

ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIALUNRESTRICTED  
E/AC.24/SR.40  
9 August 1949Dual DistributionECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCILNinth SessionCO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTIETH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Monday, 25 July, 1949, at 3 p.m.Contents:

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL  
ON RELATIONS WITH INTER-GOVERNMENTAL  
ORGANIZATIONS (Item 43 of the  
Council Agenda) (Continued) ..... pages 3 - 25

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. PLIMSOLL

Members:

Australia

Mr. CUMES

Belgium

Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE

Brazil

Mr. MACHADO

Byelorussian SSR

Mr. AGAPOV

Chile

Mr. GONZALEZ

China

Mr. TSAO

Denmark

Mr. DAHLGAARD

France

Mr. de COMMINES

India

Mr. SEN

New Zealand

Miss HAMPTON

Poland

Miss CZARKO

Turkey

Mr. MIRAS

Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics

Mr. BORISOV

United Kingdom

Mr. LEDWARD  
Miss SALT

United States of America

Mr. STINEBOWER

Representatives of Specialised Agencies:

International Labour Office

Mr. COX  
Mr. SOTO

Food and Agriculture  
Organisation

Mr. OLSEN

United Nations Educational,  
Scientific and Cultural  
Organisation

Mr. TERENCE

World Health Organisation

Dr. HAFEZI  
Miss HOWELL

Secretariat:

Mr. Martin Hill

Director of Co-ordination for  
Specialised Agencies and for  
Economic and Social Matters

Sir Raphael Cilento

Director of the Division of Social  
Activities

Mr. Lukac

Director of the Transport and  
Communications Division

Mr. Schachter

Deputy Director General  
Legal Division

Mr. Sze

Secretary to the Committee

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON RELATIONS WITH INTER-  
GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (Item 43 of the Council Agenda)  
(Documents E/1318, E/AC.24/W.25) (Continued).

(21) Central International Railway Transport Office.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) recalled that discussions were proceeding within the Sub-Committee on Rail Transport of the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe on the integration of all bodies concerned with railway transport. He would propose therefore that, pending the conclusion of those discussions, the matter be deferred.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) was not opposed to deferment of the question, but drew attention to the fact that the Economic Commission for Europe was only a provisional body, the existence of which was guaranteed only until 1951. He wondered whether there were any underlying reasons for submitting that point to the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. LUKAC, Director of the Transport and Communications Division, said that the Economic and Social Council had previously decided that the work of inland transport organizations should come within the purview of the relevant regional commissions. Close though the links were between the two, there was no suggestion that the Economic Commission for Europe should absorb the Central International Railway Transport Office.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) considered that the issue should be examined without reference to the future of any regional commission.

The Committee adopted by 10 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions a resolution for submission to the Economic and Social Council noting that the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe was studying the whole question of inland transport including the functions of the Central International Railway Transport Office, deciding to take no action in the matter at present, and requesting the Secretary-General to report upon it to the Economic and Social Council at its eleventh session.

(22) International Commission of the Cape Spartel Light

Mr. LUKAC, Director of the Transport and Communications Division, said that the question of the administration of the Light did not come within the proposed terms of reference of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, but that once it had begun its work it could certainly examine the question.

The Committee adopted by 10 votes to 3 a resolution for submission to the Economic and Social Council resolving that no action be taken on that question, which should be referred to the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, when established.

(23) International Conference for Promoting Technical Uniformity in Railways.

The Committee decided by 10 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions to submit to the Economic and Social Council in regard to the International Conference for Promoting Technical Uniformity in Railways a resolution identical with that adopted on the Central International Railway Transport Office.

(24) International Hydrographic Bureau

Mr. LUKAC, Director of the Transport and Communications Division, referring to the comment made by the United Kingdom Government on the International Hydrographic Bureau (Document E/1318), recalled that it was an intergovernmental organization which had worked under the auspices of the League of Nations in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter of that body.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) stated that his Government's comment had been sent in before the recent meeting of cartographic experts at Lake Success, which had been attended by a representative of the Hydrographic Bureau. The comment was out of date.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) was prepared to agree that a specific reference be made to that Organization in the Committee's report, and considered that it should continue its work.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) drew attention to the comment made by his Government on the International Hydrographic Bureau, stressing its closer relationship with the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization rather than with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Document E/1318, page 23)

and proposed that the Committee take no action in the matter for the present.

The Committee decided by 11 votes to 3 to submit to the Economic and Social Council in regard to the International Hydrographic Bureau a resolution on similar lines to that adopted on the International Commission of the Cape Spartel Light.

- (25) International Ice Observation and Ice Patrol Service in the North Atlantic Ocean.

The Committee agreed, in the light of the Secretariat's comments, (Document E/1318, pages 23-24) to recommend that the International Ice Observation and Ice Patrol Service in the North Atlantic Ocean be deleted from the list of organizations.

- (26) Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine.

Mr. M. CHADO (Brazil) stated that at the present time the relationship between the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine and the Economic Commission for Europe was perfectly clear, but that his Government was unable to accept, as a matter of principle, that permanent activity be referred to a body with a provisional status such as that enjoyed by the Economic Commission for Europe. An explicit reference to that point should be made in the Committee's report.

The Committee adopted, by 11 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions, a resolution for submission to the Economic and Social Council, noting with approval the relationship established by the Economic Commission for Europe with that body, and requesting the Secretary-General to submit a report on such to the eleventh session of the Council.

- (27) European Conference on Time Tables.

The Committee unanimously decided to submit to the Economic and Social Council in regard to the European Conference on Time Tables a resolution identical with that adopted on the Central International Railway Transport Office and the International Conference for Promoting Technical Uniformity in Railways.

- (28) Office of Inter-American Telecommunications.

- (29) Pan-American Railway Committee

- (30) Permanent American Aeronautical Commission

The Committee unanimously decided to submit to the Economic and Social Council in regard to the following organizations: Office of Inter-American Telecommunications, Pan-American Railway Committee, Permanent American Aeronautical Commission, a resolution inviting the Secretary-General to initiate negotiations with the Director-General of the Organization of American States on the question of the possible relationships which might be established between the above-mentioned organizations and the United Nations or a specialized agency and to report on the results of those negotiations to the next session of the Council.

(31) Permanent Committee of International Congress on Military Medicine and Pharmacy.

Dr. HAFEZI (World Health Organization) did not favour the integration of the Permanent Committee of International Congress on Military Medicine and Pharmacy into the World Health Organization since it was undertaking useful work in a distinct field.

Mr. SEN (India) said that the fact that an organization was doing useful work was not a reason for its not being independent.

Mr. MIRAS (Turkey) declared himself in favour of maintaining that organization's present constitution.

Dr. HAFEZI (World Health Organization), replying to the CHAIRMAN, pointed out that the question of co-operation between the two organizations had been examined by the Executive Board of the World Health Organization, which had decided that the Permanent Committee's work did not fall exactly within the organization's terms of reference.

Mr. SEN (India) considered that the Committee should adopt the same procedure as in other border-line cases, namely to request the Secretary-General to study whether any further co-operation were necessary. It might be that the two bodies approached the same question from different angles, and that the fundamental difficulty was one of terminology. He was prepared to endorse the recommendation

made by the United Kingdom Government to the effect that "the question of absorbing [the Permanent Committee] in or relating it to the World Health Organization should be considered" (Document E/1318, page 26).

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America), recalling that the question of merging the Permanent Committee with the International Red Cross Committee was also under discussion, proposed that the Secretary-General be requested to report on the possibilities of closer relationship or integration between the former and other international bodies.

Miss HOWELL (World Health Organization) pointed out that the Permanent Committee was already affiliated to the International Red Cross Committee. The World Health Organization was able to maintain liaison with the Permanent Committee by means of the official relations between the Organization and the two international Red Cross Organizations; the International Red Cross Committee and the League of Red Cross Societies.

The CHAIRMAN proposed, and it was agreed by 11 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions, that the Committee adopt for submission to the Council a resolution taking no action at present in regard to the Permanent Committee of International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy, and requesting the Secretary-General to report to the Eleventh Session of the Economic and Social Council on the possibility and desirability of closer relations and integration between that body, the World Health Organization and other international bodies.

(32) Pan-American Sanitary Bureau.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) proposed with regard to the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau that the Committee make the same recommendation to the Council as it had done in the case of other Inter-American organizations.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) pointed out that the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau was in a somewhat special position because the majority of its members were also members of the World Health Organization; moreover, it had been proposed that the Bureau should

act as a regional office of the World Health Organization within the provisions of the latter's constitution. In his opinion the process of integration and co-operation was being correctly carried out.

Miss HOWELL (World Health Organization) said that the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau was now acting as a Regional Office of the World Health Organization. Until two-thirds of its members became members of the Organization, however, full integration was not possible. Moreover, formal integration necessitated certain changes, which would, presumably, be made at the appropriate time, in the constitution of the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau.

On the proposal of the representative of Brazil,  
the Committee unanimously decided to submit to the Economic and Social Council in regard to the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau a resolution identical with that adopted in the case of all other Inter-American organizations.

(33) Central Pan-American Bureau of Eugenics and Homiculture.

The Committee unanimously decided to submit to the Economic and Social Council in regard to the Central Pan-American Bureau of Eugenics and Homiculture a resolution identical with that adopted in the case of all other inter-American organizations.

(34) Far Eastern Commission

(35) International Criminal Police Commission

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Far Eastern Commission must be deleted from the list, since its functions and purposes fell outside the scope of the Council's resolution. The same action must be taken with regard to the International Police Commission, since it had now been granted consultative status as a non-governmental organization.

The Committee agreed to recommend deletion in both cases.



(36) International Institute for the Unification of Private Law.

Mr. SEN (India) said that though logical, the United Kingdom proposal (Document E/1318, p.28) on the possibility of negotiating the formal relationship agreement between the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law and the Economic and Social Council might be difficult to apply in practice. He wondered what sort of agreement the United Kingdom Government had had in mind. He also had some misgivings with regard to the United States proposal that the General Assembly consider the question. In his opinion the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law should be deleted from the list of inter-governmental organisations.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) had no serious objections to that proposal, but pointed out that in the opinion of his Government a relationship should be established between the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law and the International Law Commission, rather than direct between the former and the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. SEN (India) pointed out that the International Law Commission was concerned with international, and not with private law.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) considered that the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly alone was competent to consider the matter.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) said that since the United Kingdom had sent in its recommendation given in the report of the Secretary-General (Document E/1318, page 28), it had come to its knowledge that Spain was a member of the organization. The United Kingdom delegation consequently considered that it would be preferable for the Committee to make no specific recommendation.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Indian representative's proposal that the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law be deleted from the list of inter-governmental organizations.

The Committee unanimously agreed to recommend that the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law be deleted from the list of inter-governmental organizations.

(37) International Penal and Penitentiary Commission

The CHAIRMAN having drawn attention to the United States draft resolution in Document E/AC.24/W.25,

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) recalled that a substantive discussion had been held on the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission and its relationship with the United Nations both in the Social Commission and the Social Committee of the Economic and Social Council. The possibility that the United Nations should undertake work in the field of the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders had also been studied by the relevant bodies. The United States Government proposed that the work of the Commission be integrated with that of the United Nations.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) said that her government's position was similar to that of the United States of America, although the procedure envisaged was somewhat different. The Executive Board of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was shortly to meet in Berne. The United Kingdom representative at that meeting would submit to the Board a resolution on very much the same lines as those laid down in the United States draft resolution, recommending integration of the Commission in the United Nations.

Would the United States representative agree that the question be deferred until the decisions and the attitude of the Executive Board were made known?

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) was not prepared to urge his point of view, but considered that it might also be argued that it would be appropriate for the Executive Board of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission to have the guidance of the Economic and Social Council. The organization was important in itself, and difficulties of duplication and conflict might arise between it and the functional commissions.

The Twelfth International Penitentiary Congress which was scheduled to convene in 1950 offered a suitable starting point for the transfer of functions.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Executive Board of the Commission would meet between 1 and 6 August 1949.

Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) stated that as her Government was opposed to the dissolution of the Commission she would support the United Kingdom proposal by which the Council would avoid any action prejudging the decision of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission. If the Commission agreed to disband, the Council would be presented with a fait accompli, but the initiative should not come from the United Nations.

Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE (Belgium) did not share the views of the United States representative when he spoke of "duplication". The fact was that the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, thanks to its highly specialized secretariat and library, was an organ of documentation of such a character that fusion with a body of more extended competence would destroy all its value. For that reason, he was against the proposed fusion, but was prepared to support the United Kingdom representative's proposal that study of the question be deferred.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee would be prepared to adopt in principle the United States draft resolution, requesting the Economic and Social Council to defer consideration of the matter in plenary session until information became available concerning the decisions taken by the Executive Board of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) considered that proposal to be more far reaching than those made by the Belgian and New Zealand representatives.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) thought that it would be inadvisable to initiate two parallel lines of action.

Mr. SEN (India) asked what would be the budgetary implications if the United Nations took over the functions of the Commission.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opposed the United States draft resolution on the grounds that the Commission's terms of reference were highly specialized and technical, and that out of twenty-six member governments, ten were not members of the United Nations. He supported the implicit reference to greater expenditure contained in the question put by the Indian representative, and stated that he would vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. DAHLGAARD (Denmark) supported the proposal made by the United Kingdom representative.

Mr. SEN (India) proposed that the decision be deferred until a later stage in the session, the Secretary-General being requested meanwhile to report on the cost which would be incurred by the United Nations taking over the functions of the Commission and on whether that procedure would or would not interfere with the highly specialized work carried out by the latter.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) emphasized the fact that by earlier decisions the Economic and Social Council planned to intensify its work in the field of the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders and that annual budgetary provision had been made for those activities by the General Assembly. He was prepared to accept the Indian representative's proposal, but would recall that the case of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was clearly parallel to the case of the International Institute of Agriculture in Rome and the Office d'Hygiene Publique in Paris, organisations which had been amalgamated with the Food and Agriculture Organisation and the World Health Organization respectively. The purpose of including Item 43 in the Council Agenda was to achieve simplification.

Mr. MARTIN HILL, Director of Co-Ordination for Specialized Agencies and for Economic and Social matters, said that in the Secretary-General's view, should the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly and the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission decide on the advisability of amalgamation, the functions of the latter could be taken over by the Secretariat. The costs involved would therefore not be very considerable.

The Committee unanimously decided that action in regard to the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission be deferred till 8 August 1949, the Secretary-General being in the meantime requested to report to the Economic and Social Council on that date on the proceedings of the Executive Board of the Commission, as well as on the financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the United States (Document E/AC.24/W.25) and of any proposals that might be submitted by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission.

- (38) United Nations War Crimes Commission.
- (40) Inter-American Commission for Territorial Administration.

The Committee decided to recommend that the United Nations War Crimes Commission, the activities of which had now terminated, and the Inter-American Commission for Territorial Administration which had never in fact been established, be deleted from the list of inter-governmental organizations.

- (41) Inter-American Juridical Committee.

The Committee decided in regard to the Inter-American Juridical Committee to submit to the Economic and Social Council a resolution identical with that adopted in the case of all other inter-American organizations.

- (39) Committee of Experts on the Codification of International Law.
- (42) Permanent Committee of Jurists on the Unification of the Civil and Commercial Laws of America.
- (43) Permanent Committee of Havana on Comparative Legislation and the Unification of Law.
- (44) Permanent Committee of Montevideo on the Codification of Private International Law.
- (45) Permanent Committee of Rio de Janeiro on the Codification of Public International Law.

The Committee decided to recommend that the above-mentioned organizations be deleted from the list of inter-governmental organizations.

- (46) Bank for International Settlements.

The Committee decided by 11 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions to recommend that the Economic and Social Council take no action at the present time in regard to the Bank for International Settlements.

(47) International Customs Tariffs Bureau.

The Committee decided by 11 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions to submit to the Economic and Social Council a resolution taking note of the discussions initiated on the possible absorption or integration of the International Customs Tariffs Bureau into the future International Trade Organization and requesting the Secretary-General to report in due course to the Council on the progress of those discussions.

(48) International Exhibition Bureau.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) and Mr. SEN (India) considered that the Committee should give no specific recommendation on the International Exhibition Bureau which could not be usefully amalgamated either with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization or with the future International Trade Organization.

The Committee decided by 11 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions to submit to the Economic and Social Council in regard to the International Exhibition Bureau a resolution recommending that no action be taken at the present time.

(49) International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, supported by Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America),

the Committee decided by 12 votes to 3 to submit to the Economic and Social Council in regard to the International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property a resolution noting that discussions were being undertaken between that organization and the Interim Commission of the International Trade Organisation and requesting the Secretary-General to report to the Council in due course.

- (50) The International Cotton Advisory Committee
- (51) The International Rubber Study Group
- (52) The International Sugar Council
- (53) The International Tin Study Group
- (54) The Combined Tin Council
- (55) The International Wheat Council
- (56) The International Wine Office
- (57) The International Wool Study Group.

Mr. SEN (India) explained that the Indian Government had suggested that the International Cotton Advisory Committee be merged with the Food and Agriculture Organisation rather than with the future International Trade Organisation because cotton



was an agricultural product and the work of the Committee related less to trade than to the solution of the difficulties in the production of yarn and cloth. Furthermore, the Food and Agriculture Organization was already fully established and co-operating actively with the Indian Government.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said his delegation was in favour of merging the International Cotton Advisory Committee with either the future International Trade Organization or the Food and Agriculture Organization, but had difficulty in deciding the relative competence of the latter organizations in the matter, since the question of cotton involved aspects of both trade and development. On the whole he would incline to the Indian representative's view that the Committee should be integrated with the Food and Agriculture Organization.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) pointed out that commodity groups of that nature were specifically provided for under Chapter VI of the Havana Charter, and that it must be remembered that the United Nations had created a similar subsidiary body, namely the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements. He suggested that the Council should take no action on the International Cotton Advisory Committee (50), the International Rubber Study Group (51), the International Sugar Council (52), the International Tin Study Group (53), the International Wheat Council (55), and the International Wool Study Group (57) pending the final establishment of the International Trade Organization, and that responsibility should be left, in the meantime, to the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements. In conclusion, he had excluded the Combined Tea Committee (54) and the International Wine Office (56) from his proposal since those bodies were subject to special conditions which did not apply to the others he had mentioned.

In reply to a request by Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) for clarification, Mr. OLSEN (Food and Agriculture Organization) explained that his organization's approach to such commodity bodies was purely practical. The Secretariat of the Food and Agriculture Organization was almost invariably instructed to carry out studies in co-operation with them, but the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization had given no directive as to their absorption or integration.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) supported the United States proposal.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom), supporting the United States proposal, said his government's view was that the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements was responsible for commodity agreements. Furthermore, the competence of the Food and Agriculture Organization in matters relating to inter-governmental commodity agreements was specifically recognised by Article 67 of the Havana Charter.

Replying to Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) explained that he had omitted the Combined Tin Committee and the Inter-American Coffee Board from his proposal because the former was a temporary committee whose future was in doubt, although it still performed certain allocation duties, whereas the latter had ceased to exist on 30 September 1948. With regard to the International Wine Office he felt it hardly belonged to the category of food organizations and in any case he understood that the Office was preparing agreements with the Food and Agriculture Organization and the future International Trade Organization.

Mr. de COULMÈS (France) did not think either that the functions of the International Wine Office could be carried out by a specialized agency. Its activities were not exclusively commercial. They had a wider range, since the Bureau was concerned with ensuring freedom of the market, protecting names of wines derived from places of origin and with suppressing fraud. Like the United States representative he thought there should be an agreement between the International Wine Office and the Food and Agriculture Organization, and good progress had in fact been made towards the achievement of such an agreement. The Economic and Social Council might therefore note with satisfaction the fruitful collaboration that was being established between those two bodies and state that there was no objection to its development.



Mr. SEN (India) and Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said they would support the United States proposal on the understanding that the co-operation now proceeding between the bodies concerned and the specialized agencies, and in particular the Food and Agriculture Organization, would continue unimpaired.

In reply to the CHAIRMAN, Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) agreed to include the Combined Tin Committee in his proposal.

After some further discussion the Committee unanimously adopted a resolution for submission to the Economic and Social Council, resolving to take no action at this time with regard to the absorption or integration of the International Cotton Advisory Committee, the International Rubber Study Group, the International Sugar Council, the International Tin Study Group, the Combined Tin Committee, the International Wheat Council and the International Wool Study Group, and requesting the Secretary-General to report to the Council in due course.

The CHAIRMAN recalled the French Government's comment that no action should be taken with regard to the absorption or integration of the International Wine Office.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) concurred with this view, while Mr. SEN (India) proposed that the Office be simply deleted from the list of organizations under consideration.

The Committee adopted by 11 votes to 3 with 1 abstention a Resolution for submission to the Economic and Social Council, noting the establishment of relations between the International Wine Office and the Food and Agriculture Organization; and deciding to take no further action at the present time.

(58) Inter-American Coffee Board.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Board was no longer in existence.

The Committee agreed to recommend that the Inter-American Coffee Board be deleted from the list of inter-governmental organizations.

(57) Inter-American Trademark Bureau.

The Committee unanimously adopted a resolution for submission to the Economic and Social Council inviting the Secretary-General to initiate negotiations with the Director-General of the Organization of American States on the question of the possible relationship which might be established between the Inter-American Trademark Bureau and the United Nations or a specialized agency, and to report on the results of those negotiations to the next session of the Council.

(60) Inter-Allied Reparation Agency.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Inter-Allied Reparation Agency lay outside the scope of Council Resolution 171 (VII).

(61) International Central Office for the Control of the Liquor Traffic in Africa.

The CHAIRMAN said that the United States and Egyptian Governments favoured the transfer of this body's limited functions to the United Nations Secretariat.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) disagreed, stressing the regional nature of its functions and the possible budgetary implications of incorporating it with the United Nations.

Mr. de COMMINES (France) remarked that in view of that body's special functions, it should be made responsible for studying the question. There seemed to be no need for assigning it to a specialized agency.

Mr. SEN (India), agreeing with the view expressed by the Brazilian representative, moved the deletion of the body from the list of organizations under consideration. The United Nations lacked the machinery for performing the executive functions entailed, and the Council could hardly regard the problem of its absorption one of vital importance.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) said his government's contribution to the Office amounted to only some hundreds of dollars per annum, so that the budgetary implications of the proposal

to integrate it with the United Nations Secretariat were slight. Furthermore, it was not an executive organ, its main function being to collect and disseminate information. In his view, its work was no less within the purview of the United Nations than was any other matter pertaining to under-developed areas. He did not accept the argument that the question was of purely regional concern, since the same might be said of other functions already being performed by the United Nations.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said it would appear, in view of the United States representative's statement, that the body under discussion enjoyed a title out of all proportion to any work it could do with its obviously limited budget. He therefore maintained his opposition to the proposal that it should be taken over by the United Nations Secretariat.

Mr. SEN (India) said he opposed the proposal, not on regional grounds, but because of the additional work and expense entailed for the United Nations.

The Committee decided by 11 votes to 2 to recommend to the Council that no action be taken with regard to the absorption or integration of the International Central Office for the Control of the Liquor Traffic in Africa.

(62) International Relief Union.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom), amplifying his government's comments, said his delegation was convinced that the International Relief Union could serve no useful purpose. Its resources were too limited; its work had been ineffective in the disasters which had occurred between 1933 and 1939, and the same would probably prove true of any work it attempted in the future. The United Kingdom Government had withdrawn from membership of the Union, and he proposed that the Union be now terminated and its research documents and assets transferred to the United Nations.

Mr. de COMMINES (France) thought he was right in saying that negotiations had been started between the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the International Relief

Union and asked whether the representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization could give some information on the matter.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the United Kingdom representative's proposal, asked whether it was suggested that the Union's archives and assets be acquired without compensation, or that they should be purchased.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) thought the details relating to the transfer of documents and assets need not be discussed at that stage.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) agreed with the proposal that the Union should be terminated, but thought the transfer of archives and assets was a matter solely for the States members of the Union.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) and Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) shared the view of the Brazilian representative, the United States representative pointing out that the financial details regarding the Union contained in the List of Intergovernmental Organizations (Document E/318/Rev.1) suggested that the Union might have an initial fund of some \$2,000,000 dollars which could hardly be transferred without the consent of the States members of the Union.

The Committee decided unanimously to recommend the Council to adopt the following Resolution:

"The ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

RECOMMENDS that the States members of the International Relief Union should take steps to terminate the Union; and

REQUESTS the Secretary-General to give every assistance towards this end."

(63) American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN the Committee agreed to submit to the Council a resolution inviting the Secretary-General to initiate negotiations with the Director-General of the Organization of American States on the question of the possible relationships which might be established between the American International Institute for the

Protection of Childhood and the United Nations as a Specialized Agency and to report on the results of those negotiations at the next session of the Council.

(64) Caribbean Commission.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that it was brought out clearly in the List of Inter-Governmental Organizations (Document E/818/Rev.1) that the general functions of the Commission were related to those of all the specialized agencies.

After a brief discussion the Committee unanimously adopted for submission to the Council a resolution noting that the Caribbean Commission had established working relations with the appropriate bodies of the United Nations and specialized agencies, and recommending that such co-operation should be continued wherever necessary.

(65) Commissioner-General's Economic Organization (for Southeast Asia)

Mr. LEONARD (United Kingdom) said his Government held the view that the Commissioner-General's Economic Organization (for Southeast Asia) was, technically speaking, not an inter-governmental organization, since it had not been established by formal inter-national agreement, but had been set up and was maintained and administered by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

Mr. SEN (India) said the United Kingdom representative's statement was technically correct. Nevertheless, the list of member governments of the Organization was to be found on page 28 of the List of Inter-Governmental Organizations (Document E/818/Rev.1). Therefore, the Organization must be functioning on the basis of some kind of formal agreement. The Indian Government considered that this Organization came within the purview of the Council and that it should be merged with the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, since its objectives were the same as the latter's.

Mr. CUMES (Australia), supporting the United Kingdom representative, considered that no Council action was required, since the Organization had already established relations with the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America), speaking from memory, thought that the Council had previously agreed not to include this Organization as an inter-governmental body. He therefore thought that it might well be deleted from the list.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) agreed that working agreements had been reached between this Organization on the one hand and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and the Food and Agriculture Organization on the other, but claimed that those agreements did not prejudice the question as to whether it was an inter-governmental organization or not.

Mr. SEN (India), stressing the statement in the United Kingdom Government's comments on page 43 of the Report of the Secretary-General on Relations with Inter-Governmental Organizations (Document E/1318) that this Organization had already entered into working relations with the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and that that relationship had been formally established, said that the question as to whether it was an inter-governmental organization or not was a purely technical matter. In practice, it involved working arrangements between several governments; the Organization's purposes and functions were the same as those of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) said it was essential to distinguish between organizations which were inter-governmental and those which were not. There were in existence many organizations the integration of which would multiply the Council's work considerably.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that inter-governmental organizations were defined in Council Resolution 171 (VII).



Mr. SEN (India) stressed that the list of inter-governmental organisations, which included the Commissioner-General's Economic Organisation, had been drawn up by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil), recalling the terms of reference of the Council, said he was disinclined to accept any proposal which might tend to impair those terms of reference.

Mr. SEN (India) said his government suggested merging this Organisation with the United Nations organs mainly in order to prevent duplication and overlapping.

The Committee decided by 7 votes to 5 with 2 abstentions to recommend the Council to delete the Commissioner-General's Economic Organization (for South East Asia) from the list of inter-governmental organizations.

Mr. SEN (India) pointed out that only the Brazilian representative, the United States representative to some extent, and he himself had given any valid reasons for their votes. He requested that his statement should be mentioned in the record of the Committee's proceedings.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) observed that the Commissioner-General's Economic Organization would continue to co-operate with United Nations organs, as a governmental organization.

(66) Inter-American Commission of Women.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Inter-American Commission of Women no longer existed as a separate organization.

The Committee agreed to recommend to the Council that the Inter-American Commission of Women be deleted from the list of Inter-Governmental Organizations.

(67) International Co-ordination Committee for European Migratory Movements.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) said he understood that the Governing Body of the International Labour Organization had agreed to incorporate this organization.

Mr. COX (International Labour Organization) confirmed this.

After some further discussion the Committee adopted by 12 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions a resolution for submission to the Council noting that the International Labour Organization had begun discussion with the International Co-ordination Committee for European Migratory Movements, and requesting the Secretary-General to report on the progress of negotiations to the Eleventh Session of the Council.

(68) South Pacific Commission

After some discussion the Committee unanimously adopted for submission to the Council a resolution noting that the South Pacific Commission had established working relations with the appropriate bodies of the United Nations, and recommending that such co-operation should continue wherever necessary.

Additional Organizations

The CHAIRMAN called attention to the four additional organizations referred to on page 2 of the Report of the Secretary-General on Relations with Inter-Governmental Organizations, namely, the International Whaling Commission, the Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council, the International Commission for Colorado Beetle Control and the Nutrition Institute of Central America and Panama.

At the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. OLSEN (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that his organization would naturally co-operate with the International Whaling Commission and was already servicing the Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council.

The question of the control of the Colorado Beetle was a technical one and the Food and Agriculture Organization was working in close association with the experts on the matter.

On the proposal of Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) seconded by Mr. MACHADO (Brasil), the Committee unanimously adopted for submission to the Council a resolution requesting the Secretary-General to collect information on the International Whaling Commission, the Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council and the International Committee for Colorado Beetle Control, and to report to the Eleventh Session of the Council.



and a further resolution requesting the Secretary-General to consult with the Council of the Organization of American States with regard to the Nutrition Institute of Central America and Panama, and to report to the Eleventh Session of the Council.

Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile) thought that the wording of the resolutions proposed was too vague and that a more precise text would have to be found later.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that discussion of Item 43 of the Council Agenda had now been completed. There remained however Section II of the Secretary-General's report on general co-ordination matters, referring to possible consideration by the Council of consultative status for inter-governmental organizations.

It was agreed, that in view of the action taken already in individual cases, no action on that suggestion was necessary at the present time.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil), referring to the work programmes of Council Committees, said it was most important that the Council should give clear indications on next year's programmes to the General Assembly. When the calendar of meetings came to be examined clear and complete picture should have been provided by the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the necessary steps had already been taken by the Secretariat.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.