

UNITED NATIONS
**ECONOMIC AND
 SOCIAL COUNCIL**
OFFICIAL RECORDS



**ELEVENTH SESSION, 427th
 MEETING**

**FRIDAY, 27 OCTOBER 1950, AT 3.15 P.M.
 LAKE SUCCESS, NEW YORK**

C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Plans for relief and rehabilitation of Korea (A/1435, E/1851/Rev.1, E/1851/Add.1, E/1852, E/1858/Rev.1, E/1858/Rev.1/Corr.1, E/1858/Rev.1/Add.1, E/1859, E/L.112/Rev.2, E/L.113, E/L.114, E/L.115 and E/L.116) (<i>continued</i>)	415

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, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Plans for relief and rehabilitation of Korea (A/1435, E/1851/Rev.1, E/1851/Add.1, E/1852, E/1858/Rev.1, E/1858/Rev.1/Corr.1, E/1858/Rev.1/Add.1, E/1859, E/L.112/Rev.2, E/L.113, E/L.114, E/L.115 and E/L.116) (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT called upon the Director-General of the Technical Assistance Administration to make a statement.

At the invitation of the President Mr. Keenleyside took a seat at the Council table.

2. Mr. KEENLEYSIDE (Director-General of the Technical Assistance Administration) said that his service was ready to collaborate immediately and as fully as possible, under the direction of the Secretary-General, in the execution of all plans which might be adopted for the relief and rehabilitation of Korea.

3. Like the specialized agencies, his service was prepared to work under the agent general, the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and the proposed advisory committee.

4. The Council had so far confined itself to consideration of plans for relief and rehabilitation appropriate to an emergency situation, deferring until later the study of long-term measures to promote the economic development and social progress of Korea.

5. It had decided to begin by meeting the immediate requirements arising from the destruction caused by the war by drawing up an order of priorities to meet the most urgent needs and restore by stages the eco-

nomie life of Korea. The Council had been right, however, in stipulating that the rehabilitation programme should be in harmony with the basic requirements for long-range economic development. As was known, the United Nations Technical Assistance Programme had not been introduced to help war-devastated countries but to assist under-developed countries.

6. The preparation of technical assistance plans for the long-range economic development of Korea had reached a fairly advanced stage before the war. Since the plans prepared applied only to South Korea, however, and since a large part of Korean industries and public services was situated north of the 38th Parallel, they would have to be reviewed and adapted both to the existing situation and to the whole of Korea. They would, however, be of great value in drawing up long-range programmes for economic development.

Mr. Keenleyside withdrew.

JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY AUSTRALIA AND THE UNITED STATES (E/1858/Rev.1, E/1858/Rev. 1/Corr.1 and E/1858/Rev.1/Add.1) (*continued*)

7. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to resume the discussion which had been interrupted at the end of the previous meeting of the joint draft resolution of Australia and the United States.

8. Mr. TAUBER (Czechoslovakia) had pointed out at the previous meeting that his delegation would find it hard to take part in the detailed discussion of the arrangements envisaged in the joint Australian and United States draft resolution until the idea underlying it had been fully clarified. The Czechoslovak delegation had stated that the preamble included two paragraphs which it could never accept. As certain representatives had, however, advocated their retention, his delegation must reserve its final position on the detailed provisions until the question of the preamble had been settled. In general, however, it noted a serious omission in the operative part, since its trend would appear to be to prevent the people of Korea from administering the relief and rehabilitation programme itself.

9. The United Nations Korean reconstruction agency must work for the benefit of Korea. The various clauses in the draft resolution, however, such as paragraph 2,

sub-paragraph (c), and paragraph 4, sub-paragraph (d), provided for consultation only with the Korean Authorities to be designated by the United Nations Korean reconstruction agency, without specifying what Korean Authorities those would be nor whether they would be allowed to implement the programme. Thus, while one could accept the first part of sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 4, it was not clear why, under sub-paragraph (c) of the same paragraph, the effective distribution and utilization of supplies was to be decided by the agent general and not by the Korean Authorities themselves. Finally, paragraph 5 referred to an advisory committee to advise the agent general, but it was not stated that that committee would include representatives of the Korean people.

10. The best way to remedy that omission would be to state categorically that it was the Korean Authorities who should be mainly responsible for relief and rehabilitation work. Secondly, the Korean Authorities to be consulted under the operative part of the joint draft resolution should be specified.

11. To sum up: although there were provisions which the Czechoslovak delegation could accept, it felt that the draft resolution tended to prevent the Korean Authorities from dealing with their own country's affairs.

12. Mr. DICKEY (Canada) began by observing that the Council should be grateful to the representatives of Australia and the United States for having prepared a joint draft resolution; it showed that they had given mature consideration to the various aspects of the relief and rehabilitation plan. The draft resolution was drawn up so as to give the speediest possible relief to the people of Korea. That was its underlying spirit. The Czechoslovak and Polish delegations were wrong to refuse to recognize that. If their arguments concerning the risk of infringing the national sovereignty of Korea were followed to their logical conclusion, then the Koreans would have to be left to their own resources with no help from outside. That was not the Council's aim; it had expressed its wish to come to the assistance of a sorely tried country in such a way that the Koreans could accept such aid. Explicit provision was being made for the Korean Authorities to be consulted to the fullest possible extent on how the relief plans would be carried out. Furthermore, the representative of India had already forestalled the objections advanced by the Polish and Czechoslovak delegations.

13. The effect of the provisions of the joint draft resolution would be to maintain the desirable balance between the various agencies responsible for executing the relief plan.

14. That plan should, in the first place, be dynamic, and to that end the agent general should be given the fullest possible freedom of action. Secondly, the Council should take no measures concerning the administration of the relief plan likely to hamper the activities of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. Consequently, the closest possible co-operation between the two bodies should be established; that was what the joint draft resolution attempted to achieve.

15. Relief activities should be continued until the Korean people could themselves undertake the rehabilitation of their economy and repair the ravages

of war. The United Nations was therefore proposing to take highly praiseworthy action, and he did not think that the Korean people could regard that action as impairing its autonomy.

16. He was glad that the Council had asked the specialized agencies to give their full co-operation in the relief work and he welcomed the statements made by the representatives of various specialized agencies to the Council. He had also been glad to hear the statement made by the Director-General of the Technical Assistance Administration.

17. With regard to the text of the joint draft resolution he proposed a slight formal amendment to the wording of paragraph 1 of the operative part. He wished to insert the last words of that paragraph after the words "... an agent general who ..." and amend the beginning of the next sentence accordingly. The beginning of paragraph 1 would, therefore, read as follows:

"Establishes the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency (UNKRA) under the direction of a United Nations Agent General *who shall be assisted by a Deputy Agent General. The Agent General shall be responsible to the General Assembly...*"

He would also like the words "in accordance with the policies established by the General Assembly, and having regard to such general policy recommendations as the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea may make" placed in brackets. Thus, the main proposal in the sentence would be more conspicuous in the text.

18. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) congratulated the delegations of Australia and the United States on having simplified the Council's work by amalgamating two separate draft resolutions (E/1852 and E/1858). It was clear that they had given mature consideration to the problem. Such questions were always extremely difficult to settle, and a satisfactory solution could usually be found only in the light of experience. But that was an emergency operation and an immediate decision had to be taken. He therefore agreed with the representative of Canada that the joint draft resolution had the merit of establishing a desirable balance between the functions of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and those of the Agent General.

19. With regard to the statements made by the representative of Czechoslovakia and those made at the morning meeting by the representative of Poland, he would strongly emphasize that in his first statement made during the early stages of the debate he had said (420th meeting) that the work of rehabilitation would, of course, depend primarily on the Koreans themselves, but that Korea would require certain essential assistance from outside. There could be no question of preventing the Koreans from protecting their own interests.

20. The United Kingdom delegation thought that the relief programme should serve the interests of Korea and that the work of rehabilitation should, as far as possible, be undertaken by the Koreans themselves. He was convinced that those were the views of the Council as a whole and that no representative had said anything to the contrary.

21. With regard to the wording of the joint draft resolution, he suggested it would be advisable to insert at the end of the operative part a paragraph which would link up with the general principles adopted by the Council on the basis of the Australian draft resolution the provisions regarding the United Nations Korean reconstruction agency by stipulating that the agent general must be inspired by those principles.

22. The PRESIDENT called for a discussion of the draft resolution paragraph by paragraph. Two amendments had been proposed to paragraph 1 of the operative part, namely, the verbal amendment just made by the representative of Canada and the Chilean amendment (E/L.116) consisting in the addition after the words "who shall be responsible to the General Assembly" the words: "through the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea".

Paragraph 1

23. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) explained that the purpose of his delegation's amendment was to make the United Nations Korean reconstruction agency responsible to the General Assembly through the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. It was understood that the agency would be responsible to the General Assembly; the Chilean amendment would make that responsibility effective. Other representatives had hinted that they would rather have the agency responsible to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. Mr. Schnake Vergara was prepared to accept that solution if the Council preferred it.

24. Mr. WALKER (Australia) and Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) accepted the Canadian amendment.

25. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) pointed out with regard to the Chilean amendment that the joint draft resolution was based on the precedents constituted by the organization of relief in Palestine and by the administration set up in Libya by the United Nations. Those administrative organs were directly responsible to the General Assembly. The United States saw no reason why the agent general should be made responsible to the Assembly through the intermediary of any other organ.

26. The agent general should be a highly qualified and authoritative person, since he would have to be given wide powers. The Chilean amendment implied that the agent general would be able to act only on the instructions of the Commission. The joint draft resolution, however, was based on the principle that the Commission should only interfere in the functions of the agent general with regard to certain questions which were defined in the draft resolution, and that he should have full freedom of action in all other matters.

27. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) pointed out that work on the rehabilitation of Korea must be co-ordinated, and to do so was a function of the Economic and Social Council.

28. In reply to the United States representative, he said that the original Australian draft resolution (E/1852) empowered the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea to draw up plans for rehabilitation—a very wise suggestion. In

view of the importance of the economic and political task assigned to the Commission, it might well set up a sub-committee to study rehabilitation plans. There was no reason to grant the agent general practically unlimited powers in that field.

29. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) reminded the United States representative that the Commission set up by the General Assembly was known as the "United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". If that Commission had not been intended to deal with rehabilitation, the General Assembly would have given it another name.

30. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) replied that, though the General Assembly had clearly defined the political tasks of the Commission, it had given it no precise instructions on economic matters. That was precisely the reason why the Economic and Social Council had been requested to work out measures for the implementation of the relief programme.

31. Mr. DICKEY (Canada) thought that, as the work of relief in Korea was very urgent and would affect the economic life of the whole country, the agent general should be given as much freedom of action as he might need. The Agent General would obviously have to co-ordinate his activities with those of the United Nations Commission, but the joint draft resolution under consideration already contained provisions to that effect.

32. As regards the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly had only asked it to prepare a plan of action, and no good purpose would be served by allotting to it further functions such as those suggested by the Chilean representative. Further, paragraph 10 of the joint draft resolution empowered the Council to review the reports of the agent general and the comments of the Commission and thus to ensure the necessary co-ordination between them by making its own report and recommendations to the General Assembly.

33. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) agreed with the Canadian representative in thinking that the Chilean amendment might cause a certain confusion in the work of the various agencies to be established. Paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution authorized the United Nations Commission to make recommendations to the Agent General on all kinds of questions. The Chilean representative was now proposing that the agent general should be responsible to the Economic and Social Council for complying with instructions given to him by the Commission and with any regulations which the Commission might impose upon him. That was an anomaly.

34. Replying to the Mexican representative, he said that that representative's arguments were certainly forceful, particularly as the Security Council had requested the Economic and Social Council to prepare a relief programme for Korea. It might be possible, however, instead of incorporating the Chilean amendment into paragraph 1, to include in that paragraph the functions of the Council set forth in paragraph 10.

35. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) drew the Council's attention to paragraphs 3 and 4 of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 7 October 1950,¹ which, in his view, should be taken as meaning that the

¹ See document A/1435.

Council was to assume certain functions even after the end of hostilities in Korea. For that very reason contacts must be established between the agent general and the Economic and Social Council. The joint draft resolution contained no provisions to that effect and thus did not allow the Council to discharge its responsibilities.

36. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) said that the main task was to establish an efficient and responsible relief agency. He agreed that it would be useless to establish a commission and appoint an agent general with no freedom of action and no power to act. They must not, however, go to the other extreme, and give the agent general practically unlimited powers. Obviously the agent general should work in close collaboration with the Commission; otherwise the General Assembly would not have entrusted rehabilitation work to that body. What, he asked, was the meaning of the words "Agent General who shall be responsible to the General Assembly"? That obviously meant responsibility for the efficiency of the work of rehabilitation. It was for the Economic and Social Council to establish general principles of policy to be followed in that respect, and thus both the Council and the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea must be responsible for the implementation of those principles.

37. Finally, he saw no reason to grant the Economic and Social Council a right, as provided by paragraph 10, to study reports of the agent general unless that officer were responsible to the Council.

38. Further, the Chilean amendment constituted no impediment at all to the freedom of action of the agent general, since other clauses of the joint draft resolution under consideration granted him all the powers necessary to enable him to fulfil his task. The amendment was intended only to better co-ordinate the activities of the proposed United Nations Korean reconstruction agency.

39. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Chilean amendment (E/L.116) to paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution.

The amendment was rejected by 10 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

40. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Canadian amendment to paragraph 1.

The amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 2

41. The PRESIDENT opened the discussion of paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution.

42. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) agreed with the United Kingdom representative that reference should be made in that paragraph to the general policy for relief and rehabilitation of Korea already approved by the Council. It would therefore be sufficient to insert after the words "Rehabilitation of Korea" a formula similar to that appearing in the original draft resolution submitted by Australia (E/1852), i.e., "subject to the agreed Statement of General Policy".

43. Mr. WALKER (Australia) stated that it would be better to insert a further paragraph in the resolution

to the effect that the Assembly approved the "Statement of General Policy on Korean Relief and Rehabilitation" contained in annex II. Such a paragraph would have the advantage of covering all the points raised in the resolution and not only those in paragraph 2. Another possible course would be to draft an entirely separate resolution to that effect.

44. Mr. SAKSENA (India) thought that the words "in accordance with the policies established by the General Assembly" which appeared in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution covered the points raised by the Mexican representative.

45. The PRESIDENT pointed out that paragraph 1 dealt with the responsibility of the Agent General, whereas paragraph 2 dealt with the functions and powers of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

Sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 2

46. In the absence of comments, the PRESIDENT announced that the discussion of sub-paragraph (a) was closed.

Sub-paragraph (a) was adopted.

Sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 2

47. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) wished to know whether the sub-paragraph authorized the Agent General to provide relief only for certain areas of Korea. If that interpretation was correct, sub-paragraph (b) would conflict with the policies already laid down by the Council.

48. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) explained that the Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and not the Agent General, was to determine priorities in the matter of relief in order to effect the independence and unification of Korea as early as possible.

49. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) stated that it was not always easy, in practice, to determine in what areas and at what time hostilities had actually ceased. Guerrilla activities might make it necessary to prolong military control in some areas over a certain period. The question whether any particular area was sufficiently pacified to enable relief operations to begin was a political question and one for the Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea to decide.

50. In the absence of further comments, the PRESIDENT announced that the discussion of sub-paragraph (b) was closed.

Sub-paragraph (b) was adopted.

Sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 2

51. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) asked the exact meaning of the words "designate authorities".

52. Mr. WALKER (Australia) explained that the sub-paragraph merely meant that the Commission would indicate to the Agent General the authority or authorities with which he could establish relationship.

53. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) considered that in those circumstances, it would be better to use the word "indicate" rather than "designate", at least in the Spanish text.

54. The PRESIDENT announced that the Spanish text of sub-paragraph (c) would be amended in the manner proposed by the Chilean representative. In the absence of further comments, he announced that the discussion of sub-paragraph (c) was closed.

Sub-paragraph (c) was adopted.

Sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 2

55. In the absence of comments, the PRESIDENT announced that the discussion of sub-paragraph (d) was closed.

Sub-paragraph (d) was adopted.

Sub-paragraph (e) of paragraph 2

56. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) asked whether the sub-paragraph would permit the Economic and Social Council to express its views on the economic and social policy pursued by the Agent General and to make recommendations thereon.

57. The PRESIDENT stated that sub-paragraph (e) should be examined in the context of paragraph 10 of the joint draft resolution which stated that the Economic and Social Council was requested to review the reports of the Agent General and any other data which might be available on the progress of relief and rehabilitation in Korea and to make appropriate reports and recommendations thereon to the General Assembly. The Economic and Social Council would therefore submit its recommendations to the Assembly and not to the Commission or the Agent General.

58. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) considered that in order to avoid any ambiguity paragraph 10, which dealt with the functions devolving upon the Council, should be placed at the beginning of the draft.

59. The PRESIDENT thought that it would be better to postpone consideration of proposals aimed at changing the order of the paragraphs.

60. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) asked the authors of the joint draft resolution whether their text took due account of the directives laid down in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the General Assembly resolution of 7 October 1950² on the independence of Korea. In his view nothing in the joint draft resolution empowered the Economic and Social Council to make its views known to the Agent General or the Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

61. Mr. WALKER (Australia) replied that sub-paragraph (e) was not in itself intended to meet all the requirements of paragraphs 3 and 4 of the General Assembly resolution. Paragraph 3 of that resolution instructed the Economic and Social Council to prepare plans: the plans would include the administrative organization as laid down in the whole resolution; and the long-term measures referred to in paragraph 4 had not yet been considered by the Council. It could decide in due course whether the Agent General should have any role in relation to those matters.

62. In the absence of further comments, the PRESIDENT announced that the discussion of sub-paragraph (e) was closed.

Sub-paragraph (e) was adopted.

Additional sub-paragraph (f)

63. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Indian delegation had put forward an amendment (426th meeting) which would add to the end of paragraph 2 a new sub-paragraph (f) as follows:

“To call for reports on any aspects of the work of the Agent General at its discretion.”

64. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) stated that he appreciated the motives of the Indian delegation in moving the amendment but could not support it, as he considered that the Agent General might be hindered in his work by the too frequent demands for reports which might be made by the Commission.

65. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that he understood the apprehension voiced by the United States representative but was convinced that the Commission would have enough sense of responsibility not to harass the Agent General. Accordingly he considered that it would be desirable to grant the Commission the powers indicated in the Indian amendment.

66. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) also supported the Indian amendment. The Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea would, he said, consist of seven members mindful of their high responsibility and careful not to abuse their powers.

67. Mr. SAKSENA (India) stated that his delegation firmly supported the fundamental principle of all sound administration, to avoid diffusing responsibility. In the present case, however, it considered that the Commission should be guaranteed against any possible abuse of powers by the Agent General. The Commission would, of course, be careful not to interfere with the day-to-day activity of the Agent General.

68. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) felt that the insertion of such a provision in the draft resolution was not desirable. He trusted that the Agent General and the members of the Commission would establish personal and cordial relations which would enable the task entrusted to them to be accomplished successfully. The amendment suggested a lack of confidence and was an invitation to build up a bureaucratic organization with too much paper work.

69. Mr. CHA (China) considered that the provisions of sub-paragraph (d) adequately served the purposes of the Indian amendment.

70. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) questioned the validity of the United States representative's arguments. If they were pressed to their logical conclusion, it might even be maintained that the Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea had no *raison d'être*. In any event, he asked the President not to close the discussion on the Indian amendment, so that the members of the Council might have time to think it over.

71. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) stated that his main objection to the Indian amendment was that it was drafted in too general terms. The words “any aspect of the work” referred to reports on all possible functions of the Agent General which might embarrass him considerably in his work. The United States delegation would not object to the addition of such words as the following:

² *Ibid.*

“To invite the Agent General to report on such aspects of his work as it may consider necessary to enable it to fulfil its functions in relation to the unification and rehabilitation of Korea”.

72. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) asked the President what steps had been taken to facilitate the entry

into the United States of the representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

73. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested the President to make his statement on the question at the next meeting of the Council.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.