



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter IV) (A/1884, A/C.3/L.162) (<i>continued</i>)	39

Chairman : Mrs. Ana FIGUEROA (Chile).

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter IV) (A/1884, A/C.3/L.162) (*continued*)

[Item 11]*

JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY FRANCE, PAKISTAN AND YUGOSLAVIA (A/C.3/L.162) (*continued*)

1. Mr. D'SOUZA (India) said that his delegation approved the letter and the spirit of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.162) and welcomed the initiative of the representative of France, a country which had always contributed to social progress in the world, and in the under-developed countries in particular.

2. He would vote for the joint draft resolution, which provided a general definition of objectives in the social field. The additional restriction proposed by the United Kingdom delegation (A/C.3/L.163) should not be inserted in paragraph 1 of the operative part as it would weaken the draft resolution. On the other hand, it was essential to underline the necessity of preventing any overlapping between the social work of the United Nations and that of the specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations and the necessity of taking account of the work done by those agencies and organizations; he would therefore support the second point of the United Kingdom amendment. It was true that the joint draft resolution referred to the co-operation of the specialized agencies, and its sponsors might perhaps advance that fact as an argument for not accepting the United Kingdom amendment. He hoped that, if that was the case, it would be possible to expand the idea already expressed by mentioning, after the reference to specialized agencies, the non-governmental organizations and other bodies dealing with social questions.

3. He supported the principles of the various points of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160), which set forth a list of social problems the importance of which no one would dispute. Nevertheless, the first paragraph of the preamble proposed by the USSR was unacceptable since it stated that "the Economic and

Social Council and its Social Commission have ignored important social problems", whereas the social questions listed in the text of the USSR amendment had been examined by a number of specialized agencies, such as the International Labour Organisation, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, working in collaboration with the United Nations and more particularly with the Economic and Social Council.

4. He agreed that it was necessary to take steps to promote social progress in the under-developed countries. Nevertheless, as that principle was already embodied in the joint draft resolution, it was unnecessary to make it the subject of a second resolution.

5. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) supported the joint draft resolution, which would make it possible to solve the great social problems of the modern world and thereby create the stability and well-being necessary for the maintenance of lasting peace, to which Article 55 of the Charter referred.

6. He preferred the original text of the first paragraph of the preamble, which defined the functions of the commissions of the Council. Like the United States representative, he could have wished that paragraph 1 of the operative part had also requested the specialized agencies to consider the social work of the United Nations in detail.

7. He did not think that the "resources available" could have any bearing on the consideration of work undertaken by the United Nations in the social field, as the first United Kingdom amendment appeared to suggest.

8. He would vote for the Lebanese amendment (A/C.3/L.164), which clarified the draft resolution. He could not support the USSR amendment, which would limit the scope of the Council's studies and throw discredit on the specialized agencies, and might involve overlapping between the work of the Council and that of the agencies. He stressed, however, that the social problems listed in the amendment were those which should be studied with special care in countries which were undergoing rapid cultural development.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

9. He would abstain when the vote was taken on the Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.165), because he considered that the joint draft resolution implied that social reforms were most necessary in the under-developed countries, which had not yet achieved the independence to which they were entitled under the Charter.

10. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the lowering of the workers' standard of living as a result of increased taxation and the rising prices of consumer goods, was one of the most serious social problems in the modern world. As an organ with special responsibility for the study of social questions, the Council should have investigated the causes of that trouble and the means of remedying it. It had, however, deliberately omitted the question from its agenda and from the agenda of its commissions. Chapter IV ("Social Questions") of the report before the Committee, did not deal with the causes of the lowering of the workers' standard of living, means of assisting unemployed workers and their families, or outstanding problems of social insurance and social welfare. The USSR delegation had submitted its amendment (A/C.3/L. 160) to the French draft resolution in order to emphasize that shameful inertia.

11. It was essential that the Council should study means of helping the unemployed; their numbers were increasing continuously since the flow of goods under the Marshall Plan resulted in the closing of many factories. Maternity and child welfare, free and compulsory primary education for all and various systems of social insurance against sickness, old age, and disablement should also be included in the Economic and Social Council's programme of future work. It should be placed on record that many capitalist countries were using all or part of the funds hitherto allocated to social welfare services for their armament programmes.

12. The French draft resolution took no account of the need to safeguard the worker's social rights and was intended to divert the Council's attention from the real social problems of the modern world. Several representatives had already pointed out that the draft resolution was obscure, contained no concrete proposals and did not indicate what the main objects of the Council's work should be.

13. The USSR amendment, on the other hand, listed most of the pressing problems in the world, and it was noteworthy that representatives who had spoken against it had not dared to deny that those problems existed. As they were afraid of public censure if they stated their open opposition to the amendments, however, they had put forward various arguments, each more specious than the other. They had said, for example, that the problems were already covered by the draft international covenant on human rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. However, the covenant had not yet been completed and the Declaration, as its name implied, was theoretical and did not include any measures of implementation.

14. The opponents of the USSR amendment also argued that the social problems in question had already been studied by the various specialized agencies. It was common knowledge, however, that the specialized

agencies never succeeded in carrying their tasks to a successful conclusion and that the best way of burying a question was to refer it to one of them. If the argument had been valid, the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.162), to which the USSR amendment also applied, would itself be pointless since, if the specialized agencies were already dealing with all social questions, the Council's action would be superfluous and there would be no purpose in making any recommendations to it.

15. The only conclusion that could be drawn from the discussion was that the sole purpose of the sponsors of the draft resolution was to persuade public opinion of the continuing interest of the United Nations in social problems while avoiding any discussion of such problems.

16. He would vote for the USSR amendment. Unlike the other proposals, it gave the Council specific indications about the direction of its future work. Anyone who was genuinely interested in improving the living conditions of the working classes could not but support the USSR amendment.

17. Mr. VALDES ROIG (Cuba) said that the differences of opinion between members of the Committee referred more to the letter of the joint draft resolution than to its purport. All agreed that it conformed to the purposes of the United Nations and the Economic and Social Council.

18. Nevertheless, some members were submitting amendments which were tantamount to votes of censure on the Council and the Social Commission. The Cuban delegation entirely agreed on that point with the Chilean representative; it believed that the Council had already done important work, although there was still much to be done.

19. The criticisms of the specialized agencies by the representatives of the USSR and Poland appeared neither justified nor necessary. Many of the agencies merited every assistance from the United Nations.

20. Cuba would vote for the joint draft resolution. It stated clearly the policy which should guide the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in social matters and which would enable the atmosphere of co-operation essential for a rapid improvement in the standards of living of the peoples of the under-developed countries to be created.

21. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that under the terms of the joint draft resolution, the Council's future work would be extremely modest, if not insignificant.

22. That attitude appeared to be justified. It would serve no purpose to state once again what members wished to see done when nobody knew whether the United Nations or the Council would have the necessary capital and raw materials.

23. If those resources, were lacking, there would be no point in framing social programmes, and the work of the United Nations could only be superficial and vain.

24. Nevertheless, the delegation of Saudi Arabia hoped that the joint draft resolution would enable positive results to be achieved, and would vote for it.

25. The USSR amendment merely enumerated a number of social problems, but to be of use a list ought to be complete. A more general text, such as that of the joint draft resolution, was better than an incomplete list.

26. He would vote for the Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.165), which stressed the need for assistance to the under-developed countries. He proposed (A/C.3/L.169) the addition of the words "and the Non-Self-Governing Territories" at the end of that amendment. The addition had been accepted by the Afghan delegation and would therefore not require a separate vote.

27. His delegation had also submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.168), consisting in the deletion of the words "those urgent" and the word "early" in paragraph 1 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution. Important social problems might not be of an urgent nature, and their solution might require time.

28. The United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.163) to paragraph 1 of the operative part appeared to be based on a somewhat excessive pessimism. He could not see why it should not be hoped that the major Powers would agree to contribute to the social progress of the small and under-developed countries. If the major Powers stopped the armaments race and agreed to devote to social programmes the funds which were being used for the military occupation of sovereign countries, and if they agreed to promote the rapid development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, it would be possible to undertake not only the tasks enumerated in the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160), but a programme ten times as extensive.

29. The delegation of Saudi Arabia could not vote for point 2 of the United Kingdom amendment as it stood. Some members of the Social Commission and the Council were not represented in the specialized agencies, and would therefore be unable to judge which activities were being unnecessarily duplicated. It should also be noted that in both theoretical and practical matters it was sometimes impossible to avoid duplication. The delegation of Saudi Arabia would, however, accept that text if the Committee agreed to make it clear that what was referred to was "unnecessary" duplication. Specifically, the representative of Saudi Arabia proposed (A/C.3/L.170) that in point 2 of the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.163) the word "duplicating" should be replaced by the words "unnecessary duplication of".

30. It was to be hoped that the major Powers would agree to pool their resources, capital and technical knowledge, which would thus become the property of all.

31. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) supported the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.162), as he had supported the French draft resolution (A/C.3/L.154), and indicated the position of his Government with regard

to the amendments thereto submitted by the delegations of the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.163) and the United States of America (A/C.3/L.167).

32. The first point of the United Kingdom amendment, consisting in the addition of the words "and of the resources available" in paragraph 1 of the operative part, did not appear to him calculated to limit the work of the United Nations unduly. It would enable the General Assembly to show that it was aware of its responsibilities. In any event, the word "resources" meant not only funds, but also, for example, personnel and experts.

33. The intention of the second point of the United Kingdom amendment was to prevent duplication in social work, and the United States amendment underlined that point. Both amendments merited support.

34. The third point of the United Kingdom amendment might be vague, but it was doubtful whether its effect would be to put off examination of the programme to the remote future. Its intention was merely to prevent the Social Commission from being pressed for time; the Netherlands delegation would therefore support it.

35. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) said that his delegation supported the joint draft in principle, together with some of the amendments proposed by other delegations.

36. The USSR amendment ought, in accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure, to be a separate resolution. It was unacceptable, first, on account of its preamble—for it was outrageous to say that the Economic and Social Council had ignored important social problems—and, secondly, because it made no mention of the work done by the specialized agencies.

37. The first point of the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom would involve the risk of restricting the scope of United Nations work, and it was therefore difficult to support it. He would vote for the second point of the amendment with the addition of the word, "unnecessary", as proposed by Saudi Arabia. He would support the third point of the amendment, since the Social Commission should be given all the time it required.

38. He had not had time to study carefully the amendment submitted jointly by Afghanistan and Lebanon (A/C.3/L.172). It appeared acceptable, but he would state his position on it later.

39. Mr. COATON (Union of South Africa) said that the debate had shown that there were two schools of thought. The first was suspicious of budgetary considerations, which it held should be studied at the proper time but not introduced into a draft resolution because they would destroy its liberal spirit. The second was more realistic and wished the draft resolution to express disapproval of duplication and over-ambitious budgets. The enthusiasm of the delegation of the Union of South Africa was tinged with realism, and so his delegation supported the second school of thought. It could therefore not support the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.162) unless it was modified as proposed by

the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.163) and the United States of America (A/C.3/L.166/Rev.1).

40. Mr. KUSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he would not vote for the joint draft resolution, as its recommendations were not concrete enough to guide the work of the Economic and Social Council and the Social Commission.

41. The only concrete proposals which could help to lessen the poverty and suffering of the toiling masses were those contained in the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160). They would enable the Social Commission to leave the realm of the abstract and put a stop to the Council's policy of not paying the least attention to vital contemporary problems. Those problems existed for the majority of the capitalist countries, where the standard of living was falling as a direct result of the armaments race. Furthermore, unemployment was increasing in the consumer industries in the countries signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty as a result of the arrival of goods imported under the Marshall Plan on their domestic markets. The working class was therefore faced with the dilemma of hunger or war.

42. In the first paragraph of the operative part of its text, the USSR delegation proposed that the urgent problems constituted by unemployment, maternity and child welfare, education, and medical assistance and social insurance, should be studied. That draft satisfied his Government's concern with the needs of man in society and with aid to the under-developed countries. The Byelorussian SSR requested delegations which the USSR amendment had put in a delicate situation with respect to the peoples they represented, not to remain in a false position and to vote for the USSR amendment.

43. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) introduced the amendment which he was proposing jointly with the representative of Afghanistan (A/C.3/L.172). It consolidated parts of their respective amendments (A/C.3/L.164 and A/C.3/L.165).

44. The joint amendment incorporated the Saudi Arabian amendment (A/C.3/L.168) proposing the elimination of the words "those urgent" and "early", but not the amendment adding the words "and the Non-Self-Governing Territories" (A/C.3/L.169). However, if the Saudi Arabian representative maintained the latter amendment, the Afghan and Lebanese delegations would doubtless support him.

45. With regard to the amendments proposed by other delegations, he regretted that the important questions listed in the operative part of the USSR amendment were presented in an unacceptable manner. In any case, a list involved the obligation of introducing some sort of priority, and hence it involved also limitation and exclusion. Thus, as the USSR delegation had submitted its text as an amendment to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.154) and had therefore kept title of that draft resolution, it would appear that the United Nations should devote its efforts to the questions enumerated in the USSR text (A/C.3/L.160). He believed, however, that it was not necessary for the United Nations to confine itself to certain questions.

He also found it a matter of regret that the USSR draft did not take account of the work of the specialized agencies.

46. The point of the United Kingdom amendment relating to "the resources available" might appear harmless, since in fact the Organization had never gone beyond its resources and had no power to run into debt. Nevertheless, the question was fundamental. In order to understand it, it was necessary to ask whence the resources came and how they were allocated. The budget of the United Nations consisted of contributions varying in amount in accordance with the fiscal periods, and there was no fixed principle for the allocation of funds. As a result, if the United Kingdom amendment were adopted and other organs succeeded in cornering a large part of the budget, the bodies dealing with social affairs would not be able to protest because the General Assembly itself would have used the words "in the light of the resources available". Thus, the Third Committee would itself have contributed to the reduction, and perhaps even to the elimination, of the social work of the United Nations.

47. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan), replying to the Saudi Arabian representative, gave some explanations concerning the joint Afghan and Lebanese amendment (A/C.3/L.172) which incorporated the Saudi Arabian amendment (A/C.3/L.168) proposing the deletion of the words "those urgent" and "early" in paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution. With regard to the Saudi Arabian amendment in document A/C.3/L.169, consisting in the addition of the words "and the Non-Self-Governing Territories" at the end of the Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.165)—and, consequently, at the end of the joint amendment—he pointed out that the underlying idea was contained in the joint amendment: the point at issue was, indeed, the various social tasks assigned to the Council under the Charter, Articles 73 and 74 of which dealt with Non-Self-Governing Territories.

48. Mr. KAYSER (France) remarked that the joint draft resolution had been judged demagogic by some representatives and too abstract by others. The two accusations, which incidentally were contradictory, seemed devoid of foundation. Demagogy would consist of proposing, as certain representatives had indeed done, work which it would be impossible to carry out during the period over which the social programme under discussion would extend. The authors of the joint draft resolution had taken good care not to commit that error. In addition, their draft text did not deserve to be considered purely academic, since it was founded on a highly concrete document—the Social Commission's programme of work for the period 1951-1953, contained in the Commission's report.¹

49. Referring to the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160), he observed that the USSR draft resolution² on which the amendment was based had not been simply

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirteenth Session, Supplement No. 12*, annex II.

² See document E/AC.7/L.88/Rev.1.

rejected by the Social Commission and the Economic and Social Council. It would in fact be seen from paragraph 644 of the Council's report and from footnote 22 to chapter IV of the same report that the Social Commission and the Council had taken into account the USSR draft resolution. In particular the question of maternity and child welfare had been given attention and was included in the Social Commission's work programme.

50. He had nothing more to add after the Lebanese representative remarks on the subject of the point of the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.163) consisting in the addition of the words "and of the resources available" after the word "considerations".

51. With respect to the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom and United States delegations with the object of avoiding duplication of the activities of the United Nations and those of the specialized agencies, he would prefer the compromise proposal suggested by the Chilean representative at the previous meeting. That could be done by indicating, after the words "necessary action", in paragraph 1 of the operative part, that the responsibilities of the specialized agencies and other bodies dealing with social affairs should be taken into consideration. He would be glad if the Chilean representative could submit his amendment in writing.

52. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160) was intended to ensure a General Assembly recommendation that the Economic and Social Council and the Social Commission should study a certain number of clearly defined problems in 1952 and 1953. The problems were among those with which the Charter required the Council to deal. He was opposed to the United Kingdom and United States amendments, and took particular exception to the argument of duplication of work. There was nothing to prevent the United Nations from dealing with social problems referred to the specialized agencies, since under the Charter the Economic and Social Council was expressly entrusted with those problems.

53. The argument of duplication of activities was a manoeuvre, aimed at modifying the Charter and at abolishing the functions of the Economic and Social

Council and of the Social Commission by eliminating important questions from their programmes. He believed that the United Kingdom amendment proposing the addition of the words "and of the resources available" tended to the same end.

54. As was shown by the opposition which the USSR draft resolution—on which the USSR amendment was based—had encountered in the Social Commission, the United Kingdom and the United States of America had always endeavoured to limit the social work of the United Nations. The representatives of those two Powers had voted in the Social Commission against the adoption of programmes for medical care, social insurance and free education. As the Economic and Social Council had taken no action to remedy that situation when it considered the Social Commission's report, the USSR delegation was justified in stating that the Council had left important problems to one side.

55. The French draft resolution (A/C.3/L.154), which had developed into the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.162), was based on sound principles, but did not draw all the obviously concrete consequences from them.

56. Generally, no one was opposed to the objectives enumerated in his amendment—objectives which were in any case those of the Charter—but some delegations refused to apply the principles underlying it by voting for it. The argument that the social programme of the United Nations would be limited if particular objectives were defined was also invalid. The USSR amendment was intended to avoid exclusion of any social activity and to give the Council exact directives.

57. He urgently requested the Third Committee, in the interests of the prestige of the United Nations and in order to spare the Organization the fate of the League of Nations, to continue the social work envisaged by the Charter and not to deprive the labouring masses of the hope of a better lot.

58. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 19 votes to 11, with 12 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.