



CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Agenda item 9: | |
| Establishment of, and elections to, the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees | 95 |
| Agenda item 10: | |
| Non-governmental organizations (continued) | |
| Report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on applications and re-applications for consultative status | 96 |

President: Mr. George DAVIDSON (Canada).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Greece, Indonesia, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following States: Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Hungary, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Philippines, Romania, Spain.

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.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Establishment of, and elections to, the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (E/L.787)

1. The PRESIDENT announced that the Netherlands delegation had expressed a wish to be included with the United States of America as a sponsor of the draft resolution (E/L.787) before the Council.
2. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) presenting the draft resolution, referred to the remarkable work that had been done by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees since 1954 with limited resources. The sole purpose of the proposed resolution was to give effect to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1166 (XII).
3. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the Soviet delegation had not voted for resolution 1166 (XII), which, in its view, was pointless and would not in any way help to solve the problem confronting the High Commissioner. The United States and the Netherlands were now proposing, not to confirm the General Assembly resolution, but to enlarge its scope by trying to include among the

functions of the High Commissioner matters with which he had never before dealt. The Council, if it accepted that proposal, would be placing itself above the General Assembly, and that was something which it could not do. The sponsors of the draft resolution, clearly prompted by political motives, were simply trying to give undue importance to the refugee problem. The High Commissioner should be primarily concerned with arranging for displaced persons and refugees to return to their countries of origin and settle there. There was no need to set up some unwieldy committee to deal with a matter such as that. To magnify the question in that way could only benefit the special interests of certain countries which were not, moreover, called upon to settle the practical problems relating to the refugees. The Soviet Union protested against such proposals.

4. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) pointed out that under General Assembly resolution 1166 (XII), it was clear that the Executive Committee was supposed to exercise the powers which the draft resolution (E/L.787) would confer upon it. Operative paragraph 5 (a) of the General Assembly resolution was explicit, and operative paragraph 2 (i) of the draft jointly sponsored by the United States and the Netherlands was perfectly in keeping with its provisions.

5. The fact was that the USSR was unconcerned about the fate of the refugees and the work of the High Commissioner, but that work would always have the support of the United States and, it was to be hoped, of the United Nations.

6. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was not convinced by the arguments of the United States representative. The wording of the General Assembly resolution and that of the draft resolution now before the Council were in fact very different. That could be ascertained by reference to resolution 1166 (XII) in which the General Assembly had instructed the Committee "to give directives to the High Commissioner for the liquidation of the United Nations Refugee Fund". It was obvious that operative paragraph 2 (i) of the two-Power draft went much further. There were also many other discrepancies between the two texts, and his delegation felt bound to draw the Council's attention to them.

7. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) supported the draft resolution submitted by the United States and the Netherlands.

8. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) called for a separate vote on operative paragraph 2.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 15 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The draft resolution (E/L.787) as a whole was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

9. The PRESIDENT called on the Council to elect twenty-four members to the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commis-

sioner for Refugees. The twenty-one members of the Executive Committee of the United Nations Refugee Fund had agreed to stand for election, with the addition of China, Sweden, Tunisia and Yugoslavia.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Galvão (Brazil) and Miss Pelt (Netherlands) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

| | |
|---|----|
| <u>Number of ballot papers:</u> | 18 |
| <u>Invalid Ballots:</u> | 0 |
| <u>Number of valid ballots:</u> | 18 |
| <u>Abstentions:</u> | 0 |
| <u>Number of members voting:</u> | 18 |
| <u>Required majority:</u> | 10 |
| <u>Number of votes obtained:</u> | |
| Australia | 17 |
| Greece | 17 |
| Iran | 17 |
| Italy | 17 |
| Netherlands | 17 |
| Switzerland | 17 |
| Austria | 16 |
| Norway | 16 |
| Sweden | 16 |
| Yugoslavia | 16 |
| Brazil | 15 |
| Denmark | 15 |
| France | 15 |
| Germany (Federal Republic) | 15 |
| Turkey | 15 |
| United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | 15 |
| United States of America | 15 |
| Belgium | 14 |
| Israel | 14 |
| Tunisia | 14 |
| Canada | 13 |
| Colombia | 13 |
| Vatican | 13 |
| Venezuela | 13 |
| China | 11 |
| Finland | 1 |
| Guatemala | 1 |
| India | 1 |
| Mexico | 1 |
| Pakistan | 1 |
| Thailand | 1 |
| USSR | 1 |
| Uruguay | 1 |

Having obtained the required majority, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iran, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, the Vatican, Venezuela and Yugoslavia were elected members of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Non-governmental organizations (E/3073) (continued)*

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS ON APPLICATIONS AND RE-APPLICATIONS FOR CONSULTATIVE STATUS (E/3073)

10. Miss PELT (Netherlands), Chairman of the Coun-

*Resumed from the 1004th meeting.

cil Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, presented the Committee's report on applications and re-applications for consultative status (E/3073).

11. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), submitting his delegation's amendment (E/L.788) to the draft resolution submitted by the Council NGO Committee (E/3073), pointed out that it was not the first time he had been obliged to defend the legitimate rights of the Women's International Democratic Federation. That great women's organization numbered 200 million members in eighty countries; yet, its category B consultative status, granted in 1947, had been arbitrarily withdrawn in 1954. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had just refused once again to repair that injustice; it had discussed the matter at closed meetings to which the Federation had not been admitted in order to set forth its point of view and to reply to the tendentious charges made against it. Such an anti-democratic procedure was hardly likely to enhance the prestige of the United Nations and was all the more astonishing in that the Council was publicly considering the question although the organizations concerned could not take part in its deliberations.

12. There was no justification for the decision of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. The Women's International Democratic Federation had been formed shortly after the Second World war to meet the aspirations of women throughout the world. Its chief object was to mobilize the efforts of women's organizations in order to guarantee equal rights for men and women, to promote social and cultural progress and to work for international friendship and peace. The Federation had proclaimed those principles in its charter and had based its activities upon them. As examples he cited the Declaration on the Rights of Women adopted by the World Congress of Women held at Copenhagen in 1953, the proclamation of Children's Day in 1954 on the Federation's initiative, and the seminar on maternal and child welfare organized in September 1957 with the participation of twenty-one countries. It was absurd to contend that the Federation's activities were contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter or that they concerned only a limited group of women. From 1947 to 1954 the Federation had sent the United Nations more than a hundred documents relating to various questions connected with the status of women and child welfare. From 1947 to 1954 it had taken part in the work of many United Nations bodies, including the Commission on the Status of Women, which, at its seventh session, had adopted a special resolution protesting against the denial of a United States entry visa to the Federation's representative.^{1/}

13. The Council did not have the right to exclude from its activities a large international organization which sincerely wished to co-operate with the United Nations. It should reverse the decision of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, which, from all indications, had been dictated by purely political motives.

14. There existed a dangerous tendency to discriminate against organizations found objectionable by certain Council members, which did not hesitate to dis-

^{1/} See Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Sixteenth Session, Supplement No. 2, chap. I, para. 9.

tort the facts in order to discredit those organizations. In doing so, they were actually discrediting the United Nations in the eyes of the world. Therefore, the Soviet delegation strongly urged the Council to reject the recommendation of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and thus take a stand against discrimination and for justice and the honour of the United Nations.

15. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) regretted that the USSR representative had called upon the Council to reject the recommendation adopted by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, with only one negative vote, concerning the Women's International Democratic Federation. The Committee members had acted not from political motives but on the basis of purely objective considerations. The Federation had shown itself clearly unworthy of retaining the consultative status accorded it in 1947; the Economic and Social Council had withdrawn that status in 1954 (Council resolution 529 B (XVII)) because the Federation had used it for political propaganda directed in a special way against the United Nations, in violation of the principles enunciated in Council resolution 288 B (X). He cited the publication We Accuse, which had contained attacks on United Nations activities and unfounded and slanderous charges against certain United Nations Members concerning the use of germ warfare in Korea. He also quoted passages from a periodical published by the Federation, which, in January 1957, after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1131 (XI) demanding immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Hungary, had supported the intervention of those troops. The Federation's attitude towards the report of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary^{2/} showed what it meant by collaboration with the United Nations: a member of the Federation's Council, Mrs. Vass, Vice-Speaker of the Hungarian Parliament, had stated that the United Nations had no grounds for intervening in Hungary and that the Special Committee had interviewed only fascists.

16. He urged the Council not to reverse the NGO Committee's decisions on the Women's International Democratic Federation or on any other organization.

17. Mr. MACHOWSKI (Poland) thought it illogical to grant category B consultative status to the Associated Country Women of the World, with a membership of only 5.5 million in eighteen countries and a limited sphere of activity, and to deny it to the Women's International Democratic Federation, with a membership of 200 million in seventy-nine countries and a much vaster sphere of activity. There was nothing, moreover, in the Charter or in any United Nations document forbidding a non-governmental organization to carry on political activity. Discrimination against the Women's International Democratic Federation was prejudicial not only to that organization but to the interests of the United Nations as well. He therefore hoped that the Council would adopt the Soviet amendment.

18. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) supported the draft resolution submitted by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and hoped that the Council would adopt it as it stood. The Women's International

Democratic Federation had failed to fulfil the conditions required for enjoyment of category B consultative status. It was still concerning itself predominantly with political questions, which did not fall within the Council's province, and on certain of those questions it had taken a stand diametrically opposed to that of the United Nations. It had persisted in a propaganda campaign against the United Nations forces in Korea, and had even seen fit to inform the United Nations of its activities.

19. It was to be regretted that an organization with so many members did not have consultative status with the Council. Nevertheless, the very fact that it had such a wide membership made it all the more imperative to ensure that it adhered to the principles of the Charter and that there was no danger of its using the privilege it might be granted for purposes of political propaganda. Contrary to what the representative of the USSR had said, it was not for the Council but for the Federation to change its attitude.

20. The United Kingdom delegation would vote against the Soviet amendment.

21. Mr. SUTANTO (Indonesia) said that he had not been able to form an opinion on the considerations, whether technical or political, underlying the decision of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

22. In the circumstances, the Indonesian delegation would abstain in the vote on paragraph 6 of the Committee's draft resolution and also on the Soviet amendment.

23. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was clear from the statements of the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom that what they had against the Women's International Democratic Federation was that it held views different from their own. The attitude of those representatives was not consistent with democratic principles, and the Soviet delegation reiterated the hope that the Council would refuse to support them.

24. Mr. MARANDET (France) did not agree that in refusing to grant consultative status to the Women's International Democratic Federation, the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had acted in an arbitrary fashion. It had merely followed the rules which should govern any decision of that kind and which were set forth in Council resolution 288 B (X). It had rightly considered that in view of the political activities in which the Federation continued to engage, contrary to those rules, the consultative status that had been withdrawn from it in 1954 (Council resolution 529 B (XVII)) should not be restored. It was quite otherwise with the Associated Country Women of the World, which had a precise and limited objective and could make a useful contribution to the Council's work without any undesirable political implications.

25. The French delegation would vote against the Soviet amendment.

26. Miss RADIC (Yugoslavia) said that she would vote in favour of the Soviet amendment, for she believed that a change in the Council's attitude on that matter could have only beneficial results.

27. Mr. CAÑAS (Costa Rica), introducing the amendment submitted by his delegation and the delegation

^{2/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Supplement No. 18.

of Mexico (E/L.789), pointed out that the American Coffee Federation comprised the largest coffee-producing or exporting organizations of fourteen Latin American countries, which had greatly benefited from its activities during its thirteen years of existence. It was indeed unfortunate that the two largest coffee producers of Latin America were not represented in that Federation. But neither that—nor the fact that there was another organization that had not submitted an application—was a sufficient reason for refusing to place the Federation on the Register. The Federation could make a valuable contribution to the Council's work, especially in the discussions of problems concerning commodity prices, since it represented not only government interests, but also the interests of producers.

28. The delegation of Costa Rica had been surprised to hear the United States representative invite the Council to adopt the draft resolution of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations as a whole, without making any reference to paragraph 5. It hoped that the Council would agree to amend that paragraph on the lines he had just suggested.

29. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) said that he could not support the amendment submitted by Costa Rica and Mexico.

30. The Brazilian delegation had no very definite opinion on the matter but merely wished to point out, as it had already done in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, that the Federation did not represent all the coffee producers of the world, nor even all those of Latin America, since it did not have a branch in the two main producing countries of that region, and since other similar organizations existed in Latin America. It should also be borne in mind that all the members of the American Coffee Federation, without exception, belonged to the Pan American Coffee Bureau and that an attempt was currently being made to set up an International Coffee Bureau. That was why the Pan American Coffee Bureau had not asked to be placed on the Register. In those circumstances the Brazilian delegation considered that it would be better to wait before placing the American Coffee Federation on the register.

31. Mr. ESPINOSA (Mexico) regretted that the Brazilian delegation maintained in the Council the position it had taken in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations concerning the inclusion of the American Coffee Federation in the Register. A non-governmental organization need not necessarily cover the whole world to be placed on the Register, and the Federation in question had branches not only in Central America but also in the Caribbean and in South America.

32. In any case, he felt that the procedure followed in considering applications for admission to consulta-

tive status was far from satisfactory. The Council was asked to consider a single draft resolution embodying a whole series of decisions, on the basis of an extremely brief report which gave no account of the discussions that had taken place in private. In such circumstances it was difficult to understand what had prompted the adoption, rejection or deferment of the applications. For its part, the Mexican delegation protested against the rejection of the application of the American Coffee Federation. It was also disappointed that consideration of the application of the Inter-American Planning Society had been deferred until 1959, since that Society, although only recently established, deserved encouragement.

33. The Mexican delegation had difficulty in expressing an opinion on the Soviet amendment in the absence of any information on what had happened in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. It would therefore be obliged to abstain, although it regretted that it had been placed in that position.

34. He wished it to be understood that his criticisms were not directed against the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations which had, as usual, performed its task in a most conscientious manner.

35. The PRESIDENT said that he would put to the vote first the amendment of Costa Rica and Mexico (E/L.789), secondly the amendment of the Soviet Union (E/L.788) and, lastly, the Committee's draft resolution (E/3073).

The amendment submitted by Costa Rica and Mexico (E/L.789) was rejected by 8 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

The amendment submitted by the Soviet Union (E/L.788) was rejected by 11 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

The draft resolution (E/3073), as a whole, was adopted by 14 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

36. Mr. CAÑAS (Costa Rica) expressed regret that the Council, disregarding the opinion of the fourteen countries represented on the American Coffee Federation, had preferred to accept the view of one of the two Latin American countries in which the Federation had no branch.

37. Mr. MARANDET (France) said that he had voted against the amendment submitted by Costa Rica and Mexico for substantive as well as procedural reasons. As regards substance, the French delegation had been unable, because of the differing viewpoints involved, to form a clear opinion. It had therefore preferred to wait before taking a final decision. As regards procedure, it considered that it was undesirable to be always disputing the judicious decisions of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.