

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS



ELEVENTH SESSION, **421st**
MEETING

FRIDAY, 20 OCTOBER 1950, AT 3 P.M.
LAKE SUCCESS, NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Representation of World Federation of Trade Unions at the current session of the Council	387
Plans for relief and rehabilitation of Korea (A/1435, E/1851/Rev.1, E/1851/Add.1, E/1852, E/1853, E/1856, E/1858, E/1858/Corr.1, E/1859, E/L.108/Rev.1 and E/L.109) (<i>continued</i>)	388

President: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

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, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Health Organization, International Refugee Organization.

Representation of World Federation of Trade Unions at the current session of the Council

1. The PRESIDENT called upon the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs to make a statement on behalf of the Secretariat on the question of the representation of WFTU at the current session of the Council, a matter which had been raised again at the previous meeting.
2. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) said that there were two aspects to the question of WFTU representation: the attendance of Mr. Fischer at the General Assembly, and his attendance at the current session of the Economic and Social Council.
3. The right of representatives of non-governmental organizations with consultative status to attend the General Assembly had not been in question before that Assembly. However it was now understood that, in the opinion of the United States Authorities, the special clause in the Headquarters Agreement referred exclusively to consultations between the Council and non-governmental organizations under Article 71 of the Charter. That question had now been raised in the Second and Third Committees¹ and the Secretary-General had outlined the position to the Chairmen of the Committees in the following terms:

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Second Committee*, 118th and 121st meetings, and *Third Committee*, 273rd meeting.

"The Secretariat has been giving serious attention to the principle involved, namely the interest which non-governmental organizations with consultative status have in meetings of the General Assembly dealing with economic and social questions. Discussions on the legal questions raised in connexion with this principle, under the relevant clauses of the Headquarters Agreement between the United Nations and the United States, are currently in progress between the Secretariat and the United States Government."

4. Turning to the question of Mr. Fischer's attendance at the current session of the Council, he said that a cable had been received from the Secretary-General of WFTU, dated 10 October 1950, referring to Mr. Fischer's expulsion and asking the United Nations for guarantees enabling the WFTU to be represented at the current session of the Council. On 11 October, a reply had been sent from the Secretariat suggesting that WFTU should, in accordance with the normal procedure, request a visa for the attendance of its representative at the Council. A second cable from WFTU, dated 13 October, had been received on 16 October informing the Secretariat that WFTU had designated Mr. Fischer as its representative to the current session of the Council and asking to be informed, before his departure, whether the United Nations had obtained the "cancellation of the arbitrary measure" taken against him by the United States Authorities. A reply had been sent the same day pointing out that the cable did not state clearly whether a visa for attendance at the Council had been requested for Mr. Fischer and asking for that information. A third cable had subsequently been received from WFTU on 18 October stating that a visa had been requested in Paris. The United States Mission had been informed of those developments on 18 October and the Secretariat was now awaiting its reply.

5. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Council had been meeting for some time already and that the question of WFTU attendance was still not settled. As formalities of various kinds might well delay the settlement of the question until it was too late, he wanted to receive an assurance from the Assistant Secretary-General that

all the necessary steps would be taken to ensure the arrival of a representative of WFTU during the current session of the Council, and not after the session had ended.

6. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) said that the matter was receiving the Secretary-General's active and urgent attention. Representations had been made to the United States Mission and the question would not be allowed to rest.

7. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) wished to point out that the request for a visa for Mr. Fischer had been made in Paris only 36 hours previously, on the evening of 18 October. He wondered whether other countries, the USSR for instance, granted visas automatically and without any delay whatever.

8. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the issue before the Council was not the automatic delivery of visas by any country, but the violation of the Headquarters Agreement by the United States. Mr. Fischer had received a visa and had arrived in the United States with that visa. Yet, he had been arrested, detained and sent back. It was idle to pretend that that was a purely technical matter pertaining to the delivery of visas. He objected most strongly to the arbitrary attitude adopted by the United States Authorities towards representatives of non-governmental organizations and felt that the Secretary-General should do his utmost to settle that question satisfactorily as soon as possible.

Plans for relief and rehabilitation of Korea (A/1435, E/1851/Rev.1, E/1851/Add.1, E/1852, E/1853, E/1856, E/1858, E/1858/Corr.1, E/1859, E/L.108/Rev.1 and E/L.109) (continued)

9. The PRESIDENT called for a resumption of the discussion on the question of plans for relief and rehabilitation of Korea and referred members of the Council to the relevant documents before them. It had been agreed at the previous meeting that the Council would proceed with the discussion of annex II of the Australian proposal (E/1852). Amendments to that proposal had been submitted by the United States (E/1859) and by the USSR (E/L.108). He proposed that the Council should discuss annex II of the Australian proposal paragraph by paragraph. Drafting amendments would be in order during the discussion, and the decision taken on the paragraphs would be final.

It was so decided.

**DISCUSSION OF ANNEX II OF THE
AUSTRALIAN PROPOSAL**

Paragraph 1

10. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America), supported by Mr. DE SEYNES (France), proposed the deletion of the words "a" and "counterpart" from paragraph 1. The word "counterpart" was used in the expression "counterpart funds" in a later paragraph of the annex, and the United Nations programme should not be regarded as "a necessary counterpart" to the restoration of peace and the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government in Korea; the paragraph should merely state that the pro-

gramme was necessary to those purposes. He also proposed the deletion of the words "the State of", so as to make it quite clear that such a government should be established for the whole of Korea, and not only for part of the country.

11. Mr. WALKER (Australia), supported by Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom), agreed to the deletion of the words "the State of". He (Mr. Walker) did not think, however, that the deletion of the words "a" and "counterpart" would improve or clarify the text of the paragraph in question.

12. The PRESIDENT put the United States amendment to delete the words "a" and "counterpart" from paragraph 1 to the vote.

The amendment was adopted by 11 votes to 2 with 4 abstentions.

13. The PRESIDENT called for a vote on the text of paragraph 1, as amended, and reading as follows:

"1. The United Nations programme of relief and rehabilitation in Korea is necessary to the restoration of peace and the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government in Korea."

Paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 2

14. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) believed that since paragraph 2 listed all the objectives of the United Nations in providing aid to Korea, it should also refer to the economic development of the country. Consequently, he proposed the addition of the words "and for its economic development" at the end of paragraph 2. Immediate reconstruction and rehabilitation work should, whenever possible, take into consideration the future economic needs of Korea.

15. Mr. WALKER (Australia) agreed that plans for reconstruction and rehabilitation should, whenever possible, fit in with plans for economic development. At the same time it should be remembered that economic development projects would require much larger funds than Member States might be willing to provide at the present time.

16. The idea that relief and rehabilitation in Korea should be consistent with the country's long-term economic needs could best be included in paragraph 4 of the annex. At the appropriate stage of the discussion he would therefore propose that paragraph 4 should be amended to read:

"4. Whilst the programme should be consistent with the pattern of the long-term economic development in Korea, it is itself necessarily limited to relief and rehabilitation, and contributions and supplies furnished under this programme shall be used exclusively for that purpose" (E/L.109).

17. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) agreed with the Australian representative's suggestion and withdrew his amendment.

Paragraph 2 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 3 and paragraph (a) of USSR amendment (E/L.108/Rev.1)

18. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that paragraphs (a) and (b) of the

amendment proposed by his delegation (E/L.108/Rev.1) involved important questions of principle; he thought it would be preferable, therefore, to include them after paragraph 2 of the Australian draft. The third paragraph of the USSR amendment concerned only paragraph 7 of the Australian text.

19. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) wondered whether paragraph (a) of the USSR amendment should not rather be placed after paragraph 3 of annex II than after paragraph 2, as suggested by the USSR representative.

20. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would not object to the addition of paragraph (b) of his amendment to paragraph 3 of annex II because both dealt with the same question of the work to be done by the Korean people themselves in promoting their recovery. Paragraph (a) however dealt with the entirely different question of the principles under which the United Nations was to provide aid and assistance to Korea. Consequently, he suggested that paragraph (a) of his amendment should be inserted as an independent paragraph after paragraph 2 of annex II and that paragraph (b) of his amendment might be added to paragraph 3.

21. Mr. DICKEY (Canada) proposed that the opening words of paragraph (a) of the USSR amendment, "Assistance to Korea", should be amended to read "The United Nations programme of relief and rehabilitation in Korea" so as to bring it into line with other paragraphs of annex II. He also proposed the deletion of the word "national" from that paragraph; in his opinion that word was somewhat restrictive since it implied that the Korean people had no international interests to consider.

22. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) believed that the first part of paragraph (a) of the USSR amendment, up to the words "independence of Korea", was redundant. The principles it enunciated had already been set forth in previous paragraphs of annex II. He agreed with the second part of paragraph (a).

23. Mr. WALKER (Australia) agreed with the Belgian representative that the first part of paragraph (a) of the USSR amendment was redundant. He had no objection to the second part, but thought that it might be prefaced with the following words: "in accordance with the general principles underlying all United Nations assistance to particular countries". Such an addition would remove the suggestion that it was the first time that the United Nations accepted the principle that assistance should not serve as a means for furthering foreign economic interference in the internal affairs of the country receiving that assistance.

24. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had no objection to the Canadian suggestion that the words "Assistance to Korea" should be replaced by the words "The United Nations programme of relief and rehabilitation in Korea". It should be remembered, however, that the assistance was more important than the programme because the programme could be perfect while the assistance given under the programme might still be made to serve foreign economic and political interests. It was essential therefore to emphasize that the principles set forth

in paragraph (a) applied not only to the programme, but also to the way it was carried out. Consequently, he proposed that the opening words of paragraph (a) should be amended to read "The United Nations programme of relief and rehabilitation in Korea shall be carried out in practice in such a way . . ."

25. He could not agree to the second Canadian proposal, that the word "national" should be deleted from paragraph (a), because he felt that it was essential to retain the concept of national interests. That concept was unfortunately often disregarded in connexion with the provision of technical assistance and other aid to under-developed countries. Indeed, there was a very strong tendency to make any assistance received by under-developed countries correspond to the interests of world economy and world markets. He wanted no ambiguity on that point, because it was imperative that the assistance given to Korea should be in conformity with the national interests of the Korean people.

26. The representative of the Soviet Union then referred to the Australian proposal that the words "in accordance with the general principles underlying all United Nations assistance to particular countries" should be inserted after the words "independence of Korea". In his opinion such an addition might involve reference to other decisions of the United Nations and the interpretation of paragraph (a) in the light of those other decisions. That would only lead to confusion. To meet the point raised by the Australian representative, he would, however, agree to the insertion of the expression "in accordance with the general principles of the United Nations". Indeed, what other principles than those of the United Nations could underlie United Nations assistance to particular countries?

27. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Canadian amendment proposing the deletion of the word "national".

The amendment was not adopted, 6 votes having been cast in favour, 6 against, with 6 abstentions.

28. The PRESIDENT called for a vote on the amended text of paragraph (a) of the USSR amendment (E/L.108/Rev.1) reading as follows:

"The United Nations programme of relief and rehabilitation in Korea shall be carried out in practice in such a way as to contribute to the rapid restoration of the country's economy in conformity with the national interests of the Korean people, having in view the strengthening of the economic and political independence of Korea and, in accordance with the general principles of the United Nations, such assistance must not serve as a means for foreign economic and political interference in the internal affairs of Korea and must not be accompanied by any conditions of a political nature."

Paragraph (a), as amended, was adopted unanimously.

29. The PRESIDENT called upon the Council to consider the United States amendment (E/1859) to paragraph 3.

Paragraph 3 and United States amendment (E/1859)

30. Mr. WALKER (Australia) accepted the amendment.

The paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 17 votes.

Paragraph 3 and paragraph (b) of USSR amendment (E/L.108/Rev.1)

31. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider paragraph (b) of the USSR amendment (E/L.108/Rev.1).

32. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico), supported by Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) and Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile), felt that the word "representatives" was too vague; as the amendment stood the representatives of minor political parties might claim to represent the Korean people. The term "Korean Authorities" would therefore be preferable.

33. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that the persons responsible for carrying out the relief and rehabilitation programme would obviously have to decide who "the representatives of the Korean people" were. The term "authorities" was too narrow and too restrictive. In connexion with the distribution of supplies he had already stressed the importance of securing the participation of public organizations such as the Red Cross, the co-operatives and the agricultural societies; the representatives of such organizations could not be defined as "authorities" and it was to them, among others, that his delegation had intended to refer in the phrase "representatives of the Korean people".

34. Mr. ALI (Pakistan), while agreeing with the representative of the Soviet Union that the word "authorities" was too restrictive, felt that the term "representatives of the Korean people" was too wide; the phrase "representative organizations of the Korean people" might meet both points of view.

35. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) considered that the second sentence of the USSR amendment might be deleted as the General Assembly had already taken steps to set up United Nations machinery for assistance to Korea and had requested the specialized agencies to help in the programme.² Furthermore, the participation of the Korean people was already insured by other paragraphs of annex II, particularly by paragraph 3, as it had been amended. It was clear that any plan to assist Korea must be carried out with the participation of the Korean people.

36. Mr. DICKEY (Canada) agreed that it was clear that the Korean people should participate to the greatest extent possible in the rehabilitation programme.

37. The Council had already established (418th meeting) the Temporary Committee on Korean Relief Needs and had left it complete freedom to consult anyone it considered necessary. As it stood, the USSR amendment might result in restricting the activities of the Committee by compelling it to consult representatives of the Korean people before taking any decisions. He therefore suggested that the paragraph should be amended to make it clear that the Korean people should participate in the programme "whenever possible".

38. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) pointed out that, although paragraphs 7, 11 and 13 of annex II already

referred explicitly to "authorities in Korea" and defined their relations with the United Nations, those paragraphs dealt with relatively unimportant matters. He thought that a general statement defining the relation of the Korean people to the United Nations programme must therefore be included in annex II. The USSR amendment would serve that purpose if modified in the way he had suggested. The Council must be careful, however, to avoid delaying rehabilitation work by a profusion of red tape.

39. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to the fact that, so far as the matters referred to in paragraphs 7, 11 and 13 of annex II were concerned, the Korean Authorities were the proper people to consult. In the field of broad co-operation, however, not only the Korean Authorities but all public institutions and organizations should be asked for their assistance on the task of relief. The USSR formula would not exclude authorities. However, he would be willing to accept any amendment which would cover public organizations.

40. Replying to the United Kingdom representative's remarks about the second sentence, Mr. Arutiunian pointed out that both the temporary Committee and the specialized agencies would be working within the general framework of the United Nations programme; the phrase "shall be carried out by the United Nations" was not therefore out of place.

41. In connexion with the Canadian contention that the Soviet Union amendment would hamper the work of the Committee, his delegation regretted that the resolution establishing the temporary Committee (E/1856) had not invited the Korean people to participate in its work; their exclusion had been based on political considerations which had nothing in common with the programme at present being examined. Furthermore, the Committee had been established to consider a temporary assistance programme whereas the Soviet Union amendment dealt with the principle which should underlie any permanent relief programme.

42. In view of the discussion which had just taken place he was more than ever convinced of the necessity for stating the principle of Korean participation explicitly. Any opposition to it could only arise from a desire to use the programme as a political weapon.

43. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) suggested that the phrase "with the participation of Korean Authorities and of the representatives of institutions of the Korean people" might satisfy the representative of the USSR.

44. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) said that he was not certain of the real significance of the USSR amendment. In his opinion, the points raised in it were already dealt with sufficiently elsewhere and adoption of it would lead to loss of time.

45. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that the Council was obviously in favour of including a reference to the importance of associating the Korean Authorities, people and organizations with the assistance programme somewhere in the statement of general policy. It was clear, however, that representatives required time for further study of the amendment.

² See document A/1435.

46. He therefore proposed that the Council should note that the question was important but that it should adjourn consideration of it until an appropriate stage later in the discussion. He recalled that the Council had already agreed to postpone consideration of paragraph 9 which dealt with purely organizational matters.

47. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) speaking on the motion to adjourn discussion of the USSR amendment, wished to make it clear that his delegation regarded it as a guiding principle that all major questions should be settled with the participation of the Korean people. Consequently, the Soviet Union amendment and paragraph 9 were in no way analogous. It was not enough to express sympathy with the principle contained in that amendment; it must be explicitly included as a separate paragraph in annex II.

48. The United Kingdom representative was, in fact, aware of the full implications of the proposal and disliked them.

49. Mr. Arutiunian was quite prepared, however, to postpone consideration of the USSR amendment until the following meeting of the Council so that the English translation might be reviewed and representatives might have time to consider it and any amendments they might wish to introduce.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 4

50. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) expressed satisfaction with the new drafting proposed by the Australian delegation (E/L.109) which noted the relationship between the relief and rehabilitation programme and the long-term programme.

51. The PRESIDENT put to the vote paragraph 4 as redrafted by the Australian delegation (E/L.109).

Paragraph 4 was unanimously adopted.

Paragraph 5

52. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said the main difference between the original Australian draft of paragraph 5 (E/1852) and the United States amendment (E/1859) was that the latter had omitted the distinction drawn by the former between the first and second priorities and had introduced for consideration a third group of activities to which his delegation would be inclined to give the highest priority.

53. While the matter was merely one of interpretation, there being no basic disagreement between his delegation and that of the United States, he would prefer to see his own delegation's formulation adopted, with the addition of the last sentence of the United States amendment.

54. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) agreed that first priority must be given to the necessities of life but pointed out that certain other materials were necessary for the provision of those necessities. He would, however, accept the Australian representative's suggestion, and suggested that, in that case, in the last sentence of his delegation's amendment the word

"necessary" should be inserted before the word "replacement" and the word "productive" should be deleted.

55. Mr. WALKER (Australia) accepted that suggestion.

56. Mr. DE SEYNES (France), considering that some representatives considered that the word "facilities" was too vague, proposed the following drafting for the end of the United States amendment: "... war-damaged facilities necessary to the economic life of the country."

57. Mr. WALKER (Australia) and Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) accepted the French representative's amendment.

58. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) suggested that that phrase might be amended to read: "economic and social life of the country", so as to take into account such facilities as educational establishments, which were not strictly covered by the word "economic".

59. The PRESIDENT said it was generally recognized in the United Nations that all economic work included important social aspects; it was not therefore necessary to insert the Danish representative's amendment.

60. He put paragraph 5, as amended, to the vote.

Paragraph 5, as amended, was unanimously adopted.

Paragraph 6

61. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) asked for clarification of paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of annex II. It appeared from those paragraphs that the intention was to put up for sale the specific resources provided by Member States. Such an attempt to sell to the Korean people, doubtless destitute as a result of the war, the relief provisions which governments were prepared to give free, might have unfortunate consequences, both in Korea and in the countries which were supplying the assistance.

62. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 followed the wording of the paragraphs contained in the Secretariat paper (E/1851/Add.1), which had been modelled on the policy followed by UNRRA in moving relief and rehabilitation supplies to war-damaged countries. There had been no intention of excluding gifts or of putting them up for sale. Apart from such direct relief, however, it seemed advisable to circulate goods through the normal agencies of distribution. He was sure that the matter could be worked out satisfactorily by the United Nations Authorities in the field, in co-operation with the Korean Authorities.

63. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) feared that the normal agencies of distribution would have been disrupted by the war and would no longer exist. He understood the economic problem involved, but pointed out that it also raised serious moral and political problems. The matter being of some importance, he moved that the meeting should adjourn so that the Council might discuss the question at length at its next meeting.

The Mexican proposal was unanimously adopted.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.