

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.24/SR.100
19 November 1951

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH AND FRENCH

Dual distribution

Thirteenth Session
CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Saturday, 15 September 1951, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

pages

Reports of the Ad hoc Committee on the Organization and Operation of the Council and its Commissions (item 36 of the Council agenda) (continued):

1. Joint draft resolution submitted by the Canadian, Swedish and United Kingdom delegations (E/AC.24/L.66) 3 - 6
2. Inclusion of three annexes to the Committee's resolutions on item 36 of the Council agenda. 6 - 7
3. Draft resolution submitted by the Pakistani delegation (E/AC.24/L.45) on economic development, amendments thereto submitted by the Belgian, Chilean, French and United Kingdom delegations (E/AC.24/L.48) and Pakistani amendment (E/AC.24/L.67) to the amendments in document E/AC.24/L.48 7 - 11
4. Statement to be prefixed to the Committee's comprehensive resolution on item 36 of the Council agenda. 11

Present:

Chairman: Mr. KOTSCHNIG

Members:

Belgium	Mr. van der SCHUEREN
Canada	Miss MEACHER
Chile	Mrs. FIGUEROA
China	Mr. TSAO
Czechoslovakia	Mr. NOSEK
France	Mr. HESSEL
India	Mr. DESAI
Iran	Mr. JAZAERI
Mexico	Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG
Pakistan	Mr. Atwar HUSSAIN
Philippines	Mr. REYES
Poland	Mr. BIRECKI Miss KALINOWSKA
Sweden	Mr. MICHAŃEK
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

Observer from a Member State:

Netherlands	Mr. van ASCH van WIJCK
-------------	------------------------

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. FLORES
-----------------------------------	------------

Secretariat:

Mr. Steinig	Acting Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs
Mr. Lukac	Director, Division of Transport and Communications
Mr. Powers	Department of Administrative and Financial Services
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) (continued):

1. Joint draft resolution submitted by the Canadian, Swedish and United Kingdom delegations (E/AC.24/L.66)

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Canada, Sweden and the United Kingdom (E/AC.24/L.66) relating to the avoidance of double discussion.

Mr. Atwar HUSSAIN (Pakistan) repeated that, in his opinion, procedural changes should only be made when they commanded the support of a substantial majority. Accordingly, as a number of delegations had spoken against the joint draft resolution, he would vote against it.

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that, for reasons he had made clear at earlier meetings, he would vote against the joint draft resolution.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) deplored the obstinacy of the three co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution in declining to withdraw it in the face of the refusal of a number of delegations to agree to any limitation of the freedom of discussion granted to the Council under the Charter. He considered that the proposals put forward in the joint draft resolution were illegal, and he would vote against it.

Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) considered that the joint draft resolution was in fact an independent proposal unrelated to the question of the reorganization of the Council's operations, and one which really raised an issue of principle, and not one of procedure.

As a body responsible for taking action, the Council could only adopt its resolutions after full and free discussion of their subject matter, and no matter how excellent the intentions of the authors of the joint draft resolution might be, the Chilean delegation could not agree to a provision which conflicted with one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations.

It would be regrettable if the success of the patient work so far accomplished

by the Committee were jeopardized for that reason. Consequently, considering that the question of the prevention of double discussion was not yet ripe, the Chilean delegation, in a spirit of compromise, proposed that its consideration should be deferred to a later session.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom), replying to the Chilean representative, reiterated that, in the opinion of the United Kingdom delegation, the provisions of the joint draft resolution related only to a matter of procedure. No delegation which had taken part in the earlier discussions in the Committee had spoken against the principle of freedom of speech, but it was most important that that freedom should not be allowed to degenerate into licence.

Mr. ALVAREZ OLLONIEGO (Uruguay), confirming the Uruguayan delegation's position, regretted that there did not seem to be any support for the Chilean proposal, since it would no doubt be possible during the next few months to work out a procedure capable of commanding general support.

Just as the authors of the joint draft resolution genuinely believed that it related only to a procedural issue, so those who opposed it considered with equal good faith that it struck at the very principle of freedom of speech.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) assured the Uruguayan representative that he had never entertained any doubts about the sincerity of the intentions of other delegations.

If the joint draft resolution were rejected, he considered that it was not improbable that other delegations would, in the light of future experience, come in time to move towards the views it represented.

Mr. REYES (Philippines) explained that, although the Philippine delegation was anxious to help the Committee to find a way out of the impasse in which it found itself, and although it had been partly responsible for initiating the idea at issue, it was not prepared to press the matter unless there was evidence that there would be unanimous support for, or at least an overwhelming majority in favour of, the concept underlying the provisions of the joint draft resolution.

In view of the fact that the Committee was evenly divided on the issue, he would abstain from voting, but he reserved his right to reconsider his position in the Council itself should any new considerations arise.

Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico), supporting the opinion of the Chilean representative that the question was not yet ripe for consideration, thought that the best course would be for the sponsors of the joint draft resolution to agree to withdraw it, on the understanding that the question might be taken up again at a later session of the Council.

If, however, the joint draft resolution was pressed to a vote, the Mexican delegation, faithful to the principle of freedom of expression, would vote against it.

Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) wished it to be placed on record that the Chilean delegation did not doubt that the delegations which supported the joint draft resolution were equally convinced that they were acting in defence of inviolable principles. Nevertheless, the difference between the two schools of thought hinged on the belief that the methods advocated in the proposals militated against those principles.

Mr. DESAI (India) drew attention to the fact that the proposals contained in the joint draft resolution had developed from earlier discussions in the Committee. The background to the resolution was the attitude earlier adopted by a number of delegations and generally accepted by the Committee, namely, that the bulk of the Council's business should be dealt with at plenary meetings of the Council, and that the Committees should function, when required, only as working parties. That would throw a heavy burden on the Council.

The joint draft resolution had brought out a different idea, namely: that only major questions should be taken up by the Council itself in plenary meeting; that the Council might refer to an appropriate committee some aspects of those questions for study, drafting and report back to the Council; that such reports made by a committee to the Council would always remain open for discussion; that some minor questions might be referred direct to a committee of the whole by the

Council during the discussion on the adoption of the agenda; and that discussion on the report of the committee of the whole on such matters should ordinarily be limited, unless it was the desire of one-third of the members of the Council that the discussion should be reopened in plenary meeting.

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) requested that the vote on the joint draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.66) should be taken by roll call.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Pakistan, having been drawn by lot by the CHAIRMAN, was called upon to vote first. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Belgium, Canada, China, France, India, Sweden,
United Kingdom and United States of America.

Against: Chile, Czechoslovakia, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan,
Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
and Uruguay.

Abstained: Philippines.

8 votes were cast in favour of the joint draft resolution and 8 against, with 1 abstention. The joint draft resolution was accordingly rejected.

2. Inclusion of three annexes to the Committee's resolutions on item 36 of the Council agenda.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had been proposed earlier in the discussions that three annexes should be attached to the resolutions recommended to the Council by the Co-ordination Committee on item 36 of the Council agenda. It had been suggested that Annex A should reproduce paragraphs 5 to 10 of the second report of the Ad hoc Committee on the Organization and Operation of the Council and its Commissions (E/1995/Add.1); that Annex B should reproduce paragraphs 15 to 18 of the first report of the Ad hoc Committee (E/1995); and that Annex C should reproduce paragraphs 12 and 13 of the first report, relating to the operation of the Council itself.

Mr. HESSEL (France) thought that the various paragraphs of the reports of the Ad hoc Committee constituted a very valuable whole which the Secretariat and delegations would undoubtedly keep before them.

It would therefore be as well in his opinion, not to annex them to the Committee's resolutions, to which they would only be an encumbrance.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) said that it might facilitate the future study of the question if the Annexes were included, since they would make clear which parts of the ad hoc Committee's reports had met with the approval of the Co-ordination Committee. He would therefore vote for their inclusion.

Mr. DESAI (India) said that the reproduction of paragraph-by-paragraph excerpts from the Ad hoc Committee's reports as annexes to the Committee's resolutions would fail to differentiate between those parts with which the Co-ordination Committee was in agreement and those with which it was not. He would therefore vote against the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal that three annexes consisting of extracts from the reports of the ad hoc Committee should be attached to the resolutions adopted by the Co-ordination Committee on item 36 of the Council agenda.

The proposal was rejected by 9 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

3. Draft resolution submitted by the Pakistani delegation (E/AC.24/L.45) on economic development, amendments thereto submitted by the Belgian, Chilean, French and United States delegations (E/AC.24/L.48), and Pakistani amendment (E/AC.24/L.67) to the amendments in document E/AC.24/L.48.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Pakistani draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.45) on economic development and the various amendments submitted in connexion therewith.

Mr. REYES (Philippines) understood that the Pakistani representative had reached an understanding with the sponsors of the joint draft amendments (E/AC.24/L.48). He would therefore withdraw his own amendment (E/AC.24/L.46) to the Pakistani draft resolution, since its content was satisfactorily covered.

Mr. Atwar HUSSAIN (Pakistan) said that the Pakistani delegation had changed its position, and was now willing to accept the principle of the joint Belgian, Chilean, French and United States amendments to its draft resolution, provided that meetings on economic development could be arranged during the regular sessions of the Council. He therefore proposed that paragraph 3 of the joint amendments (E/C.24/L.48) should be replaced by the following paragraph:

"Decides,

To include in the agenda of the Council each year an item on economic development, and to arrange a series of meetings which would be devoted to a review of the problem of economic development in all its aspects, to consider the progress made on the implementation of the resolutions of the Council in the field of economic development and to make such recommendations as it may consider necessary to accelerate the pace of development in under-developed countries."

Mr. HESSEL (France) thanked the Pakistani representative for his happy attempt to devise a common text, which the French delegation would gladly support. He wished, however, to propose a slight amendment to it.

The problem of economic development undoubtedly formed part of the "major economic questions" which, according to the terms of an earlier decision of the Committee, were in principle to be considered at the first regular session of the Council each year. For the sake of clarity, the French delegation would therefore like it to be stated in the new text just proposed by the Pakistani representative that the question of economic development would be placed on the agenda of the first regular session of the Council each year.

Mr. Atwar HUSSAIN (Pakistan) said that he would be prepared to accept the suggestion if it met with the approval of the majority of the Committee.

Mr. DESAI (India) said that, since the Committee had already adopted a general directive concerning the establishment of the programmes for the two regular sessions of the Council, he felt that the subject mentioned by the Pakistani representative would be automatically assigned to the appropriate session, and that no specific recommendation was therefore necessary.

Mr. ALVAREZ OLLONIEGO (Uruguay) supported the Indian representative. Since the Committee had already laid down general principles, it seemed unnecessary to specify in any individual case the session at which a particular item should be examined.

Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) felt that it was unnecessary to discuss further whether the subject in question should be taken at the first regular session of the Council each year, or at another one. The agenda Committee would be better qualified to decide that point.

Mr. HESSEL (France) said that he had been convinced by the arguments advanced by the Indian representative, and accordingly withdrew his proposal.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) agreed that the inclusion of a specific recommendation that the question of economic development should be considered at the first regular session of the Council each year was not strictly necessary. He considered, however, that such a recommendation might serve a useful purpose by including governments to press on with their work in that field. He therefore suggested that the words "normally in the agenda of the first regular session of the year" should be inserted, between commas, after the words "each year" in the Pakistani amendment (E/AC.24/L.67) to the joint draft amendments (E/AC.24/L.48) to the original Pakistani proposal (E/AC.24/L.45).

Mr. ALVAREZ OLLONIEGO (Uruguay) requested the United Kingdom representative to withdraw his proposal. There might be a lengthy discussion about what "normally" meant.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom), replying to a question by the CHAIRMAN, said that the United Kingdom amendment (E/AC.24/L.49) to the joint amendments (E/AC.24/L.48) to the original Pakistani draft resolution had been withdrawn, since it had become obsolete.

The CHAIRMAN announced that the first three paragraphs of the original Pakistani draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.45) would be put to the vote forthwith, since there were no amendments to those paragraphs before the Committee.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that a separate vote should be taken on the words "or ad hoc bodies as appropriate" in the first paragraph.

The words "ad hoc bodies as appropriate" in the first paragraph of the Pakistani draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.45) were adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The first paragraph as a whole was adopted unanimously.

The second and third paragraphs were adopted unanimously.

The new fourth paragraph of the preamble, contained in the joint amendments submitted by the delegations of Belgium, Chile, France and the United States of America (E/AC.24/L.48), was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The United Kingdom oral amendment, consisting in the insertion of the words "normally in the agenda of the first regular session of the year", in the revised operative part (E/AC.24/L.67) of the Pakistani draft resolution was rejected by 7 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

The revised operative part (E/AC.24/L.67) of the Pakistani draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. HOGAN, Secretary to the Committee, then read out the draft resolution as amended. It read:

"The Economic and Social Council

Having noted the recommendation of the ad hoc Committee on the Organization of the Council and its Commissions, that the Economic, Employment and Development Commission be discontinued, its work being taken over by the Council, its committees, regional commissions or ad hoc bodies as appropriate,

Recognizing that economic development of under-developed countries is one of the most important long-range economic problems which faces the world today,

Recognizing further that this question should receive the constant consideration of the Council in all its aspects, with special emphasis on the financing of economic development,

Recalling Council resolution 295 (XI) requesting the Economic, Employment and Development Commission to place the problem of financing economic development on the agenda of at least one of its sessions each year,

Decides to include in the agenda of the Council each year an item on economic development, and to arrange a series of meetings which would be devoted to a review of problems of economic development in all its aspects, to consider the progress made on the implementation of the resolutions of the Council in this field and to make such recommendations as it may consider necessary to accelerate the pace of development in under-developed countries."

The Pakistani draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously in the above form.

4. Statement to be prefixed to the Committee's comprehensive resolution on item 36 of the Council agenda.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the basic resolution recommended by the Committee, comprising in all three sections, should open with the following statement:

"The Economic and Social Council

Notes the reports of the Ad hoc Committee on the Organization and Operation of the Council and its Commissions".

The Chairman's proposal was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN declared that the Co-ordination Committee had disposed of all the items on its agenda, and thanked members of the Committee for the spirit of co-operation which they had shown, which had resulted in the achievement of a considerable measure of agreement.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.