



CONTENTS UN/SA COLLECTION

Agenda item 12:	Page
Non-governmental organizations	
Report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on applications and re-applications for consultative status .....	5

*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: Argentina, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Greece, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Thailand.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization; World Meteorological Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Non-governmental organizations

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

1. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) recalled that the fundamental task of the United Nations under Article 1 of the Charter was to maintain international peace and security through friendly relations among peoples, and that Article 13 conferred upon the General Assembly, among other tasks, that of promoting international co-operation in the economic, social and cultural fields. Town twinning served both those aims perfectly, for it was a means of promoting co-operation between the people of Eastern and Western centres of population, or of cities in developed countries and centres in under-developed countries, and of bringing them closer together. Senegal accordingly hoped that the Council would grant category B

consultative status to the United Towns Organization, place on the agenda for its thirty-third session the study of relations between towns throughout the world with a view to exchanges of personnel and services for purposes of cultural and technical co-operation, and establish a capital fund of \$10 million to finance such exchanges and to augment the technical services of the United Towns Organization and its branches, particularly the Union continentale africaine des villes jumelées. The United Towns Organization was the only body to have been courageous enough not to let itself be deterred by the division of the world into two blocs and to have tried to remedy a compartmentalization that endangered the future of mankind.

2. It was true that the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, which was set up to give technical advice on applications for consultative status, had not approved the organization's application, doubtless influenced by the argument that it had an extreme left-wing cast. Unfortunately, however, mistaken and facile accusations of that nature were always levelled at those who sought to overcome the division of the world into rival blocs. It was nevertheless necessary to find common ground on which to build a universal civilization. Senegal considered that the United Towns Organization's endeavour deserved the Council's support, and hoped that its draft resolution (E/L.934) would be adopted.

3. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) noted with satisfaction that Senegal, in a spirit of compromise, had modified its original request and now proposed that the United Towns Organization should be granted category B consultative status. That position would enable many members to vote in favour of the request. He hoped, however, that Senegal would not press the part of its draft resolution concerned with financial matters. If the proposal was put to the vote, his delegation would like a separate vote on that part.

4. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) said that he would prefer a vote by division to outright rejection.

5. Mr. BIRICHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the Senegalese representative that there were no grounds for rejecting the application of the United Towns Organization, which already had consultative status with UNESCO. The purposes and principles of the organization, which were to further friendship among peoples, whatever their race, language, creed or political views, through town twinning and the establishment of cultural links, in such a way as to promote aid to under-developed countries, were in full conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations

Charter, as required by Council resolution 288 (X) concerning non-governmental organizations. The Soviet Union therefore supported whole-heartedly the Senegalese proposal that the United Towns Organization should be granted consultative status.

6. Furthermore, it was not clear why consideration of the request of the Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation, whose aims were in conformity with those of the Charter and which already numbered thirty-eight countries of Asia and Africa among its members, should be deferred for one year. The admission of that organization would be all the more desirable in that the non-governmental organizations represented at the Council's meetings included very few from those two continents.

7. Lastly, the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/3589) did not give a full account of the discussions, since it did not reflect the position taken by the Soviet delegation; moreover no agreement had been reached on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 4. He hoped that in the future the Committee would keep to the normal procedure.

8. Mr. RAFFAELLI (Brazil) said that he was prepared to support the granting of category A or B consultative status to the United Towns Organization as proposed by Senegal. It would be preferable, however, for Senegal not to press its draft resolution (E/L.934) to a vote; the best course would probably be to treat it as an amendment to the Committee's draft resolution. If the Senegalese draft resolution was nevertheless put to the vote, his delegation would vote in favour of the first part, but abstain on the second.

9. Mr. OKAZAKI (Japan) said that he was grateful to the Senegalese representative for his effort to achieve a compromise but was not convinced of the need to establish a capital fund; if operative paragraph 3 of the Senegalese draft resolution was put to the vote, he would vote against it. Moreover the Council should heed the advice of the Committee it had appointed to carry out the technical examination of applications, and it was for the Committee itself, not the Council, to consider whether the decision taken should be changed.

10. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that, although he was glad the Senegalese representative wished to find an acceptable compromise, he wondered whether the Council could decide to place the United Towns Organization in category B when it had applied for admission to category A. The Organization would perhaps have to make a new application, on which the Committee would then have to decide.

11. Mr. REVOL (France) felt that the Council's problem was a difficult one inasmuch as the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had already taken a formal decision on the United Towns Organization's application for category A consultative status. His delegation had already signified its interest in town twinning and appreciated the Senegalese representative's arguments, but would support the Committee's recommendation specifically because it considered the matter important. The Committee had adopted as its criterion,

not the organization's intentions or even the worth of its activities, but the use which was sometimes made of it and which might jeopardize the laudable aim of bringing peoples closer together through town twinning. That was not a final judgement; the organization was so complex in structure that the activities of some of its branches might be beyond its sponsors' control, and if a house-cleaning was carried out the question might be reopened. Furthermore there was no call for the Council to set a precedent by rejecting a Committee proposal. At the very most, the question might be laid before the Committee again at a subsequent session so as to enable the organization to state its views on admission to category B. He was to some extent bound by a resolution of the Council of Europe, of which France was a member, and would have to vote against the Senegalese draft resolution.

12. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) pointed out to the Italian representative that the original application in respect of the United Towns Organization had been made by the President of Senegal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and not by the organization itself, whose application had come later.

13. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that he had not been aware of that detail, which was not mentioned in the documents submitted to the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

14. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) recalled that there had been several instances in which the Council had decided to place a non-governmental organization in a category other than that for which it had applied. Consequently, from the procedural point of view, there was nothing to prevent the Council from adopting either the proposal of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations or the Senegalese proposal.

15. The PRESIDENT said that the Brazilian representative's idea would amount to adding the United Towns Organization's name to the list of organizations in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution submitted by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/3589, para. 4) and deleting operative paragraph 2. The Senegalese proposal could accordingly be treated as an amendment to the draft resolution set forth in document E/3589. The Council would then decide what action to take on the remainder of the Senegalese draft resolution.

16. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) accepted that suggestion.

17. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that although his country had had some experience of town-twinning, it had had no direct contact with the United Towns Organization. The application for consultative status made on behalf of the organization deserved attention because of the importance the President of the Republic of Senegal appeared to attach to it. Mr. Walker paid a personal tribute to President Senghor, but pointed out that there was an established procedure for considering applications, under which the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations prepared for the Council a report which the Council did not disregard without serious reason.

18. No member of the Council had objected to the Committee's decision not to grant the United Towns Organization's application for category A consultative status. Senegal had put the question on a different footing by requesting that the organization should be placed, not in category A, but in category B. In the circumstances the best solution would be that suggested by the Italian representative; namely, to refer the application in its new form to the Committee, which would then make its recommendations to the Council.

19. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) said that there was no compulsion to refer the matter back to the Committee.

20. In reply to a question from Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America), the PRESIDENT said that, under the proposal made by the Brazilian representative and accepted by the Senegalese representative, the Council would have to vote first on an amendment to the draft resolution set forth in document E/3589, the effect of which would be to add the words "United Towns Organization" to operative paragraph 1. Adoption of that amendment would automatically entail the deletion of operative paragraph 2.

21. Mr. REVOL (France) felt that, if the Council deemed it necessary to reconsider the matter, it should ask the Committee to take it up again at a later session on the basis of a new application by the United Towns Organization.

22. Mr. JHA (India) said that although there was no rule against it, he would hesitate to depart from the Council's practice of endorsing the Committee's recommendations in all cases. However, since there had already been cases where organizations had been granted consultative status in a category lower than that initially requested, and since the Senegalese representative, with the unquestioned authority of President Senghor behind him, had explained the social and cultural aims of the United Towns Organization and had refuted the political charges made against that organization, it would be possible, without slighting the Committee, to grant the organization category B consultative status.

23. With regard to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution set forth in document E/3589, he did not see why the Committee had decided to defer for one year consideration of the request of the Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation, whose aim — the promotion of economic co-operation among the countries of Africa and Asia — was fully in conformity with the purposes of the United Nations. Following the pattern suggested by the Jordanian representative, he proposed that the draft resolution set forth in document E/3589 should be amended by adding the words "Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation" to operative paragraph 1 and deleting operative paragraph 4.

24. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) said that he wished to make it quite clear that there was nothing in the Council's rules of procedure or established practice to prevent it from altering proposals submitted to it by its subsidiary organs. However, while it was true that many organizations had been granted

consultative status in a category lower than they had requested, such decisions had always been taken by the Committee, never by the plenary Council. That, of course, was merely custom and, as such, had no binding force.

25. Mr. NATORF (Poland) said that he would gladly support the United Towns Organization's application for category B consultative status. With regard to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution set forth in document E/3589, he agreed with the Indian and USSR representatives that there was no adequate reason to defer for one year the admission of the Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation, which had a large membership and whose aims and activities were entirely in conformity with the Council's expressed desire to give increasing importance to the economic development of Africa and Asia. He would therefore vote in favour of the Indian amendment.

26. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) shared the view of the Indian and Polish representatives that the Council was free to follow whatever procedure it saw fit in dealing with the United Towns Organization's application. There was no point in referring the matter back to the Committee, and it was too late to do so anyway.

27. On the point raised by the Indian representative, the Committee's decision was all the more incomprehensible to him in that the Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation had submitted its application as early as June 1961, whereas other organizations which the Committee recommended for admission had not done so until October.

28. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) said that her country, being a member of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, had made its views known at the Committee stage and she would have preferred to see the Committee's report adopted as it stood. She did not question the power of the Council to amend the reports, but doubted the wisdom of its doing so in that case. The Council itself had established a committee for the specific purpose of making recommendations on such matters, and that committee had had no opportunity to consider the problem which the Council was now called upon to decide: namely, whether to place the United Towns Organization in category B. She therefore thought that new question should be referred back to the Committee and proposed that operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution in document E/3589 should be amended to read as follows:

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

29. She requested that that amendment should be voted upon first, in accordance with rule 66 of the rules of procedure.

30. Mr. RODRIGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay) said that he was prepared to support the Senegalese proposal. However, it was difficult for the Council to take a deci-

sion contrary to that of the Committee without knowing exactly on what criteria the latter had decided to reject the organization's request. He therefore supported the proposal to refer the matter back to the Committee.

31. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) agreed with the representative of Uruguay and pointed out to the Senegalese and Indian representatives that the Committee had requested the Secretary-General to submit to it in 1963 an account of the activities, in connexion with United Nations bodies, of all non-governmental organizations granted category A or B consultative status prior to 1960. Several of the Council's decisions to grant consultative status had been criticized. It was therefore necessary, in the applicant organization's own interest, to proceed with caution. Since all members of the Council agreed that the Committee had acted rightly in rejecting the United Towns Organization's application for category A consultative status, it would be paradoxical to deny the Committee an opportunity to reconsider the question as it now stood — in other words, to examine the application for category B.

32. The Indian delegation had protested against the decision to defer for one year consideration of the application by the Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation; but that organization had been established only very recently and there was no reason why the Committee should not give itself a year for further reflection.

33. It was true that the Council had the power to reverse the decision of one of its subsidiary organs, but it should use that power only when new facts or indisputable evidence showed that a mistake had been made. In the present case there was no evidence that the Committee had not acted fairly, and it should therefore be given an opportunity to reconsider both questions. He would support the United Kingdom representative's proposal.

34. Mr. PATIÑO ROSELLI (Colombia) recalled that, during the Committee's discussions, his country had opposed the admission of the United Towns Organization to consultative status on the basis of the information supplied to the Committee. The enthusiasm with which the Senegalese representative had taken the organization's side might prompt some members of the Council to reconsider their position. However, he did not think one man's opinion sufficient justification for reversing the Committee's decision and, like the Uruguayan and United States representatives, would support the United Kingdom amendment.

35. Mr. JHA (India) feared that some representatives were carrying respect for the Committee's decisions too far. The Committee was composed of members of the Council and was not strictly speaking a committee of experts. Its recommendations could not be considered sacrosanct, and delegations which were members of the Council but not of the Committee could not renounce their right to examine them.

36. He still thought that the Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation should be granted category B consultative status. It was true that the organization was new, but it already had thirty-eight

national chambers of commerce as members and had already held two general conferences. It was well organized, and its extreme youth should not be held against it since even younger States had been admitted to membership in the United Nations. Moreover very few African-Asian organizations had consultative status. Lastly, it should be noted that no member of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had rejected outright the application of the Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation.

37. Mr. BIRICHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he saw no need to refer the question back to the Committee. All members of the Committee were also members of the Council and could express their views at plenary meetings. Sending the question back to the Committee would mean postponing any decision until February 1963.

38. As the Indian representative had pointed out, no member of the Committee had disputed the *bona fides* of the application submitted by the Afro-Asian Organization for Economic Co-operation. The United Towns Organization, for its part, had forty-two affiliated organizations, many of which represented Africa and Asia.

39. As to the order of voting, the Council should vote on the Senegalese and Indian proposals before that of the United Kingdom. Under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, if two or more proposals related to the same question, the Council should vote on the proposals in the order in which they had been submitted.

40. Miss SALT (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, observed that, if the representative of the Soviet Union would take the trouble to read the second part of rule 66, he would see that the United Kingdom proposal could be considered as a previous question and accordingly put to the vote before the other proposals.

41. Mr. ROUANET (Brazil) said that, as he understood it, the representative of Uruguay hesitated to support the Senegalese representative's proposal because he did not know exactly for what reasons the Committee had rejected the application submitted by the United Towns Organization. Perhaps the Chairman of the Committee might explain those reasons to the members of the Council; that would save referring the question back to the Committee, with the inevitable delays that would involve. In any case, it was pointless to speak of the Council's being entitled to examine the Committee's recommendations unless the Council was also given the right to know the reasons for those recommendations.

42. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) recalled that the United Towns Organization's application seemed to have been rejected for a political reason. It had been said that the organization had been used by elements of the extreme left. That charge was baseless; respected European personalities were members of the organization, and what was more, UNESCO had already granted it consultative status. In the circumstances, the proposal to refer the question back to the Committee could only be interpreted as delaying tactics.

43. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) considered that it might be useful for the Council to obtain further information on the reasons for the Committee's decision, in which case he would support the Brazilian representative's suggestion.

44. In reply to a question from Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan), the PRESIDENT said that there was nothing to prevent the Council from hearing the Chairman of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

45. Mr. JOURY (Jordan), Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, said that, as he saw it, the records of the Committee's meetings showed clearly that different views had been expressed regarding the admission of the United Towns Organization, and that the majority had opposed it.

46. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) doubted the advisability of inviting the Chairman of the Committee to state the considerations which had guided the Committee's six members. If necessary the United States representative on the Committee would explain his vote, in order that the Chairman of the Committee should not be put in such an embarrassing position.

47. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) agreed. In any case it seemed inappropriate to ask the chairman of a com-

mittee which held closed meetings to give the Council, which met in public, an account of that committee's proceedings.

48. Mr. REVOL (France) associated himself with the arguments put forward by the United States and United Kingdom representatives. There were two pitfalls to be avoided: that of regarding the Committee's decisions as sacrosanct and, alternatively, that of over-readiness to reconsider decisions reached after due reflection. It would therefore be better to follow the regular procedure and refer the question back to the Committee. That method had the advantage of leaving the way open for a final solution to be reached when the members of the Council had obtained the further information required.

49. Mr. NATORF (Poland) observed that it was clear from the statement by the Chairman of the Committee that the Committee's recommendations had not been unanimous. For fuller information the Council could turn to the Committee's documents and the records of its meetings. However, since the question had now been discussed at length and many arguments had been advanced for and against the various amendments, the Council should be able to take a decision soon.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.