

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.24/SR.91  
15 November 1951

ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH AND FRENCH



Dual Distribution

Thirteenth Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE NINETY-FIRST MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 11 September 1951, at 10 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Reports of the Ad hoc Committee on the  
Organization and Operation of the Council  
and its Commissions (item 36 of the Council  
agenda)(E/1995 and Corr.1, E/1995/Add.1 to 4,  
E/L.176, E/L.274, E/AC.24/L.35, E/AC.24/L.36,  
E/AC.24/L.38, E/AC.24/L.41, E/AC.24/L.42,  
E/AC.24/L.43, E/AC.24/L.44)(continued)

- (a) Functional commissions (continued)
- (b) Regional commissions (resumed from the  
90th meeting)
- (c) Functional commissions (resumed)

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. KOTSCHNIG

Members:

Belgium	Mr. van der SCHUEREN Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE
Canada	Miss MEAGHER
Chile	Mrs. FIGUEROA
China	Mr. TSAO
Czechoslovakia	Mr. NOSEK
France	Mr. HESSEL
India	Mr. DESAI
Iran	Mr. JAZAERI
Mexico	Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG
Pakistan	Mr. ISMAIL Mr. Atwar HUSSAIN
Philippines	Mr. REYES
Poland	Miss KALINOWSKA
Sweden	Mr. MICHANEK
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. MOROSOV
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. CORLEY SMITH Mr. OVERTON
United States of America	Miss BELL
Uruguay	Mr. ALVAREZ OLLONIEGO

Observers from Member States:

Brazil	Mr. MACHADO
Netherlands	Mr. van ASCH van WIJCK

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. FLORES
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. McDOUGALL

Representatives of specialized agencies (continued):

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. TERENCE
World Health Organization	Dr. FORREST

Representative of an organization invited by the Council:

League of Arab States	NAMAZI Pasha
-----------------------	--------------

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category B and Register

Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations	Mr. WARBURG
International Federation of University Women	Miss MILLS
International Statistical Institute	Mr. NIXON
International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues	Miss ARCHINARD
World Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations	Mr. PENCE

Secretariat:

Mr. Steing	Acting Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs
Mr. Lukac	Director, Division of Transport and Communications
Mr. Chossudovsky	Economic Commission for Europe
Mr. Malinowski	Division of Economic Stability and Development
Mr. Hogan	Secretary to the Committee

REPORTS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE COUNCIL AND ITS COMMISSIONS (item 36 of the Council agenda) (E/1995 and Corr.1, E/1995/Add.1 to 4, E/L.176, E/L.274, E/AC.24/L.35, E/AC.24/L.38, E/AC.24/L.41, E/AC.24/L.42, E/AC.24/L.43, E/AC.24/L.44) (continued)

(a) Functional Commissions (continued)

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Pakistani representative, who had to leave shortly to attend a plenary meeting of the Council, had requested permission to speak on the activities of one of the functional commissions. He accordingly proposed to give that representative the floor, after which the Committee would continue its discussion on the future activities of the regional commissions.

It was so agreed.

Mr. ISMAIL (Pakistan) recalled the fact that the Ad hoc Committee on the Organization and Operation of the Council and its Commissions had recommended that the Economic, Employment and Development Commission be discontinued, its work being taken over by the Council or its committees, by the regional commissions, or by ad hoc bodies, as appropriate (E/1995, paragraph 20(1)). That Commission had recently been dealing with the problem of financing the development of under-developed countries, which, as the Committee would undoubtedly agree, was one of the most important economic problems with which the world was faced. He felt that the Council itself was not in a position to give that matter the time and attention which it deserved. If the Committee felt that, because of the wide scope of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission's terms of reference, or for other reasons, it was no longer the proper body to deal with the matter of financing, he would suggest that a small standing committee of the Council or some similar machinery should be set up, in order to ensure that the measures recommended by the Council for the development of under-developed countries were implemented. Such a standing committee might also submit recommendations to accelerate the rate of development in under-developed countries and, with the help of experts and the Secretariat submit, if necessary, studies for the consideration of the Council.

The Council should maintain a continuous watch on the action taken to implement its decisions concerning under-developed countries, and, since it would have difficulty in doing so by itself, a standing body of the type he advocated would be necessary. He felt that a small committee would be most suitable, but if the Committee thought that some different kind of machinery might be more appropriate, his delegation would be prepared to consider any suggestions. He intended to introduce a draft resolution on the lines he had indicated.

(b) Regional Commissions (resumed from the 90th meeting)

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft resolution submitted jointly by the French and United Kingdom delegations (E/AC.24/L.42) and to the Soviet Union amendment (E/L.274) to the draft terms of reference of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) recommended by the Seventh session of that Commission.

Mr. HESSEL (France) explained that the French and United Kingdom delegations had endeavoured to incorporate in the text of their joint draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.42) all the provisions relating to the regional economic commissions examined by the Committee at its previous meeting. That meant that the provisions in documents E/AC.24/L.39 and E/AC.24/L.39/Add.1 as well as those given in document E/AC.24/L.40, which was no longer before the Committee, were to be set aside in favour of the new text.

In that connexion, he had again examined the question of the interval that should elapse between two successive sessions of any of the regional commissions, and had come to the conclusion that it would be better not to insert in the joint draft resolution a restrictive paragraph on the lines of the one which had originally appeared in document E/AC.24/L.40. Hence the Committee should note that the last paragraph of Section (4) of the joint draft resolution (page 5) was to be regarded as deleted. Otherwise, the joint draft resolution contained only one new paragraph, namely, Section (1) on page 1, where it was proposed that Annex A should incorporate the text of paragraphs 5 to 10 of the second report of the Ad hoc Committee. That would enable readers of the resolution to see at a glance which were the principles laid down by the Ad hoc Committee and approved by the Co-ordination Committee for adoption.

In reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN, Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) said he agreed to the deletion of the paragraph in Section (4) to which the French representative had referred.

Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE (Belgium) supported the joint draft resolution. It was important that the regional commissions should be allowed a certain latitude in respect of the period that must elapse between any two sessions of the same commission. After all, the economic situation might develop in such a way that the regional commissions would be obliged to convene a session for the purpose of approving a decision taken by one of their committees.

Mr. DESAI (India) supported the joint draft resolution in general, but felt that it was unnecessary to place undue emphasis on paragraphs 5 to 10 of the second report of the Ad hoc Committee by including the text of those paragraphs in Annex A. If the sponsors of the joint draft resolution insisted on retaining Annex A, he would be obliged to speak on certain aspects of the principles laid down in those paragraphs.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) explained that the text of paragraphs 5 to 10 would be reproduced purely for the sake of convenience.

Mr. HESSEL (France) pointed out that the joint draft resolution would form only the beginning of the general resolution to be adopted by the Committee in connexion with the reports of the Ad hoc Committee, so that it would perhaps be wise to defer a final decision on the reference to Annex A, pending the completion of the Committee's work on item 36 of the Council agenda.

If, after approving the general considerations and the recommendations of the Ad hoc Committee, the Committee perceived that a large number of texts would, in the interests of clarity, have to be reproduced as annexes it might then deem it simpler to abandon the idea of having annexes and to refer the reader to the Ad hoc Committee's reports as a whole. In that event, the French delegation might decide not to press for the inclusion of the text of paragraphs 5 to 10 in Annex A. He therefore suggested that the Committee should defer its decision on the matter, since agreement might be reached at a later stage.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the proposed new section (5) of the joint draft resolution (page 5) referred to a subject which, the Ad hoc Committee had suggested should be referred to the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. The latter had discussed the matter at length, and had adopted a relevant resolution which was included in its report to the Council. He had discussed the point with the President of the Council, who had suggested that the Co-ordination Committee should not embark upon a discussion of the substance of the question, since it was now before the Council itself.

The proposed new paragraph 5 of ECAFE's terms of reference (section (3) II (f) of the joint draft resolution) was the text proposed by ECAFE itself; the Soviet Union delegation had submitted an amendment (E/L.274) to that paragraph. He suggested that that amendment should be discussed first.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), requesting clarification of the Chairman's remarks on section (5) of the joint draft resolution, said that if the Committee need take no decision on section (5) for the reasons stated by the Chairman, the same would appear to apply to other sections of the joint draft resolution, and especially to section (3) I (a), which concerned the inclusion in the terms of reference of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) of a new paragraph 13. It was his understanding that the Committee would not have to discuss that particular point either.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the paragraph in question had not been referred to the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. That Committee had been assigned the task of considering the rules of procedure of the regional commissions, but not their terms of reference.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the paragraph he had referred to dealt with the same question as that to which section (5) related. In any case, if the problem was discussed by the Committee, he reserved his delegation's right to make some observations on the subject.



Presenting his delegation's amendment to new paragraph 5 of the draft terms of reference of ECAFE (E/L.274), he recalled that, although the question of the participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Commission had often been discussed by various organs of the United Nations, it had not been settled in accordance with the principles of the Charter. The decisions taken were contrary to the interests of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, and favoured the metropolitan countries responsible for administering them.

Since the question was again under discussion, the Soviet Union delegation considered that the Council should review its earlier decisions.

ECAFE proposed the insertion of a new paragraph in its terms of reference to the effect that any territory within the geographical scope of the Commission might, on presentation of its application to the Commission by the member responsible for the international relations of such territory, be admitted by the Commission as an associate member. Such a provision would mean that a Non-Self-Governing Territory could be admitted as an associate member only with the consent of the metropolitan country concerned. The representation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories would thus be entirely dependent on the will of the colonial Powers, a position contrary to the principles of the Charter and, in particular, to Article 73, which provided that "Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government ..... accept as a sacred trust the obligation ..... to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions". Even in cases where the colonial Powers might permit the territories under their administration to be represented on ECAFE, the representatives appointed for the purpose would clearly not be in a position to defend the interests of the population of those territories, since they would be chosen to favour the interests of the metropolitan Power concerned. It was for that reason that the Soviet Union delegation had introduced an amendment which sought to enable the Non-Self-Governing Territories to make direct application to the Commission to be allowed to take part in its work. The adoption of the amendment would enhance the authority and prestige of ECAFE in the eyes of the colonial peoples, and help it to fulfil the task entrusted to it with regard to the economic development of the countries of Asia and the Far East.



Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) supported the views of the Soviet Union representative and the amendment he had introduced.

Mr. DESAI (India) asked whether he was correct in believing that, when the amendments to ECAFE's terms of reference (E/AC.24/L.39) had been under discussion the previous day, the representative of the Secretariat had stated that all Non-Self-Governing Territories in the area had joined ECAFE under the existing arrangements.

He pointed out that ECAFE itself had recommended the amendments to its terms of reference reproduced in the joint draft resolution. He wondered, however, whether an amendment of the kind now introduced by the Soviet Union representative had already been discussed, and asked the representative of the Secretariat whether any similar proposal had been submitted at the seventh session of the Commission.

Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretariat) replied that the statement he had made the previous day, namely, that all Non-Self-Governing Territories referred to in paragraph 3 (A) (1) of ECAFE's terms of reference had been admitted as associate members, had been confirmed by the Executive Secretary of the Commission.

He could not give an immediate answer to the second question put by the Indian representative, but would consult the Executive Secretary and give a reply later in the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should consider the joint draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.42) paragraph by paragraph, and that it should discuss the Soviet Union amendment (E/L.274) before dealing with section (3) II (f).

It was so agreed.

#### Section (1)

The CHAIRMAN said that he would put section (1) to the vote, with the temporary omission of the words "(see Annex A)".

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that section (1) was extremely vague. What was to be understood, for example, by the words "the principles contained in paragraphs 5 - 10 of the second report of the Ad hoc Committee"? Perusal of the report showed it to contain a number of points, some of which were contradictory. To cite one example, whereas the report recognized the special position of the regional economic commissions and their power to take decisions, the effect of certain of its recommendations was to subject the commissions to certain conditions which deprived them of that power. Accordingly, the Soviet Union delegation was unable to accept section (1) of the joint draft resolution, and wished to remind the Committee of the importance of the decision it was about to take.

Mr. DESAI (India) to some extent shared the feelings of the Soviet Union representative, and suggested that the words "in general" be inserted after the words "to approve".

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) and Mr. HESSEL (France) accepted the Indian amendment.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that the amendment suggested by the Indian representative changed the meaning of the passage; but he still considered it unacceptable, even in that more general form.

Section (1), as amended, and with the temporary omission of the words "(see Annex A)" was approved by 14 votes to 3.

Section (2)

Section (2) was approved unanimously.

Section (3) I (a).

The CHAIRMAN then invited comments on section (3) I (a).

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew the attention of the Committee to the relevant resolutions adopted by ECE and ECAFE, and included

in their annual reports; in particular he pointed out that ECE had studied ways and means of regulating its consultations with non-governmental organizations, and had unanimously decided that, apart from an amendment of form, the various rules of its rules of procedure which governed the matter were quite adequate, and that the present position and the manner in which the rules were applied established satisfactory relations between the Commission and the non-governmental organizations interested in its work. In the same way, ECAFE had considered that its special nature called for provisions with regard to relations with non-governmental organizations different from those which the Economic and Social Council and its functional Commissions had adopted in their own rules of procedure. The resolutions adopted by the two Commissions were quite clear on that point. However, despite that clearly expressed wish of the Commissions, an attempt was now being made to impose new rules on them from outside. The Soviet Union delegation remained convinced that the real object of the proposed amendments was to make it more difficult for certain democratic non-governmental organizations to participate in the work of those Commissions. For that reason, and since such an attempt ran counter to the expressed wishes of those Commissions, the Soviet Union delegation would vote against section (3) I (a).

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) explained that his position was similar to that of the Soviet Union representative with regard to the imposition of rules of procedure on the regional commissions, but he did not feel that the proposed new paragraph 13 to be inserted in ECE's terms of reference would have that effect, as it referred only to principles contained in Parts I and II of Council resolution 288 (X).

The CHAIRMAN agreed, and recalled the fact that those principles had been accepted by the regional commissions long since. The adoption of the paragraph in question would thus not oblige them to change their rules of procedure relating to consultation with non-governmental organizations, and would not affect their consultative relationship with the non-governmental organizations in any way. To his knowledge, none of the regional commissions had established consultative arrangements which conflicted with the principles of Parts I and II of Council resolution 288 (X).

In reply to a question put by the CHAIRMAN, Mr. CHOSSUDOVSKY (Secretariat of the Economic Commission for Europe) said that the question of relationships with non-governmental organizations had been discussed in ECE within the framework of the rules of procedure adopted by the Commission. He recalled the fact that, in establishing the regional commissions, the Council had not included in their terms of reference any item bearing on the relationship between the commissions and non-governmental organizations.

Miss BELL (United States of America) reminded the Committee that the item under discussion related to the terms of reference, and not to the rules of procedure of the regional commissions.

She asked the representative of the ECE Secretariat whether he could confirm that ECE had maintained formal consultative relations only with non-governmental organizations granted consultative status by the Council.

Mr. CHOSSUDOVSKY (Secretariat of the Economic Commission for Europe) replied that certain technical committees of ECE had maintained and were still maintaining ad hoc working relations with a number of non-governmental organizations not included in the three categories in consultative status with the Council. When, at its sixth session, ECE had unanimously adopted its report on consultative arrangements with non-governmental organizations, that practice had been kept in mind. It had been understood since the inception of ECE that - for instance, in the fields of transport and of housing - the Commission could, at the request and with the consent of governments represented in the Committees concerned, take advantage of the specialized contribution that certain non-governmental organizations could make to the Commission's work, even though those organizations might not be in consultative status with the Council.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that, according to some speakers, there was no question of imposing new rules of procedure on the economic commissions; it was simply a matter of adopting a principle. He hoped that the assurance given by the Chairman, and not challenged by any member of the Committee, namely, that the relations of the regional commissions with non-governmental organizations would not be affected, would be reported in the summary record

of the meeting. Nevertheless, he could not see what useful purpose would be served by modifying the principles governing relations between the regional commissions and non-governmental organizations by including the new paragraph in the Commissions' terms of reference. That question had been settled once and for all when the Commissions had been set up. Moreover, the three regional commissions had, in their reports to the Council, stated that they were satisfied with the existing provisions.. That being so, no new decision by the Committee or Council was called for.

Section (3) I (a) was approved by 13 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

Section (3) I (b)

Section (3) I (b) was approved without comment.

Section (3) I (c)

Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) reminded the Committee that at the preceding meeting the United States representative had expressed the hope that the Council would be able to review the work of the regional commissions at the time when it reviewed its own programme. If that review took place in 1953, the implication could be that the regional commissions would be placed on the same footing as the functional commissions. But the relevant General Assembly resolutions left no room for doubt concerning the permanent continuance of the regional commissions. She wished to emphasize, therefore, that any future review of the work of the functional commissions should not be related in any way to a review of that of the regional commissions. The functional commissions were now to be given a period of probation, whereas the regional commissions had successfully completed their probationary period over the past three years. The present decision to continue them was a decision to continue them indefinitely. She therefore fully supported the existing text of section (3) I (c) and requested that her statement be reported in the summary record.

Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) expressed agreement with the Chilean representative.

Miss BELL (United States of America) felt that the Chilean representative and she herself were actually in complete agreement. She had not meant to cast any doubt on the indefinite continuance of the regional commissions. Nor was she in favour of any further probationary period being fixed for them. But she did think that, when the reorganization of the Council and the functional Commissions came to be reviewed, the work programmes of the regional commissions would of necessity be involved if any changes were made in the Council or the functional Commissions.

Section (3) I (c) was approved unanimously.

Section (3) II (a)

Section (3) II (a) was approved without comment.

Section (3) II (b)

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union delegation's attitude to Section (3) II (a) and the other proposed amendments to ECAFE's terms of reference would depend on the Committee's decision on section (3) II (f), which contained the text of a new paragraph 5. He must therefore reserve his delegation's position for the present with regard to the other proposed amendments.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee could consider the Soviet Union ~~amendment~~ amendment to paragraph 5 of ECAFE's draft terms of reference first, if such a procedure would make it easier for the Soviet Union delegation to decide its attitude to the remaining amendments. In that connexion, he asked the representative of the Secretariat what answer had been received to the second question put to him earlier by the Indian representative.

It was agreed to take up section (3) II (f).

Section (3) II (f)

Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretariat) said that the Executive Secretary had informed him that the proposal contained in the Soviet Union amendment had not been submitted to ECAFE at its seventh session.



Mr. REYES (Philippines) stated that the Philippine delegation had always supported the principle that Non-Self-Governing Territories should be associate members of ECAFE; since it appeared that all such territories in Asia and the Far East were already associate members of the Commission, he did not see the relevance of the Soviet Union amendment. He would like to have some explanation from the Secretariat. Since it appeared that the question had become academic, his delegation would abstain from voting on the Soviet Union amendment.

Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretariat) explained that the question was largely one of a legal nature. So far as he could recall the Commission's discussion on the question, as reported in the summary records, the questions raised in the proposed new paragraph 5 and in the Soviet Union amendment thereto were relevant. For instance, applications for associate membership for certain Territories under United Kingdom administration had been made jointly, and the whole group of Territories had been admitted as one associate member. As, under paragraph 3 A (i) of the Commission's terms of reference each of those Territories had the right to become an individual associate member, there was, leaving all other considerations aside, a need to establish some procedure governing the admission of associate members. He added that paragraph 3 A (i) of ECAFE's terms of reference had been divided into two paragraphs, 4 and 5, in the text proposed by the Commission itself at its seventh session, and that the substance of the new paragraph 5 was already included in paragraph 3 A (i).

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that some speakers had questioned the practical value of the Soviet Union amendment.

Since ECAFE had considered it expedient to include in its terms of reference a new clause dealing with the participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in its work, the Soviet Union delegation considered it essential that the provisions set forth in that new paragraph should conform to the principles of the Charter. The Soviet Union amendment had, for that matter, already been introduced during the discussions in the Ad hoc Committee, so that the proposal was therefore neither new nor unexpected. The matter was one of great importance, and could not be considered as of purely academic interest, as the Philippine representative had suggested.

Mr. TSAO (China) noted that the Soviet Union amendment referred to "participating members" and wondered whether the correct term was not rather "associate members".

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), in reply to an enquiry by the CHAIRMAN, said that "participating members" was a literal translation of the Russian term. He agreed that in English it should read "associate members".

It was so agreed.

The Soviet Union amendment to the draft terms of reference of ECAFE (E/L.274) was rejected by 9 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then put section (3) II (f) of the joint draft resolution (E/AC/24/L.42) to the vote.

Section (3) II (f) was approved by 14 votes to 3.

Section (3) II (h)

Mr. MICHANEK (Sweden) requested that section (3) II (h) should be voted upon separately.

Section (3) II (h) was approved by 13 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Section (3) II (k)

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that section (3) II (k) should be voted upon separately.

Section (3) II (k) was approved by 13 votes to 3 with 1 abstention.

Section (3) II as a whole

Section (3) II was approved as a whole by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Section (3) III

Section (3) III was approved by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Section (4)

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution had withdrawn the last paragraph of section (4).

Mr. HESSEL (France) pointed out that the French text of section (4) was incomplete, as the phrase "and in consultation with the Secretary-General", which appeared in the English text, had been omitted.

The CHAIRMAN said that the French text would be corrected accordingly.

Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) thanked the French and United Kingdom representatives for withdrawing the last paragraph of section (4). She considered that it would have been unwise to lay down too rigidly the frequency of sessions of the regional commissions, and that it should be left to the commissions themselves to decide when they should meet.

Mr. MACHADO (Observer for the Brazilian Government) asked whether, under the terms of section (4), the Executive Secretary of a Commission would be entitled to change the date and place of a session after a Council decision had been taken, and what, in that case, would be the position of the Secretary-General. That was a practical question which should be answered.

Mr. HESSEL (France), replying to the Observer for the Brazilian Government, pointed out that the procedure indicated in the second sentence of the amendment in section (4), whereby the Executive Secretary would be empowered to alter the date and place of sessions in special cases, was made subject to the approval of the Interim Committee on Programme of Meetings. In the case in question, the Council was giving the commissions the opportunity of considering any developments which might occur after the termination of the Council's session, and therefore subsequent to its decision, which might call for an alteration in the date and place of their next session. Such a provision was essential, and did not in fact constitute a new procedure.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to know what changes section (4) would entail in the existing provisions of the rules of procedure of the regional commissions.

Mr. LUKAC (Secretariat) stated in reply that the procedure suggested would not alter existing practice. The purpose of the procedure was to make it possible for the date and place of sessions already approved by the Commissions to be altered, should unforeseen circumstances arise making such a change indispensable.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) saw no value in such a provision; the Soviet Union delegation would vote against section (4) for the reasons it had already had occasion to explain in its general statement to the Committee. The Soviet Union delegation considered that the regional commissions should be left to decide for themselves the question of the date and place of their next session, without the Council exercising supervision in the matter.

Section (4) was approved by 14 votes to 3.

(c) Functional Commissions (resumed)

The CHAIRMAN called the Committee's attention to the Ad hoc Committee's recommendations concerning the organization of the functional commissions (E/1995, paragraphs 15-20), to the working paper submitted by the French delegation (E/AC.24/L.36), and to the amendments to the draft resolution contained therein proposed by the delegations of Belgium, Pakistan and the United States of America (E/AC.24/L.41, E/AC.24/L.43 and E/AC.24/L.44 respectively).

Mr. van der SCHUEREN (Belgium) said that, in general, the Belgian delegation was in favour of continuing all the functional commissions except the Economic, Employment and Development Commission. His delegation also favoured the discontinuance of the existing sub-commissions, but agreed that the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press should hold one further session in order to complete its work on the draft International Code of Ethics for Journalists.

With regard to the Commission on Human Rights, the Ad hoc Committee had recommended, by 7 votes to 1 with 1 abstention, that the Commission should continue in its existing form until it had completed its work on the draft International Covenant on Human Rights. The Covenant was a most important matter, and the Commission had already done very valuable work upon it. Consequently, the Belgian delegation supported the Ad hoc Committee's recommendations in that case.

With regard to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the Ad hoc Committee had recommended, by 7 votes to 1, that the Commission should continue until it had completed the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. The Belgian delegation likewise supported that recommendation. There was no reason to expect that the work entrusted to the Commission on Human Rights and to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs could be completed before the end of 1954. Consequently, the Belgian delegation saw no objection to supporting paragraph (b) (3) of the French draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.36), which provided that both Commissions should be continued until that date.

In addition, the Ad hoc Committee had recommended the continuation of five other functional commissions, namely, the Fiscal Commission, the Statistical Commission, the Population Commission, the Commission on the Status of Women and the Social Commission, until the end of 1953; it had recommended, however, that those Commissions should meet only when convened by the Council on the recommendation of the Secretary-General.

The Fiscal Commission had succeeded in doing very valuable work, particularly on the question of double taxation, and the Belgian delegation was in favour of its continuation.

With regard to the Statistical Commission, the Ad hoc Committee had recognized the value of its work, which could serve as a basis for economic and social investigations. That Commission could help to make international statistics more comparable, and it would be regrettable if its members, who were all highly competent experts, were dispersed. The Belgian delegation agreed with the arguments advanced by the Ad hoc Committee on that matter, and wished to add, first, that the Statistical Commission had succeeded the Committee of Statistical

Experts, established under the Geneva Convention of 1928, and secondly, that the International Statistical Institute, which was responsible for co-ordinating the basic methods used by different countries in compiling their statistics, seemed to have abandoned that task to some extent. The Statistical Commission would be particularly well qualified to take over that work. Hence, the Belgian delegation agreed that the Statistical Commission should be continued under the conditions proposed by the Ad hoc Committee.

With regard to the Population Commission, the majority of the Ad hoc Committee had been in favour of its continuation, since demographic work was becoming increasingly important, particularly in relation to economic and social factors. Hence, the Belgian delegation was in favour of continuing the Commission, provided that it concentrated on a small number of tasks of immediate importance to the United Nations.

The Ad hoc Committee had also recommended that the Commission on the Status of Women should be continued until it had completed its present programme. That Commission was the body best qualified to ensure the equality of social and political rights for women referred to in the Charter, and the Belgian delegation would therefore vote for its continuation.

With regard to the Social Commission, opinions had been greatly divided. The Committee had recommended that it should be continued by 5 votes to 4, the Chairman exercising his casting vote. Those in favour of continuing the Social Commission had stressed the fact that it studied a very large number of questions which were not dealt with by the specialized agencies, and that it was the only United Nations organ concerned with the welfare of the individual; its work, moreover, was followed by a large public and by various non-governmental organizations. Those who desired its discontinuance had pointed out that the Commission dealt with such varied matters that its members could not be expected to possess full technical knowledge in all its fields of activity. They would therefore prefer groups of experts to be set up to study certain specific questions. The view of the Belgian delegation was that the Social Commission should be continued. Not only was it doing most useful work, but it gave small countries an opportunity of being heard. Belgium was in the first rank so far as social



achievements were concerned, and her experience could be of great value to the Commission. It would, however, be much harder for her to secure representation in the groups of experts which certain delegations recommended should be used in future.

The French delegation proposed, in paragraph (b) (4) of its draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.36), that the five functional commissions to which he had just referred should be continued for an unspecified period, but that they should meet only once every two years, unless special circumstances led the Secretary-General to make other proposals on the subject and such proposals were approved by the Economic and Social Council. The Belgian delegation supported those proposals on the understanding that the Commissions would be convened at least once every two years. His delegation was also able to support paragraph (b) (5) of the French draft resolution, which recommended that in 1953 only the Population Commission, the Fiscal Commission and the Commission on the Status of Women should be convened.

He then turned to the functional Commissions and their sub-commissions which the Ad hoc Committee had proposed should be discontinued. The Belgian delegation agreed to the discontinuance of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission, for the reasons given in the Ad hoc Committee's report. It did not, however, think it desirable to terminate the activities of the Transport and Communications Commission, and it had therefore introduced an amendment (E/AC.24/L.41) providing for that Commission's continuation. He would give all the necessary details at the appropriate point in the discussion. The Belgian delegation agreed that the Sub-Commission on Statistical Sampling should be done away with; its past work had been very helpful, but its functions could now more suitably be taken over by the Statistical Commission itself.

The Ad hoc Committee had recommended, by 6 votes to 1 with 1 abstention, that the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities should be discontinued. There had been criticisms of that Sub-Commission's work, and it had been charged in particular with having made insufficient progress. It was not, he pointed out, a question of terminating the work of the Sub-Commission, but of passing it over to the Commission on Human Rights, which would be better able to carry it out. Moreover, should the Commission on Human Rights consider

it necessary, it would itself be able to set up a subsidiary body or working group to deal more particularly with the prevention of discrimination.

He had had no opportunity of examining the Pakistani and United States amendments, the texts of which had just been circulated. He reserved the right to speak to them later in the discussion.

Mr. DESAI (India) said that the Belgian delegation agreed to a great extent with the views expressed by the Belgian representative, and that it supported the latter's proposal that the Transport and Communications Commission should be continued.

The Indian delegation also supported the United States amendments concerning the Economic, Employment and Development Commission, the Sub-Commission on Statistical Sampling and the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities. He was glad to note that the United States delegation had stressed the fact that when functional commissions or sub-commissions were discontinued their work should be taken over by the appropriate body of the United Nations.

He also supported paragraph 4 of the United States amendments, which provided a very necessary measure of elasticity.

Miss BELL (United States of America) supported the view expressed by the Belgian representative concerning the Transport and Communications Commission. The work that Commission did was extremely useful, and the Commission represented the best means of carrying it out for the time being. In addition, she entirely approved of the French proposal that the Population Commission, the Statistical Commission, the Fiscal Commission, the Social Commission and the Commission on the Status of Women should be convened only once every two years.

The proposals made by the United States delegation in paragraph 1 of document E/AC.24/L.44 did not affect the general substance of the French draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.36), except in the case of the Transport and Communications Commission, but merely provided that the work of the commissions discontinued should be taken over by the appropriate bodies, as had been intended by the Ad hoc Committee.

The United States delegation agreed to the proposal in paragraph (b) (2) of the French draft resolution.

Referring to paragraph 2 of the United States amendments, she stated that the proposal to continue annual meetings of the Social Commission had been put forward because her delegation felt that the Commission was doing important work which should not be interrupted. She also pointed out that there was no specialized agency operating in that field, and that the Social Commission was the only United Nations body giving attention to social welfare programmes.

She withdrew paragraph 3 of the United States amendments in favour of the Belgian amendment (E/AC.24/L.41).

Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) was in general agreement with the French draft resolution and the amendments proposed to it, but wished to refer to two matters which called for the closest attention by the Committee.

The first was the proposal that the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities should be discontinued, its work being taken over by the Commission on Human Rights. While there was no problem of discrimination or minorities in Latin America, where equal rights were enjoyed by all, such discrimination did exist in other parts of the world, and the discontinuance of the Sub-Commission would thus affect millions of human beings. There was no doubt that the Commission on Human Rights was the appropriate body to deal with the problem, but that Commission would be almost exclusively occupied for several years to come with the draft Covenant on Human Rights, and would have little time to deal with the problems of discrimination and minorities. If the problem were referred to that Commission, therefore, it would inevitably be neglected for a comparatively long time. In view of that fact, he considered that it might be preferable to continue the Sub-Commission, giving it new terms of reference.

With reference to the proposal made in the French draft resolution that only one more session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press should be convened, he recalled the fact that the Council had already alarmed public opinion by its inability to take on the basic measures necessary to bring about

freedom of information. If the Sub-Commission were to be discontinued after one final session, public opinion would surely be led to doubt that the United Nations had any interest in the problem.

Mr. HESSEL (France) was gratified to observe that his delegation's draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.36) had had the desired effect - in other words, that it had given rise to comments and amendments. He had already said that he was quite prepared to consider amendments, and to accept them if they did not clash with the principles which the French delegation was anxious to see adopted on the subject.

With regard to the Belgian amendments (E/AC.24/L.41), he said that his own delegation's view on the discontinuance of the Transport and Communications Commission was not a hard and fast one. From the discussion which had just taken place, it appeared that the majority of the members of the Committee desired that Commission to continue. His delegation was therefore prepared to accept the Belgian amendment.

With regard to the United States amendments (E/AC.24/L.44), the French delegation accepted the clearer version of paragraph (b) (1), and was therefore prepared to withdraw its original text in favour of paragraph 1 of the United States amendments. It also accepted the more precise wording given by paragraph 2 of those amendments to paragraph (b) (3) of the French draft resolution, at least so far as the mention of annual meetings was concerned. With regard to that part of paragraph 2 of the amendments, however, which dealt with the Social Commission and provided that that Commission should continue to meet every year in the same way as the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the French delegation would reserve its position for the time being. If it was really desired to lighten the calendar of conferences, it was advisable to ensure ~~that only those Commissions whose work, in the opinion of all delegations, would be improved by their meeting annually, actually did so. That did not seem to be true of the Social Commission, which dealt with multifarious questions and already had several studies in progress; its work would certainly not be adversely affected if it met only every other year.~~

He considered that paragraph 4 of the United States amendments contained an excellent suggestion, allowing as it did a certain latitude to the Secretary-General which would be very useful once biennial sessions were the regular practice.

He wished to amend paragraph (b) (5) of the French draft resolution. It seemed to him that the Commission on the Status of Women possibly had very valid reasons for meeting in 1952, the more so as the Council had just entrusted to it the urgent task of drawing up a convention on the political rights of women. But since he had accepted the proposal that the Transport and Communications Commission should be continued, he felt that it would be advisable to substitute the words "Transport and Communications Commission" for the words "Commission on the Status of Women" in paragraph (b) (5). Drafted thus, paragraph (b) (5) would have the effect of deferring to 1953 the next session of the Transport and Communications Commission; such a measure would seem justified without under-estimating the importance of that Commission's work.

With regard to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, that Commission was mentioned in paragraph (b) (3) of the French draft resolution on the same footing as the Commission on Human Rights, and its meetings were labelled with the same general reservations "until 31 December 1954". He emphasized the point that it was not to be understood thereby that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs could not continue to meet yearly after 31 December 1954, or that the French delegation was contemplating placing a limit on the frequency of its meetings. His delegation had inserted the date 31 December 1954, because it had considered it useful that the Council should, after that date, review its entire structure and the structure of its subsidiary bodies. There was therefore no reason why an exception should be made in the case of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

Mr. Atwar HUSSAIN (Pakistan) stated that the Pakistani delegation supported the Belgian amendment to the French draft resolution, but wished to have more time to consider the United States proposal that the Economic, Employment and Development Commission should be discontinued until 31 December 1954. He supported the remaining United States amendments.

The amendment proposed by the Pakistani delegation (E/AC.24/L.43) to paragraph (b) (4) of the French draft resolution had been introduced in order to retain the recommendations of the Ad hoc Committee, which it considered to be more flexible than the wording proposed in the French draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.