KOTSCHNIG (USA)

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said, in reply to the Canadian representative, that the following paragraph (lines 41 to 45 inclusive called for a report in the economic and social fields similar to the "Directory of Economic and Statistical Projects" published by the Secretariat in July 1947. A report of that type, possibly improved in form, would be helpful to the Council when it considered problems of co-ordination.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. VEYSEY (United Kingdom) agreed that such a report would be useful.

Mr. Veysey further remarked that not all subjects required listing; the Secretary-General's Committee on Co-ordination might be asked to advise on the selection of subjects. Moreover, an annual report might be sufficient.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) thought that the frequency of the reports should be included in the wording.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) suggested, in the light of his Government's experience, that the documents listed in the report should be classified according to subject-matter, and that the same classification should be adhered to; the reports over a period of years would thus be comparable, and their usefulness would be enhanced.

After a brief discussion, the paragraph was accepted in the following form: "Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the Economic and Social Council from time to time a descriptive catalogue of studies or investigations in the economic or social field by the United Nations and specialized agencies and to consider, in consultation with the Secretary-General's Committee on Co-ordination, form, content, frequency and procedures with respect to such catalogues."

The CHAIRMAN stated that the United Kingdom proposal with respect to a co-ordination committee, adopted earlier in the meeting, would be inserted at this point.

/He asked the

He asked the Committee to consider the preamble (lines 3 to 10 inclusive).

The first paragraph of the preamble (lines 3 to 6 inclusive) was deleted.

Mr. VEYSEY (United Kingdom) called attention to the fact that "paragraph (4)" in line 8 should be read "paragraph (5)".

The second paragraph of the preamble (lines 7 to 10 inclusive) was adopted.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) suggested that the second paragraph beginning with the word "Requests" (lines 36 to 40 inclusive) might come immediately after the preamble.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) proposed that the vote on the resolution as a whole should be postponed until the other two United States resolutions dealing with co-ordination had been discussed. It might be found, for example, that the paragraph dealing with the descriptive catalogue should be transferred to another resolution, in order that the resolution the wording of which had just been adopted might be concerned entirely with matters bearing on the seventh session of the Council.

The Australian proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.