



## CONTENTS

	Page
Adoption of the sessional agenda (E/2420, E/2453, E/L. 507 and E/L. 508) (concluded) . . . . .	7

**President:** M. Raymond SCHEYVEN (Belgium)

**Present:**

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Egypt, France, India, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following countries: Denmark, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Switzerland.

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 Monetary Fund, World Health Organization, International Telecommunication Union, World Meteorological Organization.

**Adoption of the sessional agenda  
(E/2420, E/2453, E/L.507 and E/L. 508) (concluded)**

[Agenda item 1]

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to continue its consideration of the provisional agenda item by item as it appeared in the annotated document prepared by the Secretariat (E/L.507).

2. With regard to the reports of the specialized agencies (items 22 to 29), he informed the Council that the reports on items 22, 23, 26, 27 and 28 were ready in English, French and Spanish, those on items 25 and 29 were ready in English and French, but the report on item 24 had not yet been completed.

*Items 22 and 23 were adopted.*

**ITEM 24**

3. Mr. TERENCE (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that, owing to unforeseen circumstances, the printing of the report of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) had been held up, and it would not be available to members of the Council before 15 to 20 July. The Director-General of UNESCO had asked him to apologize to the Council on his behalf.

4. UNESCO had always attached great importance to the Council's examination of its work. For that reason, it prepared a separate printed report each year for the Council, as distinct from the report it submitted to its own General Conference. He hoped that the Council

would be able to examine UNESCO's report before the end of the session. Should it decide otherwise, UNESCO might draw up a report on its work during 1953 for the Council's next session. The Council would thus have before it at its seventeenth session a complete picture of UNESCO's activity during 1952 and 1953.

5. Mr. STERNER (Sweden) drew attention to the fact that, under the present system, the specialized agencies were all required to prepare special reports for the Council in addition to their regular annual reports for their own general conferences. As that practice led to duplication of work, he renewed the suggestion he had already made at previous sessions that the Council might content itself with the last regular annual report of each agency, possibly with a supplement to bring it up to date.

6. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat would bear that suggestion in mind and that the Council would discuss it at the appropriate time.

7. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) proposed that item 24<sup>1</sup> be deferred until the seventeenth session, as the report was not yet ready.

*The United Kingdom proposal was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

**ITEMS 25, 26 AND 27**

*Items 25, 26 and 27 were adopted.*

**ITEM 28**

8. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) and Mr. STERNER (Sweden) said that their respective delegations had not yet received the report of the International Telecommunication (ITU).

9. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that his delegation, too, still lacked the report. Not only was there delay in producing the reports of the specialized agencies, but there also seemed to be an insufficient number of copies, and he hoped that additional copies would be supplied in future.

10. Although some of the specialized agencies' reports had not been circulated in Spanish, he had made no objection to the inclusion of the items in question because he did not wish to hold up the Council's work. However, it should be borne in mind that, were one of the Spanish-speaking delegations to object, the Council would be unable to discuss an item until the relevant documents had been circulated in all three working languages.

11. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) said that, as the report had not been circulated in Spanish, and as several

<sup>1</sup> "Report of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization".

delegations had not received it at all, it appeared appropriate to invoke rule 14 of the rules of procedure, which provided that the Council's agenda should normally include only items for which adequate documentation had been circulated to members six weeks before the beginning of the session. He therefore proposed that item 28<sup>2</sup> be deferred until the seventeenth session.

12. Mr. KURAL (Turkey) said that his delegation also had not yet received the report of ITU. He therefore supported the United Kingdom proposal.

13. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that the report was a technical one and should not take up much of the Council's time. He therefore saw no reason to defer its consideration.

*The United Kingdom proposal was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

#### ITEMS 29 TO 39

*Items 29 to 39 were adopted.*

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM

14. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the Secretary-General's proposal for the inclusion of a supplementary item entitled "Accession of Viet Nam and the State of Vatican City to the Convention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949" (E/2453).

15. Mr. ARUTYUNYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it would be difficult for his delegation to discuss the proposed supplementary item, since he had received the relevant document only that morning.

16. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that the Council had taken decisions on similar questions in the past at very short notice. He therefore supported the Secretary-General's proposal for the inclusion of the supplementary item.

17. Mr. ARUTYUNYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) saw no reason for haste. Delegations should at least be given time to read the document. He emphasized that important issues were involved, since the request regarding Viet Nam had been submitted, not by the legitimate democratic Government representing the Vietnamese people, but by a group of usurpers supported by foreign arms. In the circumstances, he thought it would be unwise to embark hastily upon a discussion of the item and he would vote against its addition to the agenda.

18. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) said that the Council was at present discussing only the procedural question whether or not to add the item to the agenda. The question of substance raised by the Soviet Union representative should be brought up during the discussion on the item itself. He would support the inclusion of the item, although that would naturally not commit his delegation on the substantive issue.

19. Mr. SEN (India) said that the matter was clearly not purely procedural. In line with the attitude taken by the United Kingdom representative on other items, he suggested that the inclusion of the supplementary item be deferred, because of the delay in the distribution of the relevant documentation.

20. Mr. BORIS (France) pointed out that the requests from the Secretariat of State of the Vatican City and the Foreign Ministry of the State of Viet Nam had been submitted on 16 and 18 May 1953 respectively. Hence the Soviet Union representative's argument—based as it was on the date of the requests—surely lost its point. Incidentally, the Secretariat document was dated 2 June 1953. The Soviet Union representative had raised a political issue in connexion with a purely technical matter, and in terms against which the French delegation felt obliged to protest vigorously. Time and time again, the French delegation had described the position of the State of Viet Nam, and the General Assembly had adopted decisions on the matter by a considerable majority. He therefore asked the President to put the Secretary-General's proposal to the vote, and intimated that he would support it.

21. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) pointed out that the supplementary item could not be included in the agenda if rule 14 of the rules of procedure was applied. In addition, although the document was dated 2 June 1953, his delegation had only just received it. He agreed with the Indian representative that the question was not purely procedural, and emphasized that important legal and political issues were involved. He was therefore unable to support the proposal that the supplementary item should be added to the agenda.

22. Mr. AZMI (Egypt) proposed that a separate vote be taken on the words "... Viet Nam and ..." in the Secretary-General's proposal.

23. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that, although the item itself involved questions of substance, its inclusion in the agenda was purely a procedural issue.

24. Mr. ARUTYUNYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the French representative, emphasized that, regardless of the date on the document, his delegation had received it only that morning. The question of the accession of a State to the Convention on Road Traffic might be regarded as procedural if the request were submitted by the legitimate government of the State concerned. The question was in fact procedural in the case of the Vatican City State, but not in the case of Viet Nam, and it was therefore quite in order for the Egyptian representative to have suggested that separate votes be taken. In the case of Viet Nam, the issue was very delicate, since the various delegations represented in the Council did not all recognize the same government of Viet Nam. Similar considerations had led the Council to defer consideration of item 6, on the question of admission to membership in the regional economic commissions of States not Members of the United Nations. He therefore felt that the Council should also defer consideration of the proposed supplementary item.

25. The PRESIDENT put the proposal for the insertion of a supplementary item to the vote in two parts as requested by the Egyptian representative.

*The proposal to include in the agenda the accession of Viet Nam to the Convention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949 was adopted by 10 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.*

*The proposal to include in the agenda the accession of*

<sup>2</sup> "Report of the International Telecommunication Union".

*the Vatican City State to the Convention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

*The sessional agenda (E/2420), as amended, was adopted.*

#### RAPPOREUR ON ITEM 15

26. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) raised the question of his status as Rapporteur on item 15 of the agenda (freedom of information). He reminded the Council that he had been appointed for one year only, and that his term of office would therefore expire at the end of the month. As it had been decided to defer consideration of his report until the seventeenth session, and as the term of his country's representation on the Council would expire at the end of the current year, he was not clear whether he would be entitled in that event to introduce his report in person.

27. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) paid tribute to the admirable work done by Mr. Lopez in his capacity as Rapporteur.

28. The PRESIDENT hoped that it would be possible for Mr. Lopez to submit his report at the seventeenth session, whether or not the Philippine Government was at that time represented on the Council.

29. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) failed to see how he could assume full responsibility for the report unless he was able to attend the meetings at which the Council eventually discussed it. After all, the situation would undoubtedly evolve during the coming twelve months, and, unless he were able to supplement or revise his report in the light of changing circumstances, it might prove to be less valuable at the seventeenth session than it was at the moment.

30. Mr. BORIS (France) said that, for the reasons it had stated on a number of previous occasions, the French delegation had proposed that consideration of item 15 of the agenda be deferred and it had assumed that the Rapporteur's term of office would thereby automatically be extended.

31. The Philippine representative had made a number of valid points, but was wrong in believing that his report would be less valuable in twelve months' time. However, if need be, he might amplify it on certain points in the light of developments during that period.

32. As it was difficult to foresee the possible consequences of its decision to defer consideration of item 15 of the agenda, he wondered whether the Council might not add to that agenda consideration of the implications of extending the Rapporteur's term of office for one year. The French delegation, for its part, would be prepared to give the matter sympathetic consideration.

33. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) said that, when he had voted for deferment of item 15 of the agenda, he had done so on the understanding that, whenever the Council might eventually take up the Report, its Rapporteur would be there in person to introduce it. That was surely a legitimate and logical consequence of the Council's decision.

34. On the other hand, he did not think that it followed that a rapporteur must invariably be present when his report was considered by the Council; a rapporteur

might be prevented from so attending by a variety of circumstances—illness, prior engagements and the like—and the Council could hardly be expected again to defer consideration of an item simply to meet the rapporteur's convenience.

35. As to the French representative's suggestion that the Council consider extending the Rapporteur's term of office, he thought that that might involve certain difficulties. Surely such prolongation, with its logical consequence of the Rapporteur's right to revise, amplify or otherwise modify the present report, could be authorized only if the Council had actually considered the report. That it could not do, since it had already decided to defer such consideration until the next session. Indeed, the Council was at that moment guilty of discussing an item which was not on its agenda.

36. He therefore considered that the discussion should be closed, on the understanding that the Rapporteur should be free to attend the meetings at which the report on freedom of information was eventually discussed, provided that it was physically possible for him to do so.

37. Mr. BAKER (United States of America), also referring to the French representative's suggestion concerning the prolongation of the Rapporteur's term of office, said that, since the financial implications of such a step were not known, the United States delegation could take no stand on the question.

38. Mr. AZMI (Egypt) recalled that, when the Council had appointed Mr. Lopez as Rapporteur on Freedom of Information, it had done so on an experimental basis for a period of one year; for that reason, he shared the views of the Yugoslav representative. He hoped that, in discussing the situation with the Rapporteur and the Secretariat, the President would bear that fact in mind.

*After further discussion, it was agreed that the President should discuss the matter with Mr. Lopez with a view to arriving at an understanding likely to commend itself to the Council.*

#### ALLOCATION OF ITEMS TO COMMENCE IN COMMITTEES WITHOUT PRELIMINARY DEBATE IN THE COUNCIL (E/L.508, paragraphs 4-7)

39. Mr. SHAW (Australia) proposed that item 12 (reports of the Executive Board of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund) should be first discussed in plenary meeting, and that, as a corollary, the relevant section of the report of the Social Commission on its ninth session (item 14) should also be dealt with in plenary.

40. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) supported the Australian representative's recommendation, particularly since, as Chairman of the Social Committee, he was anxious to lighten its heavy programme.

41. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) also supported the Australian proposal, and added that, in his view, wide latitude should be left to the President and the Secretariat to decide the precise manner in which a particular item should be discussed.

*The Australian proposal was adopted.*

42. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) suggested that that part of the report of the Social Commission which dealt with concerted action should be abstracted from item 11 and discussed together with item 10 (programme of concerted practical action in the social field of the United Nations and the specialized agencies), in view of the close connexion between the two subjects.

*It was so agreed.*

#### ORDER OF ITEMS (E/L.508, paragraph 8)

43. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) suggested that item 10 should be discussed together with item 30 (b) (co-ordination of the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies—Review of 1954 programmes and of the list of United Nations priority programmes in the economic and social fields) in plenary session of the fourth week.

*It was so agreed.*

44. Mr. ARUTYUNYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that, as consideration of item 15 (freedom of information) had been deferred to the seventeenth session, it would be preferable to consider item 30 (b) and the relevant part of item 10 in the third week of the present session, instead of, as at present scheduled by the Secretariat (E/L.508, paragraph 10), in the fourth week.

45. Mr. HILL (Secretariat) recalled that the decision to consider item 30 (b) towards the end of the session had been taken at the fourteenth session with the deliberate object of affording the Council a general view of the action taken on priorities by specialized agencies.

46. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) agreed that items 10 and 30 (b) should be taken together, as suggested by the Argentine representative, provided item 10 was subsequently referred to the Social Committee. It was not feasible to decide in advance the stage at which these two items should be discussed, as this depended to some extent on the length of the preceding debates.

47. The PRESIDENT requested the Secretariat to revise the arrangements for the consideration of the two items in question, taking into account the views advanced during the discussion.

48. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) asked whether it would not be possible for item 9 (report of the Fiscal Commission, fourth session) to be discussed in plenary meeting instead of in the Economic Committee, in order to avoid covering the same ground twice.

49. Mr. SEN (India) pointed out that, if the United Kingdom proposal were accepted, the Economic Committee would have nothing to do during the first week.

50. The PRESIDENT said that, while he was anxious to keep all the committees busy, shortage of accommodation restricted the number of committee meetings that could be held simultaneously.

51. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) supported the Indian representative, since he felt that there was a danger that the Council might not be able to exhaust all the items on its agenda for the first week.

After considerable discussion, *it was decided* that the President and the Secretariat should be allowed a

considerable measure of latitude in deciding whether, in all the relevant circumstances, item 9 should be considered in a plenary meeting, or dealt with by the Economic Committee.

52. Mr. ARUTYUNYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) raised the question of the arrangements to be made with regard to item 3 (economic development of under-developed countries) and item 8 (technical assistance). He suggested that, in view of the organic link between those two topics, it would be desirable to take them consecutively instead of, as at present proposed by the Secretariat (E/L.508, paragraph 10) during the second and fourth weeks of the session respectively.

53. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) pointed out that, since item 8 could be taken up only after the Working Party on Technical Assistance had reported its findings, the gap on the agenda between the two items was more apparent than real. It was essential to avoid overlapping between two items which called for the services of the same delegation experts.

54. Mr. SEN (India) endorsed the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union. He emphasized the importance of both subjects, and suggested that it was preferable to discuss them early in the session, while the minds of representatives were still fresh. He asked whether the meetings of the Technical Assistance Committee could not be brought forward so that, before technical assistance was discussed in a plenary meeting, representatives could have the benefit of the Committee's findings.

55. Mr. DE SEYNES (France), speaking as Chairman of the Technical Assistance Committee, said that, as Chairman both of that Committee and of the Working Party on Technical Assistance, he had given several members of the Committee an assurance that the technical assistance programmes and the economic development of under-developed countries would not be discussed simultaneously. The sole task of the Working Party was to consider the financing of future technical assistance programmes. It should therefore be possible to defer the Working Party's meetings, which had originally been fixed for 1 and 2 July, to the second or third week of the session. The Working Party would hold at most four meetings, which need not coincide with the Council's discussion on economic development.

56. Mr. ARUTYUNYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) repeated that his proposal was designed to avoid a gap between two intimately connected subjects. He believed that there had been no objection in principle to his proposal. The Yugoslav representative had admitted that such an arrangement would be logical.

57. He had gathered that the Chairman of the Technical Assistance Committee had expressed himself in favour of bringing his Committee's meetings forward by one week. In that event, it would be possible to concentrate the work of the Council, and to secure continuity between two related items.

58. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) thought that there was no basic difference of view between the Soviet Union representative and himself.

59. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) drew attention to the lack of balance in the volume of work in the second and third weeks, resulting from the present arrangement of the agenda. In the second week, only two items would be taken in plenary meeting, and there would be no Committee meetings. In the third week, on the contrary, the Council would be faced with a difficult if not impossible situation, since not only would the Economic Committee, the Social Committee and the Technical Assistance Committee all be meeting, but the Council itself would be dealing with matters referred to it by those Committees. He accordingly considered that the Soviet Union representative's proposal, which would relieve the pressure, merited favourable consideration.

60. The PRESIDENT observed that, in view of the amendments to the agenda adopted at the previous and present meetings, the Secretariat would revise the work programme with the object of remedying the existing lack of balance, and that full account would be taken of the various suggestions made by representatives.

#### NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

61. The PRESIDENT reminded the Council of the provisions of rule 85 of the Council's rules of procedure to the effect that organizations wishing to be consulted by the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations should make appropriate application in writing so that the request reached the Secretary-General as soon as possible after the issue of the provisional agenda for the session, and in no case later than forty-eight hours after the adoption of the agenda.

62. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) expressed the hope that, if the work of the session proceeded expeditiously, it

would not be necessary to adhere rigidly to the present six-weeks programme.

63. Mr. ARUTYUNYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that a revised version of document E/L.508, incorporating the modifications to the working programme approved by the Council, be circulated as soon as possible.

64. He also requested that, if no technical difficulty were involved, some of the items to be taken at the next plenary meeting which called for a good deal of preparation should be replaced by others which were less complex. He suggested, for example, that items 34 (calendar of conferences for 1953), 22 (report of the International Labour Organisation), 23 (report of the Food and Agriculture Organization), and 17 (allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights) should be discussed.

65. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba), while agreeing in principle with the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union, felt that the report of the Food and Agriculture Organization was so important that discussion of it should not be limited to the next plenary meeting alone.

66. After further discussion, the PRESIDENT suggested that, at the next meeting, items 34 (calendar of conferences for 1953), item 25 (report of the World Health Organization) and item 9 [report of the Fiscal Commission (fourth session)] should be discussed. Item 22 (report of the International Labour Organisation) and item 23 (report of the Food and Agriculture Organization) might then be taken on 2 July.

*It was so agreed.*

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.