



CONTENTS

	Page
Report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations .....	215
Agenda item 17:	
Election of members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.....	215
Agenda item 23:	
Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council .....	215
Agenda item 22:	
Question of the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Council .....	216
Agenda item 16:	
Question of the terms of reference of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission.....	217

*President:* Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia).

*Present:*

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, China, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following countries: Brazil, Canada, Greece, Indonesia.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, 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.

**Report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2809)**

1. The PRESIDENT proposed the adoption of the recommendation of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2809) that the Council should authorize the World Federation of Trade Unions to make a statement of ten minutes on item 16 of the agenda of the resumed twentieth session (Question of the terms of reference of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission”).

*It was so agreed.*

**AGENDA ITEM 17**

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

2. The PRESIDENT requested the Council to elect the members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

*At the invitation of the President, Miss Bell (United States of America) and Mr. Fomin (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) acted as tellers.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	17
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	17
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	17
<i>Required majority:</i>	9

*Number of votes obtained:*

Brazil .....	17
France .....	17
Netherlands .....	17
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland .....	17
United States of America .....	17
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.....	16
China .....	13
India .....	4
People's Republic of China .....	1

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

3. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) protested against the election of the Kuomintang group to the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and reaffirmed that only the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China was competent to represent the Chinese people.

**AGENDA ITEM 23**

**Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council (E/2806 and Add.1)**

4. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the confirmation of Mr. Ching-yuen Hsiao (Transport and Communications Commission) and of Mr. Cho-ming Li (Population Commission). As he had just pointed out, the representatives of the Kuomintang could not represent China; for that reason he was opposed to the confirmation of the members concerned and would vote against their confirmation.

5. Mr. HSIA (China) requested a separate vote on the confirmation of Mr. Leonid Moiseevich Koretsky (Statistical Commission and Population Commission) and of Mr. Valentin Ivanovich Sapozhnikov (Commission on Human Rights).

*The appointment of Mr. Ching-yuen Hsiao to the Transport and Communications Commission was confirmed by 14 votes to 4.*

*The appointment of Mr. Cho-ming Li to the Population Commission was confirmed by 14 votes to 4.*

*The appointment of Mr. Leonid Moiseevich Koretsky to the Statistical Commission was confirmed by 17 votes to 1.*

*The appointment of Mr. Leonid Moiseevich Koretsky to the Population Commission was confirmed by 17 votes to 1.*

*The appointment of Mr. Valentin Ivanovich Sapozhnikov to the Commission on Human Rights was confirmed by 17 votes to 1.*

*There being no objection, the appointment of the other persons listed in documents E/2806 and Add.1 was confirmed.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 22

#### Question of the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Council (E/L.693)

6. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) recalled that, during the first part of the Council's twentieth session at Geneva, his delegation had proposed that the steps to be taken for the celebration of the Council's tenth anniversary should be studied at the resumed session.

7. His delegation by no means intended the holding of a special session or of a meeting similar to that held at San Francisco on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the United Nations. However, on the occasion of its tenth anniversary, the Council could review past events and the results achieved since the end of the Second World War in the economic and social fields and in promoting human rights. For example, in connexion with items 2 ("World economic situation") and 3 ("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") of the draft list of items for the agenda of the twenty-second session (E/L.688 and Corr.1), the Council could consider recent events and also review the developments of the past ten years. The Secretariat could prepare the relevant documentation.

8. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) supported the Yugoslav representative's proposal. It was important to give greater publicity to the Council's work and the results the Council had achieved in the economic and social fields and in promoting human rights. The procedure proposed by the Yugoslav representative would fulfil that purpose. The Secretariat could also publish a brochure on the Council's tenth anniversary, in which the achievements of the past ten years would be displayed.

9. Mr. KAUL (India), Mr. LARREA (Ecuador) and Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Yugoslav representative's proposal.

10. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom) wondered whether it might not be better to make the celebration of the Council's tenth anniversary a separate item, the first item on the agenda of the twenty-second session. He feared that, if important matters like the world economic situation and the co-ordination of the activities of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies were studied with the emphasis on the achievements of the past ten years, certain new events of the current year or of the previous year might be overlooked. In addition, the celebration of the Council's tenth anniversary would be given greater publicity if it were made a separate item on the agenda.

11. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) stressed the value of a review of the past decade, which would reveal the main trends to be noted in the economic and social fields, and in that of human rights, and which would provide a solid basis for future action. For that reason he had proposed that the review should be made under items 2 and 3 of the draft agenda for the twenty-second session. The Council should review not only its own work and that of its subsidiary bodies but also the general development of the world economic and social situation. The *World Economic Report* (E/2729)<sup>1</sup> published two years previously had dealt with the developments which had taken place during a four-year period. As social progress was slower than economic progress, the two reports which had been prepared for the Council on the social situation could provide a useful basis for the discussions the Council would hold on the problem at its twenty-second session.

12. If the Council took up the question of the celebration of the tenth anniversary at its twenty-second session, as the United Kingdom representative had suggested, it might not have enough time to deal adequately with the other items on its agenda. There was no question of extending the session.

13. Mr. HASAN (Pakistan) agreed that the Council's work, about which people knew little, should be given the greatest possible publicity. The best way of celebrating the Council's tenth anniversary would have been to inaugurate the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development but, as that was impossible, the Yugoslav proposal seemed the best.

14. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom) withdrew his suggestion that the question of the celebration of the tenth anniversary should form a separate item on the Council's agenda.

15. He would support the Yugoslav proposal, on the understanding that, in reviewing economic and social progress during the past decade, the Council would not be precluded from giving proper attention to current problems.

16. Mr. HILL (Deputy Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that, although he had not consulted the Secretary-General on the matter, he foresaw no difficulty in preparing the documentation on items 2 and 3 in accordance with the Yugoslav delegation's wishes. The Secretary-General already intended to divide the report on the world economic situation into two parts, one of which would be devoted to economic growth during the post-war decade.

17. The Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations had already dealt with the question of co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the statement he had made at San Francisco on the tenth anniversary of the United Nations. The same subject could be dealt with from a different angle and in greater detail on the Council's tenth anniversary.

18. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) thanked the Deputy Under-Secretary for the encouraging information he had given. He asked if the Secretariat could draw up a third document, a kind of yearbook surveying the whole of the Economic and Social Council's work during recent years, which could be made public.

19. Mr. HILL (Deputy Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) replied that, although the preparation of the first two documents would entail no

<sup>1</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1955.II.C.1.

extra expenditure, the third publication suggested by the Yugoslav representative would be beyond the Secretariat's current resources.

20. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) withdrew his last proposal. His delegation had never considered that the celebration of the Council's tenth session should entail extra expenditure.

21. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) pointed out that the Department of Public Information might be asked to prepare a survey of the Council's work during the past ten years for general publication. Such a measure would not entail any great extra expenditure.

22. The PRESIDENT said that in the last resort it was for the Council itself to review its activities. With the documents the Secretariat would provide, it should be in a position to carry out that task.

23. He proposed that a brief summary of the main points of the discussion and the agreement reached should be prepared.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 16

#### Question of the terms of reference of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission (E/2665 and Corr.1, E/L.690)

24. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom) said that there was no difference of opinion as regards the need to ensure full discussion of the manifold problems connected with full employment, economic development and other economic matters. The question under consideration was whether the re-establishment of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission would contribute to that end. The view of his Government, based on the Secretariat's report (E/2665 and Corr.1), was that it would not. If the Commission were re-established, there would be an extra burden on governmental departments and the Secretariat, another drain on the budget of the United Nations and perhaps a loss of interest in the subject-matter through continued and repetitive debate. Moreover, the work envisaged for the Commission was already adequately performed by other organs of the United Nations. He hoped that the Council would adopt the draft resolution (E/L.690) unanimously.

25. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that there was no point in reviving the Commission, for its role of dealing with the economic reconstruction of devastated countries had elapsed, while its other activities had been taken over by other bodies, as the Secretary-General's report (E/2665 and Corr.1) stated. Some of its work could be much better done by *ad hoc* groups. The importance of the functions assigned to the Commission was of course unquestionable; indeed, they were so important that the Council had already taken them over itself in so far as they had not been assigned to other bodies. If the Commission were revived, there would be much duplication. If, at a later stage, the Commission appeared to be necessary, it could always be revived very quickly.

26. Mr. EPINAT (France) said that he had no objection in principle to the Council being assisted by a commission, but that he was anxious that the Organization's operations should not be encumbered and that its expenses should not be increased. The question was whether in practice the Economic, Employment and Development Commission could do useful work. The

stage of general studies had been completed and the remaining studies, most of which the Secretariat would undertake, would result in decisions. Owing to the political aspects and wide scope of economic problems, only representatives of Governments could take decisions, since experts had no authority. It was for the Council to define the general principles. The Commission would not be able to carry out specialized studies, as it would not have such up-to-date information on the situation as the regional economic commissions or the specialized agencies. Moreover, the Commission could no longer substitute for organs which had been set up for specific purposes, such as the Commission on International Commodity Trade and the bodies providing technical and financial assistance to underdeveloped countries. The Council could always set up a special body with specific duties, if that proved necessary.

27. The problems falling within the Commission's competence were under constant consideration by the Council and the relevant United Nations bodies; suspension of the Commission merely meant that the period of theoretical discussions was over and that the practical tasks had already been distributed among various specialized bodies.

28. The French delegation would vote for the draft resolution (E/L.690) before the Council.

29. Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands) pointed out that the Commission had done useful work. When its work had stopped, the Council had taken the necessary measures to ensure its continuation; revival of the Commission would therefore lead to overlapping between its duties and those of other bodies. Expert groups and committees had been set up to study specific questions and the system had yielded excellent results. It was regrettable, however, that the problem of full employment, which was still on the Council's agenda, had not been the subject of any specific proposal, as the Council stated in paragraph 112 of its latest report to the General Assembly (A/2943).<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, if there was a wish for studies on the subject, a special group could be instructed to make them. The only logical step was, therefore, to suspend the Commission's activities and to reactivate the Commission only if the current system failed. The Netherlands delegation preferred the new system to the old. It had been stated that all the members of the Council were not experts in the many branches of economics, but precedents had shown that that argument was unfounded, as every delegation could call on specialists. Moreover, if very specialized surveys were to be made, expert groups could always be set up for the purpose.

30. The Netherlands delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution (E/L.690) before the Council.

31. Mr. ALFONSO RAVARD (Venezuela) said that he had studied the Secretary-General's report (E/2665 and Corr.1) with great interest. He fully approved of the conclusions set forth in it. The establishment of many specialized bodies and the widening of the terms of reference of the Council and its regional economic commissions made it unnecessary to revive the Commission. If it were thought desirable to re-establish it, a new commission should be set up; in any case the proper time for that did not seem to have come.

<sup>2</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Tenth Session, Supplement No. 3.

32. The Venezuelan delegation would support the joint draft resolution (E/L.690), especially since the operative part did not prejudge the issue.

33. Mr. GINEBRA HENRIQUEZ (Dominican Republic) said that a close study of the report by the Secretary-General had led him to the conclusion that the Commission no longer had any *raison d'être*.

34. He would vote for the joint draft resolution (E/L.690) and thus signify his confidence in the Council, to which the General Assembly had recommended the study of all problems concerning the economic development of under-developed countries.

35. Mr. KAUL (India) pointed out that the Council had a choice between three solutions: it could revive the Commission, abolish it or go on suspending its work. With regard to the first solution, the Secretary-General's report (E/2665 and Corr.1) gave a useful indication of how the Commission's functions had been distributed after its activities had been suspended. Revival of the Commission hardly seemed justified at the current time. The time did not seem to have come to adopt the second solution; the Council had modified its operation and organization at its eighteenth session and again at its nineteenth session, and it was not yet clear whether the Commission should be finally abolished. The Indian delegation approved of the third solution and would vote for the joint draft resolution (E/L.690), on the understanding that the object was not to abolish the Commission but to keep it suspended.

36. Mr. DESMARAS LUZURIAGA (Argentina) considered that the three groups of functions for which the Council was responsible, in the economic, social and human rights fields, should be assigned to functional commissions; however, that was the case with regard to social and human rights questions only. Nevertheless, after having studied the report prepared by the Secretary-General (E/2665 and Corr.1) and noted the opinion of the majority of the Council, his delegation would support the joint draft resolution (E/L.690), by which the Council would decide not to re-establish the Commission for the time being, on the understanding that the Commission could be revived later if the Council considered it necessary to assign tasks to it.

37. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) pointed out that, although the question whether the Commission should be revived had been discussed, no mention had been made of its terms of reference, which was the agenda item before the Council.

38. It was quite natural that the Commission's terms of reference should have been influenced to some extent by the situation which had prevailed at the time of its establishment. However, the circumstances were no longer the same. Thus, the question of reconstruction had been dealt with and it was hardly necessary for the Commission to study it; on the other hand, the question of full employment and economic development required special attention.

39. The Council and its subsidiary organs were still studying those questions, but it could not be said that all the questions and all their aspects had been examined. For example, too much importance seemed to have been attached to the financing of economic development while not enough emphasis had been laid on the question of preparing economic development programmes and developing national resources.

40. Nevertheless, he agreed with the Secretary-General's view that revival of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission might, if the Commission's terms of reference remained substantially the same, give rise to uncertainty about the Commission's competence and to overlapping between the functions of the Commission and other organs.

41. After an exchange of views in which Mr. LARREA (Ecuador), Mr. HASAN (Pakistan), Mr. SCOTT-FOX (United Kingdom), Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia), Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), Mr. ANIS (Egypt), Mr. KAUL (India), Mr. HSIA (China) and Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) took part, the PRESIDENT proposed that the sponsors of the draft resolution (E/L.690) should submit a revised draft to the next meeting, taking into account the various suggestions made during the debate.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.