

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.34/SR.16

15 May 1951

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE COUNCIL AND ITS COMMISSIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 4 May 1951, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Draft first report of the Committee (Conference Room Papers
Nos. 18, 18/Corr.1, 18/Add.1, 18/Add.2, 19, 20, 21, 16) (continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SAKSENA	India
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. BRENNAN	Australia
	Mr. de ALMEIDA	Brazil
	Mr. CHANG	China
	Mr. de SEYNES	France
	Mr. CHERNYSHEV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. CORLEY SMITH	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. LUBIN	United States of America
<u>Representatives of specialized agencies:</u>		
	Mr. HILL	World Health Organization (WHO)
	Mr. ARNAIDO	United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

Secretariat:

Mr. OWEN	Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs
Mr. LUKAC	Director of the Transport and Communications Division
Mr. HOGAN	Secretary of the Committee

DRAFT FIRST REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (Conference Room Papers Nos. 18, 18/Corr.1, 18/Add.1, 18/Add.2, 19, 20, 21, 16) (continued)

Paragraph 11

The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to resume consideration of paragraph 11.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) indicated that the USSR delegation had proposed the deletion of the entire introductory section. He wished to make it clear that his silence on individual paragraphs of the text should not be interpreted as acceptance by the USSR delegation of those texts.

Sub-paragraph (a) was approved without comment.

Mr. CHANG (China) proposed that sub-paragraph (b) should be slightly amended to read:

"The arrangements for sessions should be such as to facilitate the attendance of 'high level' representatives and expert advisers of Member Governments."

Sub-paragraph (b) was approved as amended.

Sub-paragraph (c) was approved without comment.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of India, proposed a redraft of sub-paragraph (d) and a text combining sub-paragraphs (e), (f), (g) and (j) (Conference Room Paper No. 21).

Mr. de SEYNES (France) accepted the Chairman's amendments which in general were improvements of the amendments submitted by the French delegation (Conference Room Paper No. 18). He felt, however, that the Chairman's reference to Member and non-member Governments was undesirable.

/There was

There was a brief discussion, in the course of which a number of sub-paragraphs were rearranged in the order indicated below.

Sub-paragraph (e) of the draft report became the new sub-paragraph (c).

Sub-paragraph (c) of the draft report became the new sub-paragraph (d).

The first paragraph of the Indian amendment (Conference Room Paper No. 21), replacing the former sub-paragraph (d) and beginning with the words "The role of the United Nations Secretariat", became the new sub-paragraph (e).

The second paragraph of the Indian amendment, beginning with the words "The successful functioning of the Council", became the new sub-paragraph (f), the words "member and non-member Governments and" being deleted.

The third paragraph of the Indian amendment, beginning with the words "Efforts should similarly be made", became the new sub-paragraph (g).

The above sub-paragraphs were approved, replacing sub-paragraphs (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (j) of the draft report.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) proposed that in sub-paragraph (h) the words "for Governments, for delegations, and for the international secretariats" should be placed after the word "advantageous" rather than at the end of the text.

Sub-paragraph (h) as amended was approved.

Sub-paragraph (i) was approved with the insertion of the word "features" between the words "these" and "include" in line 3.

The CHAIRMAN noted that sub-paragraph (j) had been covered in the redraft of an earlier sub-paragraph.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) felt that sub-paragraph (k) was self-evident and therefore should be deleted.

Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) thought that, although the principle set forth in sub-paragraph (k) might be obvious, it should be stated since it had been one of the Committee's guiding principles.

Sub-paragraph (k) was approved.

/Mr. CORLEY SMITH

Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) said that sub-paragraph (1) was not clear and added nothing to the substance of the introduction.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) replied that sub-paragraph (1) was desirable in that it expressed a conservative attitude on the reorganization of the Council as opposed to a radical one.

Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil) felt that the paragraph contributed the essential idea that the Committee had not been drastic in its recommendations but had sought to conserve as much as possible and to limit the changes to matters which would produce obvious improvements in the functioning of the Council.

After an exchange of views regarding the drafting of the final section of sub-paragraph (1), Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) proposed that after the words "international co-operation", the text should read:

"and that its recommendations should be such as to enhance the value of these assets".

Sub-paragraph (1) was approved with the United States amendment to the final part.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) remarked that an additional paragraph should be inserted indicating an important point which had guided the Committee in many of its recommendations. He proposed the following text:

"Finally, the Committee agreed that its recommendations should be experimental in nature and should be reviewed before the end of 1953."

The additional paragraph proposed by the United States representative was approved.

The introduction as a whole was approved as amended.

Part III. Recommendations concerning the organization of the Council (Paragraphs 12 and 13)

The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee had approved the recommendations contained in part III at an earlier meeting and that detailed consideration was therefore unnecessary.

/Mr. CHANG

Mr. CHANG (China) requested that the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 8 should be placed at the end of the preceding paragraph so as to have a parallel construction in all three cases.

It was so agreed.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) recalled his proposal at the opening of the preceding meeting that part IV should be published as an annex or a separate document on the responsibility of the Secretariat. If that procedure were adopted, the views of the minority, which now appeared only in part IV, should be given a place in the body of the Committee's report.

He therefore reserved the right to make suggestions in the matter when a decision was taken regarding part IV.

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) felt that in principle the preamble and the recommendations should be restricted to the views of the majority alone. If, in accordance with the proposal of the representative of France, the Committee decided to include the views of the minority in part III, he reserved the position of the Australian delegation on the preamble to part III.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said that if the Committee had chosen to cast its recommendations in the form of draft resolutions for submission to the Council, the question of inserting minority views at that point would never have arisen.

In the opinion of the United States delegation it was completely inappropriate for the minority's views to be presented in part III of the report, which, it had been agreed, should be devoted to the recommendations of the Committee. The views of the minority should undoubtedly be indicated but they should be placed elsewhere in the report.

Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) concurred in the view of the representative of the United States and indicated that part III should be devoted only to the recommendations of the Committee as a whole. If the French suggestion were adopted, all minority views would have to be recorded.

Mr. de SEYNES

Mr. de SEYNES (France) said that his proposal that part IV should be published separately on the responsibility of the Secretariat had been intended solely to shorten debate in the Committee. It was important, however, that the views of the minority should appear somewhere in the body of the report. If part IV were published separately, the views of the minority would have no place in the report itself.

He was willing to consider alternative suggestions for the inclusion of the minority views elsewhere in the report.

Mr. CHANG (China) expressed the view that part III was not an appropriate place for the minority views and should be reserved for an expression of the majority views only. Nevertheless he wished to emphasize the importance of including the views of the minority somewhere in the report.

The CHAIRMAN noted that there was unanimous agreement regarding the desirability of including the views of the minority in the report. There was, however, disagreement regarding the appropriate place for the expression of those views.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that much of the report before the Committee was devoted to obvious statements which could easily be omitted since they served no purpose. In his opinion the report should follow the lines of the reports of Committees of the General Assembly. After indicating the Committee's terms of reference, the report should proceed directly to part IV, which should begin with concise statements of all the formal proposals and resolutions submitted to the Committee. There could then be an indication of the action on each of those proposals and finally a statement of the recommendations of the majority.

That procedure constituted the only clear and logical method of objectively recording the Committee's proceedings and defining the positions of both the majority and the minority.

/He emphasized

He emphasized the fact that the procedure he advocated would merely change the order of presentation of the material in the report without altering its substance. Moreover, there was no need to fear that the report would be lengthened unduly since the insertions would be factual and brief.

He therefore moved that the formal proposals with regard to recommendations concerning the organization of the Council and the functional commissions should be inserted in the report before the Committee's conclusions.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said that the Committee had taken a decision on the form of the report; the USSR representative's proposal would alter that form and therefore reverse the decision. Furthermore, while he fully agreed that minority views should be recorded somewhere in the body of the report, the insertion of only the formal proposals, as suggested by the USSR representative, would not give a fair picture of the proceedings. Delegations had frequently changed their positions without necessarily making a formal proposal each time.

Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) shared that view. For the Committee's convenience, the United Kingdom delegation had presented its proposals well in advance; that fact did not make them less official or worthy of note than proposals moved in the course of the debate.

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) agreed with the two preceding speakers. It was precisely because the conclusions reached frequently represented the outcome of a complex and shifting situation that the Committee had decided to cast its report into its present form.

Mr. de SEYMES (France) requested that the two parts of the USSR representative's proposal should be put to the vote separately.

The CHAIRMAN accordingly first put to the vote the USSR representative's proposal that the formal proposals placed before the Committee with regard to recommendations concerning the organization of the Council should be mentioned in the report before the majority decisions of the Committee were stated.

That proposal was rejected by 4 votes to 3.

/ The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the USSR representative's proposal that the formal proposals placed before the Committee with regard to recommendations concerning the organization of the functional commissions should be mentioned in the report before the majority decisions of the Committee were stated.

That proposal was rejected by 6 votes to one.

Paragraphs 12 and 13 were approved.

Preamble to recommendations concerning the organization of the functional commissions, to be inserted before paragraph 14 (Conference Room Papers Nos. 20 and 16)

Mr. de SEYNES (France) introduced his additional text (Conference Room Paper No. 16) which he wished to appear at the end of the four-delegation preamble (Conference Room Paper No. 20). His text did not, properly speaking, represent a minority view, but that of a fraction of the majority, which had frequently voted for the same conclusions as the majority, but for other reasons. What was more important, that fraction did not always put the same interpretation on the conclusions reached as did the majority. Thus, he did not take the same view as the drafters of the preamble on the extent to which the Secretary-General should exercise his power of recommending to the Council that a certain commission should be convened or withholding the recommendation. The additional text suggested by France was needed to complete the picture by presenting the different view within the majority.

Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil) was not sure that he could still support the French representative's text. The third paragraph, which spoke of ensuring the widest possible participation of United Nations Members in the Council's activities, appeared to be premature, since the Committee had not yet settled that point and would revert to it at the next session, at which concrete recommendations would probably be adopted. The last paragraph was superfluous: if indeed the three commissions in question had an important task before them, there was no reason to fear that their activities would be slowed down, as they would certainly be convened by reason of their agenda.

Mr. CHANG (China) pointed out that the French proposal had been drafted earlier than the preamble it was intended to follow. The two were written in very different styles. In order to avoid an abrupt transition, it would be better for the French representative to amend certain passages in the preamble and to insert sentences at appropriate places than simply to add his text on to the preamble

/ Incidentally,

Incidentally, in the fifth line of paragraph 1 of the preamble (Conference Room Paper No. 20) the word "outside" should be replaced by "specific additional".

Mr. de SEYNES (France) said, in reply to the Brazilian representative's first remark, that the mention of participation of United Nations Members in the Council's activities was necessary because the Committee could hardly make recommendations on various commissions without some reference to that important subject, which the General Assembly itself had taken up in several resolutions.

While he agreed that the Chinese representative's suggestion provided a logical solution, he had been unable to amend satisfactorily an earlier text of the preamble and feared that it would be no easier to deal with the text contained in Conference Room Paper No. 20 in that manner. He had, in fact, proposed an additional text because the preamble appeared to reflect the radical position of the United Kingdom representative, whose proposals had been rejected by the Committee, and therefore read like an introduction to conclusions opposite from those which it was intended to precede.

Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) was ready to collaborate with the French representative on a compromise text, although he was dubious of success.

The CHAIRMAN said that the debate would be continued at the following meeting.

Mr. CHANG (China) suggested that at that meeting the summary of the Committee's discussions contained in pages 11 to 21 inclusive of the report should be adopted by the Committee as part of the report, while only general comments should be made on the text in pages 22 to 42 inclusive, which would then be re-drafted by the Secretariat on the basis of those comments and issued on its own responsibility.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) withdrew the proposal he had made at the previous meeting in favour of that suggestion.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he might be unable to attend the following meeting of the Committee and therefore wished to comment now on later sections of the report.

He noted that paragraph 32 set forth the USSR proposals without indicating the reasons which had led the USSR to propose the abolition of certain commissions of the Council. He therefore requested that the views of the USSR delegation on the subject as set forth in paragraph A, page 2, of Conference Room Paper No.2/Rev.1 should be incorporated.

He also requested the deletion of the word "unconditionally" in the first line of paragraph 32 and that the final paragraph of page 27 should be amended as follows:

"One member considered that, as regards its work on double and other taxation, the Commission had been doing useless work and that it had been trying to impose...".

A complete statement of the views of the USSR delegation could be found in the summary records.

The USSR delegation would vote against the report as a whole because its proposals had not been accepted; because, on the suggestion of the United States and the United Kingdom, three sessions of the Council had been recommended; and because increasing use of individual experts was being suggested. In the opinion of the USSR, the Committee's recommendations would tend to complicate the work of the Economic and Social Council and its Commissions.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.