



CONTENTS

	Page
Tenth Anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights	157
Agenda item 19:	
Admission of further associate members to the Economic Commission for Africa	157
Agenda item 24:	
Election of members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations	157
Agenda item 29:	
Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies: draft annex relating to the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization	158
Agenda item 23:	
Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council	158
Agenda item 25:	
Work of the Council in 1959	158

President: Mr. George F. DAVIDSON (Canada).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Greece, Indonesia, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

An observer from the following State: New Zealand.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organization; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; International Monetary Fund; World Health Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Tenth Anniversary of the Adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

1. The PRESIDENT observed that the Council was meeting on the date of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In accordance with its great obligations under the United Nations Charter, the Council had always taken a profound interest in all matters affecting human rights. In the years 1946 to 1948 it had contributed to the development and formulation of the principles underlying the Declaration. Throughout the drafting of the Declaration by the Commission on Human Rights, the Council had frequently given constructive support and advice. Since 1948, it had bent its energies to the detailed work of drafting the Covenants giving effect to the Declaration.

2. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which sought to spread respect for individual rights and

freedoms, was a document for all peoples and nations. It was fitting that a day should be set aside for the commemoration of its adoption. Rights could never be taken for granted: they must constantly be reclaimed; they did not exist unless they were exercised. Countries which denied their citizens the exercise of the elementary freedoms thereby paraded their own essential weakness. Members of the Council should dedicate themselves anew to the goals of freedom and equality of opportunity for themselves and the entire world.

AGENDA ITEM 19

Admission of further associate members to the Economic Commission for Africa

3. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that France had been unable to take advantage of the extended time limit for the submission, by countries like his own, of lists of the territories they wished to see admitted as associate members of the Economic Commission for Africa, in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 671 B (XXV). It would not be in a position to present such a list until the new French Constitution had taken full effect and the members of the French Community had made the choices open to them and thus defined their mutual relations within the Community. If his Government decided, after the conclusion of the Council's twenty-sixth session, to seek the admission of territories as associate members of the Economic Commission for Africa it would follow the procedure set out in paragraph 6 of the Commission's terms of reference (Council resolution 671 A (XXV)).¹

4. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to decide that no further action was required of it on item 19 of its agenda.

5. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that members of the Council would wish to have an opportunity of commenting on the French representative's statement after they had seen it in writing.

6. Mr. MIRGHANI (Sudan) said that his delegation had some comments to make on the subject, and therefore asked that the item should be left open for the time being.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 24

Election of members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

7. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to proceed to the election of the seven members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, in accordance with rule 82 of the Council's rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Szablewski (Poland) and Mr. Parker (United States of America) acted as tellers.

¹ The complete text of the statement made by the representative of France was circulated as document E/L.815.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	18
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	18
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	18
<i>Required majority:</i>	10
<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
France	18
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	18
United States of America	18
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	17
Netherlands	16
Costa Rica	13
China	12
Afghanistan	4
Chile	2
Venezuela	2
Indonesia	1
Finland	1
Spain	1
Sudan	1

Having obtained the required majority, China, Costa Rica, France, the Netherlands, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America were elected members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations for 1959.

AGENDA ITEM 29

Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies: draft annex relating to the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (E/3179)

8. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the draft resolution contained in the Secretary-General's note (E/3179) embodying a draft annex designed to make the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies applicable to the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

9. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) stated that his delegation's support for the resolution just adopted did not imply the commitment of the United States Government to accede to the Convention. The United States accorded the necessary privileges and immunities to allow similar organizations to carry out their official functions within the United States through Presidential Executive Order. The necessary steps to that end would be taken at the appropriate time.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council (E/3189 and Add.1-2)

10. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the names of persons nominated by Governments to represent them on the functional commissions of the Council (E/3189 and Add.1-2).

The appointment of the persons listed in the note by the Secretary-General (E/3189 and Add.1-2) was confirmed.

AGENDA ITEM 25

Work of the Council in 1959 (E/L.813-814)

11. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the Secretary-General's draft programme for the work of the Council in 1959 (E/L.813) and to the Secretary-General's note concerning items arising out of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly (E/L.814).

12. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America), referring to the draft list of items for the twenty-seventh session (E/L.813), suggested that item 5 (Economic development of under-developed countries) might be divided into three sub-items: (a) Industrialization, (b) Land reform and (c) Sources of energy.

13. With regard to item 10 (Freedom of information: media of information in under-developed countries), he noted that the relevant resolution of the General Assembly² would first have to be transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights, which would not meet until March 1959; he therefore proposed that the item should be transferred from the agenda of the twenty-seventh to that of the twenty-eighth session of the Council.

14. The PRESIDENT observed that the Council's agenda at its summer session was always heavy and it was desirable, therefore, to retain as many items on the agenda of the spring session as possible. In any case, if the Commission on Human Rights were asked to give the matter priority there would be time for the Council to consider the Commission's decisions or recommendations on the subject before the end of its own April session, although the six-weeks rule with regard to documentation might have to be waived for that purpose.

15. Mr. Mir KHAN (Pakistan) hoped that it would be possible to submit supplementary items for consideration by the Council at its twenty-seventh or twenty-eighth session after the closure of the current session. Pakistan was considering submitting two items, one concerning possible changes in the Council's rules of procedure and the other concerning the possible establishment of an economic commission for the under-developed countries. It was not yet in a position, however, to make definite proposals.

16. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the President's views regarding item 10 of the draft list of items for the twenty-seventh session. He saw no objection to the subdivision of item 5 as proposed by the United States representative since that was the manner in which the item would be discussed in any case. He agreed that every effort should be made to lighten the agenda of the twenty-eighth session and wondered whether some items might not be transferred from the agenda of the twenty-eighth to that of the twenty-seventh session. The Secretariat might perhaps examine that possibility. As to the additional items mentioned by the representative of Pakistan, he would be grateful for more details about them.

17. Mr. Mir KAHN (Pakistan) said that it had not been his intention to seek the views of the Council at the current time on the matters he had mentioned since it was not yet certain that his delegation would put them forward as supplementary items. As regards the first item he had mentioned, his delegation had in mind certain changes in the Council's rules of procedure

² Subsequently General Assembly resolution 1313 A (XIII).

which would enable it to discharge its functions more effectively, for example, by permitting non-members to participate in the work of the Council on matters of interest to them. With regard to the second item, it was thinking in terms of a functional commission subordinate to the Council. If those items were put forward, his delegation would prefer them to be considered at the twenty-eighth rather than at the twenty-seventh session.

18. The PRESIDENT stated that delegations would still be able to make proposals for supplementary agenda items after the end of the current session under rule 13 of the rules of procedure. Such proposals would be considered at the opening meeting of the twenty-seventh or twenty-eighth session as appropriate. He hoped that the Pakistan delegation's proposals for additional items would refer to the twenty-seventh rather than the twenty-eighth session, in view of the need to establish a balance between the agenda of the spring session and that of the summer session.

19. With regard to the United States proposal concerning item 10, he suggested that the Council might request the Commission on Human Rights to complete consideration of the relevant resolution of the General Assembly in time for the twenty-seventh session.

20. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) agreed with that suggestion and withdrew his own proposal. He made a further proposal that the following two sub-items should be included under item 10: (a) Report of the Secretary-General on media of information in the under-developed countries (Council resolutions 574 D (XIX) and 643 (XXIII)); (b) Relevant sections of the reports of the Commission on Human Rights, UNESCO and other specialized agencies.

21. The PRESIDENT said that if there was no objection the subdivision of items 5 and 10 proposed by the United States representative would be considered approved.

It was so agreed.

22. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) proposed that the report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the report of the International Finance Corporation should be considered separately under item 4.

It was so agreed.

23. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to section I of the note by the Secretary-General on the disposal of items arising out of the thirteenth regular session of the General Assembly (E/L.814), which listed resolutions that might be considered by the Council at its resumed twenty-sixth session and set forth certain suggestions with regard to them. The first of those resolutions was General Assembly resolution 1272 (XIII), on control and limitation of documentation. He asked whether the Council wished, as suggested by the Secretary-General, to transmit that resolution to its subsidiary bodies and to consider it as a sub-item of item 4 in the draft list of items for the twenty-eighth session.

24. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) proposed that the Council approve the Secretary-General's suggestions. The resolution should be taken up as a separate agenda item by each of the Council's subsidiary bodies.

It was so decided.

25. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the question of freedom of information had already been dealt with. He moved that the Council should formally agree to transmit the resolution on the subject to the Commission on Human Rights, requesting the Commission to give it priority so that the Council could consider it at its twenty-seventh session.

It was so agreed.

26. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to section II A of the Secretary-General's note (E/L.814), where it was suggested that the Council might wish to consider draft resolution D contained in the report of the Second Committee (A/4054 and Add.1)³ in connexion with item 5 in the draft list of items for the twenty-seventh session (Economic development of the under-developed countries).

27. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) observed that when the resolution in question had been debated in the Second Committee, certain delegations, including his own, had made it absolutely clear that in their view the report on the Symposium on the Development of the Petroleum Resources of Asia and the Far East should not receive any special treatment, but should be handled purely according to normal procedure. No opposition to that view had been expressed. The normal procedure would be for the report to be forwarded by the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) as part of the documentation connected with that Commission's report, and thus to be considered at the Council's twenty-eighth session under item 2 (b) Consideration of the reports of the regional economic commissions). It seemed therefore rather surprising that the Secretary-General should have suggested that the report of the Symposium should be considered in connexion with item 5 of the draft list of items for the twenty-seventh session, although such a procedure would of course be possible and he would not wish to make an issue of the matter.

28. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was clear from draft resolution D that the Council should consider the report of the Symposium. The only question was when and how that should be done. His delegation supported the Secretary-General's suggestion that the report should be considered under item 5, of which it might be made a fourth sub-item.

29. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said that his delegation had no strong feelings on the subject. If the Council wanted to consider the report at the twenty-seventh session, it would be most suitable to do so under item 5 (c). However, his delegation had said in the Second Committee⁴ that it interpreted the draft resolution as conforming with normal procedure which would imply a preference for including it under the report of ECAFE (item 2 (b)) at the twenty-eighth session. Moreover, the Council presumably would want to have the views of ECAFE on the report. The Commission would be meeting very soon before the Council's twenty-seventh session so that there might be difficulties with regard to documentation.

30. Mr. VIAUD (France) shared the United Kingdom representative's view that in adopting the draft

³ Subsequently General Assembly resolution 1319 (XIII).

⁴ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirteenth Session, Second Committee, 575th meeting.

resolution the Second Committee had intended that the normal procedure should be followed. The comments of ECAFE on the report of the Symposium would presumably not be ready for the Council's twenty-seventh session and would therefore form part of the Commission's report to the Council at its twenty-eighth session. If the Council considered the report of the Symposium at its twenty-seventh session, the same ground might have to be covered twice. It would be better to deal with the whole problem at the twenty-eighth session.

31. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reiterated that the terms of draft resolution D were quite clear. He was in favour of considering the report of the Symposium at the twenty-seventh session in order to avoid overloading the agenda of the twenty-eighth session.

32. Mr. URQUIDI (Mexico) pointed out that the Symposium was likely to produce a large volume of documentation, much of it technical. It would therefore be some time before the results of the Symposium could be made available. If the Secretariat could say when the results would be available, the Council might be better able to decide when it could consider them.

33. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that the report of the Symposium would be available by the beginning of 1959. It was uncertain whether the report of ECAFE would be ready in time for the twenty-seventh session. Unlike the United Kingdom representative, he had drawn no specific impression from the Second Committee's debate on the subject. The Secretary-General's suggestion was based on the fact that the Committee had considered the subject in a debate of a general nature and that the Council might also wish to do so.

34. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) said that he had not referred to the Second Committee's debate as a whole. The summary record showed that the United Kingdom and the United States, at the end of the debate, had expressed the view which he had mentioned earlier. There had been no objection and his delegation had understood that the Committee agreed with that view. He formerly proposed that the report of the Symposium be discussed at the Council's twenty-eighth session under item 2 (b).

35. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) said that since the report of the Symposium would be ready by January 1959, there would be no difficulty in considering it at the twenty-seventh session. That procedure would also lighten the agenda of the twenty-eighth session.

36. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said that he would vote for the United Kingdom proposal, because he believed that under normal procedure a report such as that of the Symposium would be discussed within the framework of the report of the economic commission under whose auspices it was produced. The question was not, however, of great importance to his delegation.

37. Mr. VIDIC (Yugoslavia) remarked that draft resolution D contained in document A/4054 and Add.1 had been discussed by the Second Committee under the item "Economic development of under-developed countries".

38. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he saw no reason for the United Kingdom proposal. There was no provision in draft

resolution D for including the report of the Symposium in that of ECAFE. The report of the Symposium had been submitted as a separate item and to treat it otherwise would be to revise a decision of the General Assembly.

39. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said there was no intention of revising the General Assembly's decision. The report of the Symposium would not be an integral part of the report of ECAFE but would be submitted with it.

40. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) thought that in principle as many items as possible should be dealt with at the spring session. Further, he doubted whether the Council could change a decision taken by the General Assembly. Draft resolution D made no reference to the transmission of the report of the Symposium to ECAFE.

41. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) observed that it was the normal procedure for the reports of bodies set up by the regional commissions to go back to the parent organ for consideration. The only question at issue was how the report could most appropriately be considered by the Council and it was hard to see how a decision in the matter could derogate from the powers of the General Assembly.

42. Mr. CHENG Paonan (China) felt that consideration of the report should be deferred until the Council's twenty-eighth session to allow Governments sufficient time to study it and prepare their comments.

43. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the draft resolution had been adopted by the Second Committee under the item of its agenda relating to the economic development of under-developed countries and the report should therefore be considered by the Council under the corresponding item of its agenda. He considered that the Secretary-General's suggestion, which fully conformed to the Second Committee's decision, was a perfectly proper one.

44. Mr. Mir KHAN (Pakistan) observed that as the members of the Council in general appeared to have no objection to considering the report on the Symposium at the twenty-seventh session, provided it was received by Governments in time for them to give it due consideration, it might be left to the Secretariat to take the necessary action when the report became available. He suggested that if the report on the Symposium was in the hands of Governments by, say, 15 February 1959 the Secretariat could place it on the agenda of the twenty-seventh session; if not, it could be considered at the twenty-eighth session.

45. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) indicated that the suggestion was acceptable to him. He withdrew his proposal.

46. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Pakistan representative's proposal for the modification of the Secretary-General's suggestion. An affirmative vote would signify acceptance of the suggestion in the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.814), on the understanding that if the report of the Symposium was not in the hands of the members of the Council by 15 February 1959 the Secretary-General would be authorized to delete the question of the consideration of resolution D from the agenda of the twenty-seventh session and transfer it to the agenda of the twenty-eighth session. If consideration of the resolution was deferred to the

twenty-eighth session, it would be for the Council to decide under what item it would be taken up.

The Pakistan representative's proposal was adopted unanimously.

The provisional agenda for the twenty-seventh session, as amended, was approved.

47. The PRESIDENT reminded the Council that consideration of the report of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund at the twenty-seventh session would involve a waiver of the six-weeks rule; a similar waiver would also be necessary in the consideration of the reports of a number of the functional commissions.

48. He invited the Council to consider the draft list of items for the twenty-eighth session (E/L.813).

49. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said he believed it would be helpful if explicit reference were made under the general headings to sub-items of particular importance.

50. In that connexion, he would propose the addition of a third sub-item under item 2: (c) General Assembly requests pertaining to international co-operation in economic fields. Draft resolutions F, G and H in the report of the Second Committee (A/4054 and Add.1)⁵ might appropriately be considered under that sub-item.

The proposal was adopted.

51. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) then proposed that item 3 should be divided into two sub-items: (a) Survey of programmes of social development and (b) Report of the Social Commission. General Assembly resolution 1258 (XIII) could be considered under sub-items (a).

52. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed the addition of a third sub-item: (c) International Health and Medical Research Year.

53. The PRESIDENT said that he presumed that the Secretary-General had suggested that the resolution in question (General Assembly resolution 1283 (XIII)) should be considered under item 4 because the subject would be raised in the report of the World Health Organization, which would, in accordance with the usual procedure, be considered in connexion with the general review of the development and co-ordination of the economic, social and human rights programmes and activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies as a whole.

54. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the particular significance of

the recommendation in the resolution might be obscured if it was discussed under item 4.

55. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said that he could see no objection to the Soviet proposal, provided it were understood that the Council could at the appropriate time refer the matter to the Co-ordination Committee for consideration if it deemed it desirable.

56. The PRESIDENT said that the inclusion of the question under item 3 would not in his view preclude its consideration under item 4 also.

57. With regard to the United States proposal he suggested that it would be more appropriate to reverse the order of the sub-items.

The United States proposal, so modified by the President's suggestion, and the Soviet proposal were approved.

58. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) proposed that item 4 should be divided into the following sub-items: (a) Reports of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency; (b) Concentration of activities and General Assembly resolution on documentation; (c) Appraisal report on the scope, trend and cost of United Nations programmes in the economic, social and human rights fields; (d) Concerted action.

59. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that he was prepared to accept the subdivision of items proposed by the United States representative on the understanding that the intention was merely to provide guidance in the preparation of the agenda and that the subdivision would not preclude consideration of aspects of the general topics other than those listed under the sub-headings.

60. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that it was not the function of the Co-ordination Committee to determine the volume and direction of the work of the various organs in the economic, social and human rights fields or to evaluate the programmes in those fields. The United States proposal in connection with item 4 seemed to imply that it was.

61. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) assured the Soviet representative that the sub-items he had proposed in no way prejudged what would be referred by the Council to the Co-ordination Committee for its consideration.

The United States proposal for the inclusion of four sub-items under item 4 was approved.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.

⁵ Subsequently adopted as General Assembly resolutions 1321 (XIII), 1322 (XIII) and 1323 (XIII).