

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS



ELEVENTH SESSION, **418th**
MEETING

MONDAY, 16 OCTOBER 1950, AT 11 A.M.
LAKE SUCCESS, NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Plans for relief and rehabilitation of Korea (A/1435, E/1851/Rev.1, E/1851/Add.1, E/1852, E/1852/Corr.1 and E/1853) (<i>continued</i>)	375

President: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

Acting President: Mr. R. R. SAKSENA (India).

Present: Representatives of the following countries:
Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Monetary Fund, World Health Organization.

Plans for relief and rehabilitation of Korea (A/1435, E/1851/Rev.1, E/1851/Add.1, E/1852, E/1852/Corr.1 and E/1853) (*continued*)

1. Mr. WALKER (Australia), introducing the three draft resolutions submitted by his delegation (E/1852, E/1852/Corr.1) concerning plans for relief and rehabilitation of Korea and relating to the long-term measures to promote the economic development and social progress of Korea, pointed out that the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its 294th plenary meeting on 7 October 1950 (A/1435) placed certain obligations upon and entrusted certain tasks to the Economic and Social Council; namely, to propose functions, in relation to rehabilitation, for the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and to prepare a general plan for rehabilitation. On those matters the Council was requested to report to the Assembly by 28 October. He took it that the Council would not at that stage enter into the problems of the long-term economic development of Korea which was a separate and distinct item on the agenda, but would confine itself to the question of relief and rehabilitation.

2. Accordingly he asked the members of the Council to consider the first of the three draft resolutions submitted which referred more particularly to the formulation of a provisional programme of assistance to the civil population of Korea. The resolution in question proposed that the three Member States which were members both of the Council and of the United Nations

Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea should serve on the proposed seven-member committee, because it was felt that liaison was necessary between the Council and the Commission. The proposed committee should examine all the evidence relating to Korea's needs for relief and rehabilitation and report back to the Council.

3. In drafting its resolution I, the Australian delegation had felt that the committee should report to the Council by 21 October 1950, namely within three weeks of the adoption of the General Assembly's resolution of 7 October 1950, as requested by that resolution. In the light of discussions he had had with other members of the Council, however, it seemed desirable not to fix a definite date, and his delegation had amended its resolution I accordingly (E/1852/Corr.1).

4. He assumed that the material available from the Unified Command, and any information in the hands of governments represented on the United Nations Commission, would be placed at the disposal of the proposed committee. The committee would thus be perfectly free to consult anyone who was in a position to provide useful information regarding actual needs in Korea.

5. He felt it was most urgent for the proposed committee to be set up as soon as possible as it would be impossible for many governments to accept any financial arrangements relating to relief and rehabilitation in Korea unless they had at their disposal an estimate of the probable total cost of the programme. At a later stage, governments would have to decide how they would apportion the cost of such a programme among themselves. In view of the statement of the Secretary-General's Personal Representative in Korea (417th meeting), the Council might conceivably be unable, in the space of a few weeks, to determine the size of a programme extending over a very lengthy period. That question would have to be settled after the proposed committee had submitted tentative estimates of the cost of the programme to the Council.

6. In suggesting that the proposed committee should consist of seven members the Australian delegation assumed that the President would dominate the members in accordance with the Council's rules of procedure.

Mr. Santa Cruz (Chile) took the Chair.

7. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) said his delegation supported the Australian representative's suggestion that some basic research work should be done before the Council gave further consideration to the question of financing a relief programme for Korea; accordingly he would vote for draft resolution I submitted by the Australian delegation.

8. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) supported the Australian delegation's draft resolution I and agreed with the remarks of the United Kingdom representative.

9. He suggested that the proposed committee should invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to appear before it.

10. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said the third paragraph of draft resolution I submitted by the Australian delegation was not clear. He thought that reference should be made in that resolution or in resolution II to the agency which would determine the needs of Korea after the proposed committee had considered the question of immediate requirements and costs and reported to the Council.

11. Mr. WALKER (Australia) pointed out that the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General in Korea had suggested, at the 417th meeting of the Economic and Social Council, that any systematic survey of Korean requirements for relief and rehabilitation over a long period would have to be based on first-hand information, and might best be entrusted to the organ set up to carry out the work of relief and rehabilitation. Since the whole question of the machinery to be established had to be considered by the Council, he did not think it necessary to come to that point forthwith. The proposed committee would be temporary in nature, and its task would be to make a preliminary study of the problem and submit a provisional report to the Council. It should be left to the discretion of the committee to decide how detailed its report should be. It should be recognized that the Council would not expect the committee to do in New York, what, in the last resort, could only be done by a body operating in Korea.

12. Mr. DE SEYNES (France), supporting draft resolution I submitted by the Australian delegation, said that the remarks of the United States representative raised some doubts whether the Council could continue to discuss the problem of relief for Korea while the proposed committee was meeting.

13. Mr. WALKER (Australia) explained that once the proposed committee had been set up it would carry on with its work without interrupting the Council's general study of the organization of relief work in Korea. It might well be that before the Council finally reached a decision on the procedure to be adopted for apportioning the costs of any programme among Member States, it would require a preliminary report giving some indication of the magnitude of the sums of money involved. While he considered that without a report by the proposed committee the Council could not reach a final decision, the Council could, nevertheless, even in the absence of such a report, proceed to discuss how the programme of rehabilitation was to be operated and whether there was to be an administrator

or a special agency, or whether the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea was to be the principal authority. Such questions could be discussed by the Council before it received the report to be submitted by the proposed committee.

14. Mr. ALI (Pakistan), while supporting Australian draft resolution I, said that it would not serve any useful purpose for the Council to discuss and decide on the machinery to be set up to carry out the programme of relief and rehabilitation of Korea until the proposed committee had reported back to it. He suggested, therefore, that the Australian draft resolution should be amended in that sense.

15. Mr. YU (China) suggested that the *ad hoc* committee set up under Economic and Social Council resolution 295 B (XI) should be entrusted with the work which, according to the Australian draft resolution, would be done by a special committee.

16. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) pointed out that the *ad hoc* committee referred to by the Chinese representative had been appointed to review the organization and operation of the Council and its commissions and therefore could not carry out the work to be entrusted to the committee referred to in draft resolution I.

17. He suggested that the Council should first decide whether or not to appoint the proposed committee. The next decision to be made thereafter would be whether the Council should discuss the proposed relief and rehabilitation machinery before the special committee had submitted its report.

18. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that Australian draft resolution I had omitted to suggest that representatives of the Korean people should be invited to take part in the special committee's discussions, though, of course, under its last paragraph the committee was free to obtain advice and assistance of such other persons and authorities as it considered necessary. As the USSR delegation considered the Australian proposal too vague, it suggested that the following words should be inserted in the first operative paragraph of draft resolution I: "... and decides to include in the membership of the committee representatives of both North and South Korea".

19. Mr. SAKSENA (India) supported draft resolution I submitted by the Australian delegation.

20. Referring to the amendment suggested by the delegation of the Soviet Union, he said his delegation considered that representatives of North and South Korea should not be members of the proposed committee, but should be asked by that committee to appear before it and make statements concerning the damage sustained and the material assistance required by Korea.

21. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) considered that the proposed committee should consist solely of members of the Council. The Council had never on any previous occasion included in the membership of its committees representatives of organizations which were not directly represented on the Council. The proposed committee was to be primarily a fact-finding body and therefore should be left free to select

what methods it saw fit for the purpose of obtaining the information required.

22. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the procedural arguments adduced by the United Kingdom representative should not prevent representatives of North and South Korea from serving on the proposed committee; only the representatives of the Korean people could give the committee first-hand information of the country's needs. The committee need not confine itself to consulting such representatives but could also ask for the advice of other interested organizations. In order to arrive at a compromise he proposed the following revised amendment to be inserted in the first operative paragraph of draft resolution I after the word "rehabilitation": "and instructs the committee to hear the representatives of the Korean people, namely representatives of both North and South Korea, as regards relief and rehabilitation needs in Korea".

23. Mr. YU (China) stated that, if the committee found it necessary to hear a representative of the Korean people, an invitation should be extended only to a representative of the Republic of Korea, the only government in Korea recognized by the United Nations. The North Koreans had challenged the authority of the United Nations and of all those States which were endeavouring to maintain peace in the Far East. The goal of the United Nations was a unified Korea. After the United Nations armed struggle against aggression, there was no reason to recognize the division of Korea, particularly when victory for United Nations forces was in sight.

24. Hence his delegation strongly supported the suggestion that a representative of the Republic of Korea should be heard. In no case, however, could it agree to the proposal that representatives of North Korea should be invited.

25. Mr. TAUBER (Czechoslovakia) said the committee should set aside political considerations and questions of prestige and instead adopt a realistic attitude. The Australian draft resolution called for the rehabilitation of the whole of Korea. If the Committee was to ascertain the needs of the whole of Korea, representatives of both North and South Korea must be consulted.

26. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) stated that, in view of the USSR amendment which had just been presented, he formally wished to propose as an alternative proposal the addition of the following words at the end of the last paragraph of the Australian draft resolution: ". . . and to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to present his views".

27. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) expressed support of the Australian draft resolution and stated that the Council could have confidence that the proposed seven-member committee would obtain advice and assistance from all qualified sources.

28. He suggested that in the last paragraph of the Australian draft resolution the word "necessary" might be changed to "desirable".

29. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said he had no objection to the substitution of the word "desirable" as suggested by the representative of Denmark.

30. His delegation could not, however, accept the USSR amendment and would therefore vote against it. Although the programme of rehabilitation was intended for the whole of Korea, it must be borne in mind that military operations were still proceeding in that country. Moreover, the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea had issued recommendations to the Unified Command regarding the establishment of a provisional administration in certain areas of the country. In the circumstances, it seemed most unwise to include the amendment proposed by the USSR.

31. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) said his delegation would support the Australian draft resolution, particularly in view of the assurances given in reply to the representative of France that the proposed committee would be a temporary working body which would make a preliminary survey of the needs of Korea.

32. Referring to the USSR amendment to the draft resolution, he said the last paragraph of the Australian text struck him as adequately covering the point. The proposed committee should be set up immediately and the Economic and Social Council should proceed without delay to the discussion of other related problems.

33. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said the proposed committee would be under the obligation to take the views expressed in the Council into account and to consult with anyone who it thought could throw light on the problem of Korean rehabilitation. His delegation was therefore unable to support the USSR amendment.

34. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said if it was agreed that the proposed committee was to be a temporary fact-finding body, the Council should logically adopt the USSR amendment. The last paragraph of the Australian draft resolution was not adequate to insure that assistance of any kind would be decided upon only in consultation with representatives of the people of Korea. The Australian draft placed persons and authorities on an equal footing and left it to the committee to decide whether or not to invite certain persons or authorities and whether such persons and authorities were to be treated as individuals or as representatives of governments.

35. He noted that in a number of cases, including UNRRA, UNICEF and the United Nations Technical Assistance Programme, the principle of prior consultation with representatives of governments concerned had been accepted.

36. In view of the time-limit imposed by the Australian draft resolution for the work of the temporary committee, it was essential to adopt a realistic approach and recognize that two governments existed in Korea.

37. His delegation supported the USSR amendment and urged Council members to set aside political considerations and act in accordance with precedent.

38. Mr. DICKEY (Canada) said his delegation favoured the Australian draft resolution.

39. Referring to the USSR amendment, he said the working of the last paragraph of the Australian draft was quite satisfactory and appropriate. The Canadian delegation was therefore unable to support the USSR amendment.

40. The PRESIDENT declared closed the debate on the Australian draft resolution and the amendments hereto.

41. He put to the vote the USSR amendment reading as follows: “. . . and instructs the Committee to hear representatives of the Korean people, namely representatives of both North and South Korea, as regards relief and rehabilitation needs in Korea”.

The amendment was rejected by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

42. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Chilean amendment to add the following words at the end of the last paragraph of the Australian draft resolution: “. . . and to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to present his views”.

The amendment was rejected by 4 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.

43. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America), explaining his vote, said the United States Government assumed that the committee would consult with representatives of the Republic of Korea and, hence, needed no instruction. In fact, the United States expected that the committee would seek the advice of all persons who could be of assistance to it.

44. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said that, although it was desirable to hear the views of the people of Korea, he agreed with the representative of Australia that, owing to the military situation, consultation with the North Koreans was impossible. Accordingly, he had been obliged to vote against the USSR amendment.

45. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) said that now that the word “desirable” had been substituted for “necessary” in the last paragraph of the Australian text, his delegation did not think that the authorities to be consulted by the committee had to be specified further.

46. Mr. SAKSENA (India) felt that the temporary committee should be allowed to exercise its discretion in issuing invitations. Since to refer to any party, individual or authority by name carried with it political implications, his delegation had abstained in the vote.

47. Mr. DICKEY (Canada), explaining his vote, said his delegation considered the Chilean amendment as an unnecessary addition to a general statement which was quite satisfactory.

48. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the vote on both the Chilean and USSR amendments showed that the Council did not favour hearing the representatives of either North or South Korea. Thus, the committee, if it wished to be objective and ascertain the needs of all Korea, would not be prevented from hearing both sides. The commit-

tee's success would depend on its interpretation of its terms of reference.

49. The PRESIDENT put to the vote Australian draft resolution I as a whole (E/1852 and E/1852/Corr.1), as amended.

The draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

50. The PRESIDENT noted that the second paragraph of Australian resolution I provided for a committee of seven members, including the three which were members both of the Council and of the Commission: Australia, Chile and Pakistan. To complete the membership of the Committee, he proposed for approval by the Council the following four countries: Belgium, India, United States of America and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

51. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation would first have to consult its government concerning the President's proposal.

52. Mr. TAUBER (Czechoslovakia) moved that the decision on the remaining members of the Committee be deferred.

The Council, by 7 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions, agreed to postpone its decision.

53. The PRESIDENT, referring to the procedure to be followed by the Council in dealing with the remainder of its work, suggested that the precedent established in 1949, in connexion with the technical assistance programme, might be followed. Thus the Council might first discuss the machinery and organization of the programme, then hear general statements of principle and finally consider the financial implications and arrangements for contributions.

54. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said his delegation was engaged in consultations on the question of machinery and would present a paper on the subject to the Council.

55. He indicated that, in the final analysis, the measures contemplated would be determined by the general policy adopted by the Council. Accordingly the Council should first consider questions of general policy and in that connexion discuss annex II of the Australian document (E/1852) and the memorandum prepared by the Secretariat (E/1851 and E/1851/Add.1).

56. The PRESIDENT said he would take the absence of objection to mean that the Council was in agreement with the United States proposal to hear general statements of policy before discussing measures for carrying out the programme of relief and rehabilitation for Korea.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.