UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Thirty-third Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

1189th meeting

Wednesday, 4 April 1962, at 2.55 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

President: Mr. Jerzy MICHALOWSKI (Poland).

Present:

Representatives of the following States: Australia, Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Poland, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following Member States: Israel, Philippines, Romania.

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; World Health Organization.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Non-governmental organizations (*continued*)

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS ON APPLICATIONS AND RE-APPLICATIONS FOR CONSULTATIVE STATUS (E/3589, E/L. 934) (*concluded*)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to continue its consideration of the draft resolution embodied in the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/3589, para. 4). Three oral amendments had been submitted at the previous meeting. First, the Brazilian representative had proposed that the United Towns Organization should be added to the list in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. As a result, the representative of Senegal had withdrawn operative paragraph 1 of his draft resolution (E/L.934). Secondly, the Indian representative had proposed that the Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation should also be added to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution submitted by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and that operative paragraph 4 should consequently be deleted. Thirdly, the United Kingdom representative proposed that operative paragraph 2 should read:

> " *Decides* to refer the request of the Government of Senegal that the United Towns Organization be granted category B consultative status to its Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations for consideration and a report thereon to the Council at a later session."

2. Mr. CISS (Senegal) recalled that at the previous meeting the Uruguayan representative had inquired why the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had rejected the application from the United Towns Organization. The reasons for the rejection had been purely political.

3. Mr. ITO (Japan), Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark), Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) and Mr. CARRILLO (El Salvador) supported the United Kingdom amendment.

4. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) felt that the Council should not become involved in a discussion whether the United Towns Organization wanted to be placed in category A or B. All it sought was consultative status; the actual category was immaterial.

5. Mr. BIRICHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opposed the United Kingdom amendment. The Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had rejected the application from the United Towns Organization by a built-in majority for purely political motives. The Council itself was fully competent to take a decision on that application at the current session. The procedure proposed by the United Kingdom would merely cause further delay. The Committee had not only discriminated against the United Towns Organization; it had also, for no valid reason, deferred consideration of the application from the Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation, even though that body was representative of under-developed countries and fully merited admission to category B status. The Council should decide immediately to admit both those organizations to consultative status.

6. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the Brazilian oral amendment.

At the request of the representative of Senegal, a vote was taken by roll-call.

France, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Jordan, Poland, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ethiopia.

Against: France, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador.

Abstaining: Japan.

The amendment was rejected by 9 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.

7. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the Indian oral amendment.

At the request of the representative of Senegal, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Uruguay, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ethiopia, India, Japan, Jordan, Poland, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Uruguay, Colombia, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Denmark, El Salvador, Italy.

The amendment was adopted by 9 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

8. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the United Kingdom oral amendment.

The amendment was adopted by 13 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

9. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/3589, para. 4), as amended. As a result of the adoption of the Indian amendment operative paragraph 4 no longer stood.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

10. Mr. CISS (Senegal) said that since his draft resolution (E/L.934) raised a difficult problem at a difficult time in the life of the United Nations, his delegation withdrew it.

11. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) explained that her delegation had voted against the Indian amendment, not because it lacked confidence in the Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation, but because it felt that the organization was too new and not yet sufficiently representative to be granted category B consultative status at the present time.

12. Mr. RAFFAELLI (Brazil) said that he had voted for the granting of category B consultative status to the United Towns Organization because its aims were in accord with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and because it could make a valuable contribution to the Council's work. He asked the Secretariat whether it would be possible for the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to reconsider the application of the United Towns Organization some time during 1962.

13. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) thought that restricted documents, such as E/C.2/R.29 and the summary records of the two meetings of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations at which the applications under discussion had been considered, should also be made available by the Secretariat to members of the Council who were not members of that committee, without their having to request them. Since he had been unable to transmit those documents to his Government and to receive its instructions concerning the substance of the matter, he had had no other choice but to vote for the United Kingdom amendment to postpone consideration of the application of the United Towns Organization for category B consultative status.

14. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council), replying to the Brazilian representative, recalled that the United Kingdom amendment provided that the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations would report to the Council at a later session; it was, however, for the Committee to decide when it wished to consider the matter further.

15. In reply to the Italian representative, he said that the provisional summary records of the Committee's 188th and 189th meetings had been made available to all who had requested them.

16. Mr. BIRICHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations should consider and report on the application of the United Towns Organization in time for the Council's thirty-fourth session.

AGENDA ITEM 18

Revision of the Agreement between the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (E/3588, E/L.935)

17. Mr. NATORF (Poland), introducing his delegation's draft resolution (E/L.935) concerning the revision of the Agreement between the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, pointed out that the Executive Board of UNESCO had unanimously recommended that article II of the Agreement should be deleted; the deletion of that article would bring the Agreement into closer conformity with all other agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

The Polish draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 3.55 p.m.

Printed in France

10575 — June 1962 — 2,175