



CONTENTS

Page

Non-governmental organizations: (a) Applications and re-applications for consultative status: report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2550) (concluded).....	17
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

President: Mr. Juan I. COOKE (Argentina).

Present:

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, 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, Chile, Israel, Netherlands.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, World Health Organization, World Meteorological Organization.

Non-governmental organizations: (a) Applications and re-applications for consultative status: report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2550) (concluded)

[Agenda item 20 (a)]

1. Mr. SAKSENA (India) said that it was clear from the opinion of the Legal Department of the Secretariat concerning paragraph 35 (a) of Council resolution 288 B (X)¹ that the Legal Department itself realized that the paragraph in question was open to two interpretations: first, that the statutory time limit applied to re-applications and requests for changes in status as well as to new applications and, secondly, that it did not necessarily do so. The Legal Department's doubts had been so strong that it had indicated that the Council would be justified in re-examining the wording of paragraph 35 (a).

2. In his opinion, two points indicated the intentions underlying paragraph 35 (a). First, the order of the three sub-paragraphs clearly indicated that the time limits in the second sub-paragraph were meant to apply only to the preceding or first sub-paragraph dealing with new applications and not to the following or third sub-paragraph dealing with re-applications and requests for changes in status. Secondly, there was a very sound argument for the non-application of the time limit to re-applications and requests for changes in status in the fact that they had already been examined and that adequate data had already been submitted.

3. The opinion expressed in the resolution adopted by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

(E/2550, annex, para. 3) was therefore incorrect and should be reviewed by the Council. The proper procedure would be to remove any ambiguity by amending paragraph 35 (a) and, pending that, to give the benefit of the doubt to those organizations which had been adversely affected by the Committee's interpretation of it.

4. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) entirely agreed with the Indian representative on the incorrect and arbitrary nature of the interpretation of paragraph 35 (a) of resolution 288 B (X) given by the majority of the Committee. The time limit was clearly intended to apply only to new applications. The Legal Department itself had admitted that there was no precise indication in paragraph 35 (a) whether or not the Committee was entitled to examine re-applications received after 1 November each year. Hence, the Committee had had no formal justification for rejecting the re-applications of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers and the International Organization of Journalists and the requests of the World Federation of Democratic Youth for reclassification in category B.

5. The Council found itself in a very abnormal situation. In spite of the opposition of the USSR, the majority of the Committee had decided, on the basis of an incorrect interpretation of a Council resolution, to defer action on the three organizations until 1955. It was now attempting to justify its decision *ex post facto* by asking the Council to legalize that interpretation and endorse its action. Were the Council to comply with the Committee's wishes and fail to grant the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the International Organization of Journalists and the World Federation of Democratic Youth consultative status in category B, it would be depriving itself of constructive collaboration on a number of the problems on its agenda.

6. The information on the three organizations that had been submitted to the Committee had been very incomplete. The World Federation of Democratic Youth was the only international youth organization with wide representation. It had 83 million members from ninety-three countries and included people of various political and religious views drawn from all strata of society. Its aims were to strengthen international solidarity and mutual understanding in all spheres of economic, social and cultural life, to struggle against racial and class discrimination, to foster a spirit of democracy and friendship among peoples and to struggle for better educational and working conditions and better wages. It had held a number of international congresses, conferences and other meetings to deal with questions of interest to young people throughout the world. The World Youth Congress in 1953 had been attended by over 1,500 young people from 106 countries. The World Festivals of Youth sponsored by the Federation, had been particularly popular, the last festival being attended by 30,000 young people from 111 countries. Such festivals played a great part in developing mutual understanding and cultural relations. In March 1953, an international con-

¹ See document E/C.2/SR.134, paras. 12 and 13.

ference on the protection of young people's rights had been held under the auspices of the Federation and a number of decisions and resolutions had been adopted. The Federation had consistently participated in the work of the Economic and Social Council and its organs and had attended a number of conferences of non-governmental organizations held under United Nations sponsorship.

7. The International Organization of Journalists had been founded immediately after the end of the Second World War. Its membership was drawn from thirty-five different countries and its aims were the maintenance of peace in the world and the strengthening of friendship among nations and international understanding by means of free, truthful, honest information, the fight against war propaganda and the defence of freedom of the Press and the rights of journalists. The Council had devoted great attention to the question of freedom of information and would be ill-advised to refuse to grant the Organization concerned consultative status.

8. The International Association of Democratic Lawyers had been established at the time of the San Francisco Conference and its founding members had included lawyers attending the conference and lawyers who had taken part in the Nürnberg trials. Its membership was drawn from thirty-eight countries. Its aims were to foster contacts and the exchange of views among jurists throughout the world and to support the United Nations. It could make a substantial contribution to the Council's work on human rights and the status of women and it was regrettable that it had no consultative status whatsoever.

9. As matters stood, three international democratic organizations with millions of members throughout the world were being deprived of any contact with the United Nations, although they were fighting for the same purposes and principles. That situation operated to the detriment not only of the organizations concerned but of the United Nations also.

10. He therefore proposed that the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the International Organization of Journalists and the World Federation of Democratic Youth should be added to the organizations listed in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A recommended by the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2550).

11. Mr. GORSE (France) said that in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations he had voted in favour of the resolution set out in paragraph 3 of the annex to the Committee's report (E/2550). He had done so not as a matter of expediency or because three of the organizations whose applications had been rejected were Communist—in that connexion it should be noted that there was also a fourth organization, the International Federation of Senior Police Officers, with its headquarters in Paris—but for practical considerations. Doubts concerning the interpretation of paragraph 35 (a) of Council resolution 288 B (X) had been raised and his delegation had hoped that the adoption of the interpretative resolution in question would eliminate long and fruitless procedural discussions in the Committee and the Council and expedite the work of those bodies.

12. He would therefore endorse that resolution when it was put to a vote in the Council.

13. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations he had voted in favour of the resolution given in paragraph 3 of the annex to the Committee's report for reasons similar to those just mentioned by the French representative. His delegation, like a number of others, had had doubts about the interpretation of paragraph 35 (a) of resolution 288 B (X), particularly the third sub-paragraph of that text, and had felt that the issue should be settled by a resolution after a decision had been reached on the applications under discussion.

14. Mr. HOTCHKIS (United States of America) considered that the second sub-paragraph of paragraph 35 (a) concerning time limits clearly applied to re-applications and requests for changes in status as well as to new applications. The third sub-paragraph provided for a waiting period before applications could be re-submitted and at the end of that period the time limit for submitting applications would obviously come into force again. The organizations in question had failed to comply with the time limit, since their applications had been submitted only in January 1954. In addition, the information about their activities submitted to the Committee had been fragmentary. On both counts, therefore, the Committee had been quite justified in refusing to consider the applications.

15. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that in the Secretary-General's memorandum to the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/C.2/R.18/Add.2) the information on the World Federation of Democratic Youth occupied nine pages, the information on the International Association of Democratic Lawyers two pages and the information on the International Organization of Journalists four pages. Considerable additional information could be found in other documents of the Committee and the Council and the records of proceedings in both bodies. Hence, there seemed little justification for the United States representative's comments.

16. Mr. HOTCHKIS (United States of America), replying to the representative of Czechoslovakia, pointed out that although the Secretary-General's memorandum (E/C.2/R.18/Add.2) devoted a number of pages to the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers and the International Organization of Journalists, those pages contained very little concrete information and such data as they did contain had been before the Council when it had last considered those organizations several years previously. The question before the Council was whether or not the organizations in question had complied with the rule. In the opinion of the United States delegation they had not done so and their applications should therefore not be granted.

17. Mr. ADIL (Pakistan) thought there were two questions which should be kept separate: first, whether the Council endorsed the NGO Committee's interpretation of the rules, and, second, whether the organizations in question should be granted consultative status. For his part he would endorse the resolution in paragraph 3 of the annex to the Committee's report (E/2550), since he agreed with the Committee's interpretation of the rules.

18. Mr. GORSE (France) proposed that the name of the Fédération internationale de sauvetage should be included in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A recommended by the NGO Committee (E/2550).

19. At the previous meeting the United Kingdom representative had suggested that the activities of the Fédération were outside the Economic and Social Council's province. That was not the view of the French Government. The Fédération was concerned with safety in industry, an ILO report on which would shortly be considered by the Council. It also dealt with safety on the roads, which was related to the question of road signs and signals, discussed by the Council at its 757th meeting; with safety at sea, which was a matter for the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization discussed at the same meeting; and with safety in the air, which came within the purview of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

20. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. FENAUX (Belgium), Mr. EL-TANAMLI (Egypt), Mr. ADIL (Pakistan), Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom), Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) and the PRESIDENT took part, the PRESIDENT asked the Council to indicate by a vote whether or not it endorsed the NGO Committee's interpretation of paragraph 35 (a) of resolution 288 B (X) as given the resolution adopted by the Committee (E/2550, annex, para. 3).

By 14 votes to 2, with 1 abstention, the Council approved the interpretation.

21. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had not taken part in the vote because he did not consider that the question should have been put to the vote. Item 20 (a) of the Council's agenda read "Applications and re-applications for consultative status" and under that sub-item the Council was called upon to vote on draft resolutions A and B (E/2550) recommended by the NGO Committee. It was not, however, called upon to come to any decisions concerning interpretations of the rules.

22. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the USSR proposal that the names of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers and the International Organization of Journalists should be included in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A.

The proposal was rejected by 10 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

23. Mr. ADIL (Pakistan) said that he had voted against the USSR proposal because he felt that its adoption would be contrary to the interpretation of the rules which the Council had approved five minutes earlier.

24. He assured the USSR and Czechoslovak delegations that he had not been influenced by the fact that the organizations in question were Communist or Communist-sponsored.

25. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the French proposal that the name of the Fédération internationale de sauvetage should be included in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A.

The proposal was not adopted, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against, with 6 abstentions.

26. The PRESIDENT called on the Council to vote on draft resolution A recommended by the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2550).

27. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for separate votes on paragraphs 3 and 4.

28. Mr. SAKSENA (India) asked that each paragraph should be voted on separately.

Paragraph 1 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 2 was adopted unanimously.

29. Mr. TSAO (China) explained that he had voted for paragraph 2 as a whole. The statement which he had made at the previous meeting was unaffected by his vote.

30. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) called for a separate vote on the proposal to place the Fédération internationale libre des déportés et internés de la résistance on the register of non-governmental organizations.

The proposal was adopted by 13 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

31. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he had voted against the proposal because the organization in question was not representative, was actively hostile to the peoples' democracies and was acting in violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

The rest of paragraph 3 was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

32. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the International Federation of Free Journalists (of Central and Eastern Europe and Baltic and Balkan Countries) be removed from the register.

The proposal was rejected by 11 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

33. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) alleged that the organization mentioned in paragraph 4 of the operative part of the resolution was composed of traitors and renegades from Eastern European countries who were fomenting hostile acts against the peoples' democracies and the Soviet Union.

34. Mr. KOS (Yugoslavia) explained that he had voted for the proposal because the organization in question was not representative of any country in the localities mentioned in its title.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

35. The PRESIDENT requested the Council to discuss resolution B recommended by the Council NGO Committee (E/2550).

36. Mr. HOTCHKIS (United States of America) pointed out that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, the biggest national organization of business in the world, had been following the Council's work very closely. It was in a position to contribute informed advice and technical services and to assist in promoting the flow of private capital to under-developed countries. It was fully qualified for admission to category B.

37. The Co-operative for American Remittances to Everywhere, Inc. (CARE) was a humanitarian organization with an outstanding record of assistance to the victims of war and other disasters. In recent years it had helped in the development of technical assistance programmes by providing such supplies as books, agricultural implements and tool kits. He was pleased to propose it for inclusion in category B.

38. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he would support the proposal for the inclusion of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America in category B in the hope that trade relations among the peoples of the world would thereby be extended.

39. He would vote against the admission of CARE since its actions were incompatible with the principles of the United Nations and were designed to kindle hostility among peoples.

40. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the proposal to

admit the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America to category B.

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

41. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the proposal to admit the Co-operative for American Remittances to Everywhere, Inc. (CARE) to category B.

The proposal was adopted by 16 votes to 2.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.