

# UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/C.24/SR.72  
12 September 1951

ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH & FRENCH

Dual Distribution

## Thirteenth session CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

### SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-SECOND MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 2 August 1951, at 11 a.m.

#### CONTENTS:

#### pages

1. Election of Chairman 4 - 5
2. Discussion on the Committee's agenda  
(E/C.24/L.19) 5 - 7
3. Inter-governmental organizations  
(item 49 of the Council agenda):
  - (a) Relations of inter-governmental  
organizations with the United  
Nations and the specialized agencies  
(E/1999, E/1999/Corr.1, E/2022,  
E/C.24/L.20) 7 - 17

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. SANTA CRUZ, President of  
the Council

later

Mr. KOTSCHNIG

Members:

Belgium	Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXLERDE
Canada	Mr. ROGERS
Chile	Mrs. FIGUEROA
China	Mr. CHA
Czechoslovakia	Mr. TAUBER
France	Mr. MILANRICH Mr. HESSEL
India	Mr. DESAI
Iran	Mr. KAZEMI
Mexico	Mr. CALDERON PUIG
Pakistan	Mr. Atwar HUSSAIN
Poland	Mr. BIRECKI Miss KALINOWSKA
Sweden	Mr. CARBONNIER
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. KOBUSCHKO
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. LEDWARD
United States of America	Mr. KOTSCHNIG Mr. CATES
Uruguay	Mr. CULDROS

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. COX
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. McDOUGALL

Representatives of specialized agencies (continued):

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Mr. WILLIAMS
International Monetary Fund	Mr. WILLIAMS
International Telecommunication Union	Mr. MULLIER
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. TERRENZIO
World Health Organization	Dr. FORREST Mrs. JARVIS
International Refugee Organization	Miss BAVERSTOCK

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A

Inter-Parliamentary Union	Mr. ROBINET de CLERY
---------------------------	----------------------

Category B and Register

International Federation of University Women	Miss DUBOIS
International Statistical Institute	Mr. NIXON

Secretariat:

Mr. Martin Hill	Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and Economic and Social Matters
Mr. Sze	Secretary to the Committee

# 1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN, opening the Committee's proceedings, pointed out that, in accordance with the rules of procedure, and in view of the fact that neither of the two Vice-Presidents of the Council could assume the Chairmanship of the Co-ordination Committee, the latter would have to elect its own Chairman. He accordingly called for nominations.

Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) nominated Mr. Desai, the Indian representative.

Mr. DESAI (India) thanked the Polish representative, but regretted that, even were he elected, he would be unable to accept the Chairmanship, as the Indian delegation to the Council was a small one, and he could not therefore be sure of being able to attend all meetings of the Committee. He must therefore decline nomination, but would himself nominate Mr. Kotschnig, the United States representative.

Mr. CALDERON PUIG (Mexico) and Mr. QUADROS (Uruguay) supported the candidature of the United States representative.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) would have been pleased to support the candidature of the Indian representative. As the latter had declined it, he, too, would support the candidature of the United States representative.

Mr. KOBUSCHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) seconded the Polish proposal, and regretted that Mr. Desai felt unable to accept nomination.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, since the Polish representative had not withdrawn the nomination he had made, a vote would have to be taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. Rogers (Canada) and Mr. Tauber (Czechoslovakia) acted as tellers.

<u>Number of ballot papers</u>	16
<u>Number of invalid ballot papers</u>	1
<u>Number of valid ballot papers</u>	15
<u>Simple majority</u>	8
<u>Number of votes obtained:</u>	
Mr. Kotschnig	12
Mr. Desai	3

Mr. Kotschnig (United States of America), having obtained the required simple majority, was elected Chairman.

Mr. Kotschnig took the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN said that, while grateful to the Committee for its confidence in his ability to guide its work, he nevertheless felt apprehensive, for the Committee's task was a difficult one, for its work had the widest ramifications within the Economic and Social Council itself. In addition, the Committee was responsible for relations between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations; in that way, the Co-ordination Committee assisted the Council to discharge one of its most important functions.

## 2. DISCUSSION ON THE COMMITTEE'S AGENDA (E/AC.24/L.19).

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Committee's agenda, as set forth in document E/AC.24/L.19, and especially to section 3 thereof, in which it was suggested that: "In view of the earlier distribution of documents under item 49 (a) on 'Relations of Inter-Governmental Organizations with the United Nations and Specialized Agencies', the Committee may find it convenient to take this item first".

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) approved of all the suggestions contained in document E/AC.24/L.19, and moved its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to the second part of section 3, informed the Committee that the Secretariat intended to produce a further document on item 39 (c) of the Council agenda, summarizing the action taken by the Council's Commissions and the specialized agencies in the matter of priorities in their work programmes for 1952.

Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) thought that it would perhaps be more logical and expedient to defer the examination not only of item 39 (c), as the Secretariat suggested, but also of all the questions under item 39 (co-ordination among the United Nations and the specialized agencies) until such time as the Committee had examined the reports of the specialized agencies. It was clear that the study of those reports would allow of a more thorough and fruitful examination of the question of co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Secretary when the discussion of the reports of the specialized agencies was likely to be completed.

Mr. SZE, Secretary to the Committee, replied that some of those reports were linked to other items on the Council's agenda, so that the last of them might not come up for discussion until 20 August or thereabouts.

Mr. ROGERS (Canada) considered that the Committee should discuss the general principles of co-ordination before taking up the reports of the specialized agencies.

Mr. DESAI (India) said that the discussion of general principles in the Committee could probably begin by 15 August and be completed by 20 August. By that time all the reports of specialized agencies would have been reviewed. Unless it was possible for them to get a complete picture of the position with regard to the specialized agencies, he feared that the smaller delegations would have difficulty in taking an active part in the Committee's work.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) expressed his approval of the Chilean suggestion, and further proposed that the Committee should first take up item 49(a) of the Council agenda, and then consider the general aspects of item 39, before taking any further decision on procedure.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee's work was not confined to discussion of co-ordination with the specialized agencies; there was also the question of the co-ordination of the Council's own activities and those of its Commissions. Most of the activities of the Commissions were now under discussion in the Council and its Committees, and the relevant reports would be ready shortly. The Committee would therefore be able to deal with them before the reports of the specialized agencies became available. He asked the Chilean and Indian representatives whether they would be prepared to accept such an ad hoc arrangement. If necessary, the Committee might suspend its work for a few days, pending completion of the discussion in the Council of the specialized agencies' reports when the reports from Member States on action taken to implement Council resolutions would be considered.

Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) and Mr. DESAI (India) agreed to the Chairman's suggestion

In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) confirmed that he would withdraw his formal proposal, since its implications had now been adopted informally.

3. INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (item 49 of the Council agenda):

(a) RELATIONS OF INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS WITH THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (E/1999, E/1999/Corr.1, E/2022, E/AC.24/L.20)

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee might take documents E/1999 and E/1999/Corr.1, which comprised a comprehensive list of inter-governmental organizations in the economic and social fields, as a basis for discussion, taking each organization in the order in which it appeared in the list, reference being made to the report by the Secretary-General (E/2022) wherever necessary.

He drew attention to paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's report, and suggested that the Committee should defer consideration of the organizations listed as items (39) - (45) in document E/1999 until the Economic Committee had disposed of item 6 of the Council agenda.

The Chairman's suggestions were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN then drew attention to paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's report, which suggested that the implementation by Member Governments of the Council's recommendations concerning various inter-governmental organizations might best be reviewed in 1952.

It was decided that the procedure suggested by the Secretary-General in paragraph 5 of document E/2022 should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that many of the organizations listed in document E/1999 had been discussed by the Committee at previous sessions of the Council. He accordingly suggested that there was no necessity for considering again those organizations whose relationship with the United Nations and specialized agencies was known to be wholly satisfactory.

Mr. KOBUSCHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the list of organizations in document E/1999 included organizations brought into relationship with the United Nations or specialized agencies since the eleventh session of the Council, and, if that was the case, whether any but those organizations need be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN explained that a few organizations had been tentatively added to the list by the Secretariat. Such organizations, however, enjoyed no standing until the Council had approved their inclusion.

He suggested that the Committee should proceed to discuss the organizations in the order in which they were listed in document E/1999.

It was so agreed.

(1) Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences

The CHAIRMAN observed that since Annex II to document E/2022 was devoted to inter-American specialized organizations in general, there was no

need for the Committee to discuss the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences separately.

It was so agreed.

(2) Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux

There were no comments.

3) International Commission of Agricultural Industries

Mr. KOBUSCHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Spanish members of the International Commission were at present taking an active part in its work.

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Director of Co-ordination for specialized agencies and Economic and Social Matters) said that Spain was a member of the International Commission, but pointed out that it was difficult to define exactly how active a particular member was of any organization.

Mr. KOBUSCHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would oppose the inclusion in the approved list of any organization of which Franco Spain was a member.

It would at the appropriate time, and in consultation with the Secretariat, submit proposals concerning any such organization, since it considered that any connexion with Franco Spain was contrary to the purposes and ideals of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that much time might be saved if any draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union delegation to that end related to the list as a whole, and not to each individual organization affected.

Miss KALINOWSKA (Poland) said that the Polish delegation shared the views of the Soviet Union delegation. It proposed to raise the question again at a later stage.

4) International Seed-Testing Association.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the International Seed-Testing Association had been discussed at length at the eleventh session, and drew attention to Council resolution 333 (IX)E. The Report of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) /2008/Add.1, pages 37/38) also mentioned the Association.

Mr. SZE, Secretary to the Committee, said that an abstract of the relevant section of the FAO Report had been distributed to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the abstract in question mentioned nothing beyond the fact that FAO had participated in the Ninth Congress of the International Seed-Testing Association, held in Washington from 8 to 13 May, 1950.

He wondered whether the representative of FAO could tell the Committee anything about developments since that time.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that the relationship between FAO and the International Seed-Testing Association had been, and continued to be, a very close one. The Director-General and the Secretariat of FAO had considered whether the Association might with advantage be integrated with FAO. They had reached the conclusion that it would be better for the Association to continue its independent existence, although the closest co-operation between it and FAO was highly desirable, since the improvement of seed was a matter of the highest world importance.

Mr. TAUBER (Czechoslovakia) drew attention to the fact that Spain and Germany were included in the list of members of the Association. Since the Association had been founded in 1921, he would ask the Secretariat to verify whether Germany was still a member. If it transpired that, for instance, Germany was represented in the Association by the so-called Bonn Government, he would have to reserve his right to request that the Association, and all others in the same position, be removed from the list of inter-governmental organizations.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) expressed appreciation of the work done by FAO, but deplored the fact that no steps had been taken to ensure closer contact between it and the International Seed-Testing Association. Nor was there any indication of the extent of formal consultation between the two organizations. He hoped that the Association would become an integral part of FAO, and proposed that the Committee recommend to the Council that the latter urge complete integration. The representatives of Governments which were members of both organizations

would, he trusted, also press that point. He would in due course submit a formal proposal to that effect.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that the issue raised by the United States representative involved other organizations, as well as the International Seed-Testing Association, especially the International Office of Epizootics. FAO's experience indicated, however, that organizations varied greatly in respect of their responsibilities and functions. With regard to the International Seed-Testing Association, FAO felt that it would be best for it to continue its separate existence, as assumption of its functions would entail considerable expense for FAO.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) expressed his pleasure at the remarks of the representative of FAO. United Kingdom experts felt that the present relationship between FAO and the International Seed-Testing Association was the most satisfactory from the technical point of view. He therefore hoped that the United States representative would not press his point, and that the present arrangements would be allowed to continue.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) again referred to the FAO Report, in which it was stated that FAO had now a seed specialist of its own, "whose responsibility would be to follow developments and act in an advisory and co-ordinating capacity for all international efforts in the field of seed testing, crop inspection and seed certification, and to advise governments on technical and organizational problems in this field".

In view of the discussions at the eleventh session, the United States delegation still felt that integration would benefit FAO, and wished to suggest that the Council should request a full statement on the present situation. The abstract from the FAO Report was too brief to establish anything with certainty; moreover, it rather suggested that a certain amount of duplication did in fact go on.

Mr. McDougall (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that the fact that FAO had appointed a seed specialist of its own did not mean that there was any over-lapping between that specialist's functions and those of the International Seed-Testing Association. Indeed, it was the former's duty to maintain the closest contact with the latter.

However, he would undertake to request his Director-General to produce a reasoned document on the subject, setting forth all the arguments for and against integration, for consideration at the next session of the Council at which the question come up for discussion.

Mr. Atwar HUSSAIN (Pakistan) agreed that it would be wiser to defer any action until the document promised by the FAO representative became available.

Mr. DESAI (India) suggested that as the United States of America was a member not only of FAO, but also of the International Seed-Testing Association, it might raise the matter of integration in either body, to enable a decision to be taken at expert level.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) said that since the FAO representative had undertaken to present a fuller report, he would withdraw his proposal.

It was agreed that discussion of the International Seed-Testing Association should be deferred to a later session when further information had been supplied by FAO.

(5) International Sericulture Association

There were no comments.

(6) International Committee for Colorado Beetle Control

The CHAIRMAN said that the FAO Report contained some comments on the International Committee for Colorado Beetle Control.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that the International Committee, which was largely a European association, had been merged with the European Plant Protection Association, with which FAO had close contacts. As was stated in the FAO Report, it was assumed that a Plant Protection Convention would be adopted at the next FAO Conference, to be held in November, 1951. That Convention would come into immediate effect.

A technical conference was to be held in Rome before the EAO Conference to deal with any residual difficulties.

He wished to stress the progress made in connexion with the anti-locust campaign. That was a matter of great importance to many nations.

The CHAIRMAN wondered whether the International Committee was actually in existence; if it was, document E/1999 was inaccurate.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that the merger he had referred to was complete. The imminent adoption of the Plant Protection Convention was now a matter of the greatest importance.

Replying to the CHAIRMAN, he said he considered that the International Committee should be deleted from the list.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) asked whether, if that was done, the name of the European Plant Protection Association would automatically replace that of the International Committee in the list.

Mr. KOBUSCHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) urged the Committee to refrain from taking a hasty decision. According to Press reports from many countries, the Colorado Beetle had reached areas far removed from its country of origin, and was still appearing in new and unexpected places.

He thought that the Committee might ask the Secretariat to supply more information. He did not know what the functions of the relevant European organizations were, but felt that the Committee should not be too eager to transfer them to other organizations, especially as the Colorado beetle was continuing to spread over a number of European countries.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that FAO would supply all necessary information.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) asked whether the European Plant Protection Association would be added to the list immediately, or whether the Committee intended to await a further report from FAO. If proof existed that the Association was doing good work, there was no reason why its name should not be included in the list at once.

The CHAIRMAN observed that an organization which had ceased to exist must in any case be removed from the list. He suggested that FAO should make a full report on the matter for consideration at the next session of the Council; the Co-ordination Committee could then decide whether or not to add the name of the new association to the list.

Mr. KOBUSCHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) urged that a decision on the question should be deferred to avoid giving the impression that the Chairman's proposal was prompted by a desire on the part of the Co-ordination Committee to abandon the campaign against the Colorado beetle.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee was discussing not the control of the Colorado beetle, but the organization responsible for such control.

Mr. ROGERS (Canada) said that it would be futile to retain the name of an organization which had ceased to exist, and urged that it be removed from the list.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) suggested that the Committee should decide both that the name of the organization which had ceased to exist should be removed from the list, and also that more information should be supplied by FAO.

Mr. KOBUSCHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) again urged that further discussion be deferred to enable the decision to be taken on reliable information.

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and Economic and Social Matters) drew the Committee's attention to the section on legal status on page 10 of document E/1999. He explained that the International Committee for Colorado Beetle Control had been left on the list pending the establishment of a formal inter-governmental organization in Europe. The Secretariat had hoped that definite information would already have been available; however, it should be available very shortly.

Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) thought that the adoption of the Soviet Union proposal would enable the Committee to make some progress. It was the very existence of the International Committee that was at stake. The report which the Director of Co-ordination had just promised to have prepared would be the deciding factor, and he accordingly proposed that further discussion on the International Committee be deferred until further information was available.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the matter should be deferred until later in the present session, or until the next session, pending further information from the Secretariat.

It was so agreed.

(7) International Office of Epizootics

Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that the FAO was greatly in favour of a single world reporting service, and had approached the International Office of Epizootics (IOE) with a view to securing its co-operation, while providing proper safeguards for the maintenance of its identity.

Unfortunately, the negotiations with the Office had made no progress in spite of the efforts of FAO to safeguard the integrity of IOE. The Director-General of FAO had accordingly decided that countries members of both organizations must themselves decide whether or not they wanted a single world reporting service.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) said that the problem was even more important than that of integrating the International Seed-Testing Association

with FAO. In the case of the relationship between IOE and FAO, the world reporting system on the incidence of animal diseases was at stake. The question related particularly to membership, FAO's being much more widespread than that of IOE; indeed, from document E/1999 it was apparent that the membership of IOE from the world point of view, left a good deal to be desired. That was an important consideration, in view of the need for universal reporting of animal diseases.

The United States of America was disappointed at the breakdown of negotiations between IOE and FAO, and wished to urge member nations of both organizations to do all they could to promote an agreement between the two, in the interests of a world-wide reporting service. His delegation therefore recommended that the Council press that point of view on governments members of FAO and of IOE; and a report on the progress achieved should be submitted to the next session of the Council.

Mr. HESSEL (France) readily acknowledged the need for ensuring that the activities of inter-governmental organizations were co-ordinated and harmonized as closely as possible with those of the specialized agencies. That did not mean, however, that the Committee should recommend the dissolution of organizations which had proved useful in the past and were still capable of rendering yeoman service. Some of them might even be in a position to do more effective work in a particular field than the specialized agencies themselves.

The work of the International Office of Epizootics should certainly be encouraged. He did not, however, consider it unreasonable, in view of the fact that FAO had a greater number of States Members in certain parts of the world, to claim that FAO was in a better position to disseminate the information collected by the Office. It should also be noted that certain governments members of the International Office were not members of FAO.

Accordingly, rather than endeavour to disband an existing organization merely on the grounds that it was desirable to integrate the activities of the various organizations working in the same fields, it would be better to recommend that the Council pursue the course it had hitherto followed, and request the

International Office of Epizootics and FAO to co-ordinate their activities more closely without, however, causing a useful and important organization to cease to exist.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that FAO had no desire whatever to see IOE abolished. FAO felt that IOE should retain its offices in Paris and its staff, and had suggested integration in a form which would enable the Office to preserve its functions while expanding them, since all Governments Members of FAO would automatically become members of the Office too. FAO's chief aim was to organize a better reporting service. The controversy at present turned solely on the question of the Office's autonomy, as distinct from its collaboration with FAO.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) said that all that his delegation wanted was a single world reporting system, with a view to promoting more rapid collection and dissemination of information. It desired nothing more than effective co-ordination, but was alarmed at the absence of a unified system. Moreover, there was a feeling that IOE had been unco-operative.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) sympathized with the United States delegation's views about the unsatisfactory relations between the two organizations in question. The only possible solution would be for the technical experts in IOE to co-operate with FAO. All that was required was a mutually acceptable formula. He suggested that the Committee might adopt a resolution embodying in a suitable form the wording of the FAO report, which said: "It remains an urgent task for the two organizations to find a mutually acceptable formula which will be in the interest of their member countries and will produce efficient control of animal diseases the world over."

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America should meet with a view to formulating a joint draft resolution for consideration by the Committee at its next meeting.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.