

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL  
OFFICIAL RECORDS



THIRTEENTH SESSION, 494th  
MEETING

THURSDAY, 9 AUGUST 1951, at 3 p.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
Report of the Population Commission (sixth session) (E/1989 and Add.1): report of the Social Committee (E/2062) . . . . .	121
Narcotic Drugs:	
(a) Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (sixth session) (E/1998): report of the Social Committee (E/2068) . . . . .	122
(b) Report of the Commission of Enquiry on the Coca Leaf (E/1666, E/1666/Add.1/Rev.1, E/1666/Add.2 and Corr.1, E/1666/Add.3): report of the Social Committee (E/2069) . . . . .	123
Report of the Social Commission (seventh session) (E/1982): report of the Social Committee (E/2065) . . . . .	123
Programme of work . . . . .	131

*President:* Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

*Present:* Representatives of the following countries:

Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, World Health Organization, International Refugee Organization.

**Report of the Population Commission (sixth session) (E/1989 and Add.1): report of the Social Committee (E/2062)**

1. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would no doubt agree with him in commending the Social Committee for the rapidity with which it had done its work, a virtue which the Council would do well to emulate.

2. Inviting representatives to take up item 23 of the agenda, he observed that the report of the Social Committee (E/2062) on the report of the Population Commission contained four draft resolutions which the Council would doubtless wish to examine one by one. He pointed out that the Soviet Union delegation had submitted amendments (E/L.185) to draft resolution B.

3. In the absence of comments on draft resolution A, he would put that draft resolution to the vote.

*Resolution A was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

4. Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had submitted an amendment to

the last paragraph of draft resolution B because it felt that it was impossible for the Population Commission fully and competently to advise the Council on questions of migration unless it studied the causes of that phenomenon and the social and economic living conditions of migrants in the countries to which they had migrated.

5. Furthermore, his delegation proposed that the penultimate paragraph of draft resolution B be amended by the substitution of the words: "Taking note of the recommendations . . ." for the words: "Concurring with the recommendations . . .". The former was the usual formula.

6. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) supported the amendments submitted by the Soviet Union delegation to draft resolution B.

7. Before the recent war, Poland had acquired a wide experience of the problems connected with emigration, since at that time thousands of Polish workers had been seeking work abroad. The Polish Government had even concluded treaties on the subject with other governments. To-day, thanks to the change of regime in Poland, those emigrants had been re-integrated into the Polish economy.

8. In the light of its past experience, Poland was convinced that it was impossible to study emigration problems without at the same time studying the social and economic conditions which the receiving countries offered to immigrants. That was the first reason why his delegation supported the Soviet Union amendment to the last paragraph of the draft resolution. The second reason was that a large number of Polish emigrants had recently been subjected by receiving countries to discriminatory treatment by comparison with local labour.

9. With regard to the Soviet Union amendment to the penultimate paragraph of the draft resolution, he considered it to be in conformity with customary United Nations practice.

10. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) also supported the Soviet Union amendments. The experience of Czechoslovakia during the inter-war period had been similar to that of Poland. During that period, thousands of workers had been obliged to leave a country whose industry, mines and financial operations had been dominated by foreign capital, and which had consequently been subject to economic crises and afflicted by hunger and poverty. Czechoslovak citizens, lured on by false promises, had emigrated to provide cheap labour for others. After the Second World War, when the social and economic structure of Czechoslovakia had been radically changed, and its industry and mines had been nationalized for the benefit of its own people, thousands of emigrants had returned to participate in the great work of reconstruction and economic development, the objective of which was the improvement of the standard of living of the entire Czechoslovak people.

11. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet Union proposal to substitute the words: "*Taking note* of the recommendations . . ." for the words: "*Concurring with* the recommendations . . ." in the penultimate paragraph of draft resolution B.

*The proposal was rejected by 10 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.*

12. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet Union proposal to add the words: "including the results of the studies on the causes of migration and the social-economic living conditions of immigrants in the countries into which they have immigrated" to the last paragraph of draft resolution B.

*The proposal was rejected by 11 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.*

*Resolution B was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

*Resolution C was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

13. The PRESIDENT proposed that discussion of draft resolution D, dealing with the question of the membership of the Population Commission, should be deferred until the Council had before it the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Organization and Operation of the Council and its Commissions.

14. Mr. DE BEAUVARGER (France) supported the President's proposal.

*It was agreed that discussion of draft resolution D be deferred.*

#### **Narcotic Drugs:**

##### **(a) Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (sixth session) (E/1998): report of the Social Committee (E/2068)**

15. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Social Committee (E/2068) on the

report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (sixth session) (E/1998). The report of the Social Committee contained three draft resolutions and drew attention to the fact that the Committee had decided to take no action on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 142 of the Commission's report, dealing with education and propaganda against the use of narcotic drugs. It was for the Council to take a decision on the matter.

*Resolution A was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

16. Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would vote against draft resolution B, since his Government believed that the conclusion of a temporary agreement on the limitation of the production of opium would not yield the desired results. The Council had at its seventh session unanimously adopted a resolution (159 IID (VII)) recommending that a single convention to replace all existing international treaties on narcotics should be concluded as soon as possible. Provisions for the limitation of the production of narcotic raw materials should form part and parcel of such a single convention.

17. The PRESIDENT declared the debate closed.

*Resolution B was adopted by 14 votes to 3.*

*Resolution C was adopted by 13 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.*

18. Mr. VAILLE (France) reminded the Council that, although a large majority in the Social Committee had recognized that the resolution contained in paragraph 142 of the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs was excellent in its intention, the Committee had thought it advisable to recommend that the Council should take no decision upon it.

19. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) agreed with the French representative. The draft resolution on education and propaganda against the use of narcotic drugs was, in its present form, highly controversial. No action should be taken that might endanger the lives of young people by exposing them to inducements to use drugs. There was at the present time a growing feeling among educators that they might be able to make a positive contribution towards helping to avert, by the use of modern educational methods, the dangers to which the improper use of narcotics gave rise. Considerable progress had been made recently in that respect and schools might well play an important role in solving the problem. They had certainly done so in the United States. The issue affected educators more than experts in questions of narcotics, and he believed that it would be wisest for the Council to abstain from taking any position in the matter.

20. The PRESIDENT declared the debate closed and said that he would put to the vote the French representative's proposal that no action be taken on the draft resolution proposed in paragraph 142 of the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1998).

*The French representative's proposal was adopted unanimously.*

**(b) Report of the Commission of Enquiry on the Coca Leaf (E/1666, E/1666/Add.1/Rev.1, E/1666/Add.2 and Corr.1, E/1666/Add.3): report of the Social Committee (E/2069)**

21. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the draft resolution on the problem of the coca leaf contained in the report of the Social Committee (E/2069). In the absence of comments he would put the resolution to the vote forthwith.

*The resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

**Report of the Social Commission (seventh session) (E/1982): report of the Social Committee (E/2065)**

22. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Social Committee's report on the report of the Social Commission for its seventh session (E/2065) contained a series of draft resolutions dealing with various aspects of the Commission's work. The Soviet Union delegation had submitted a draft resolution (E/L.184) which was self-contained and should therefore be taken separately.

23. Mr. KAYSER (France) expressed his delegation's satisfaction with the work of the Social Commission. The discussion in the Social Committee had brought out the constructive character of the Social Commission's work.

24. Six of the eight draft resolutions submitted by the Social Commission had been unopposed, which proved how carefully they had been prepared. That the resolutions had been adopted unanimously or almost unanimously in the Social Committee was also a testimonial to the improvement in the working methods of the Social Commission and to the quality of the documentation prepared by the Secretariat.

25. In connexion with the work of the United Nations in the social field, his delegation desired the attention of the Secretary-General and particularly of the Department of Public Information to be drawn once again to the desirability of producing a larger number of popular studies on the work done in that field. It felt that the general public was too often unaware that the United Nations was carrying out the tasks assigned to it in the sphere of social affairs.

26. His delegation would be glad to learn what the Department of Public Information had done to publicize the social work of the United Nations, and the Council would no doubt wish to be kept regularly informed of developments in that connexion.

27. Mr. STEINIG (Acting Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs) replied that he had already asked Headquarters to provide a detailed account of the action taken to disseminate information about the United Nations' work in the social field, either in print, by films, by lectures or over the air. He consequently hoped to be able in a few days to give the French representative the information for which he had asked. The Secretariat would take note of the suggestion that a report of that kind should in future be included in the Social Commission's reports.

28. Mr. BALMACEDA (Philippines) wished to commend the Social Commission for its achievements at its seventh session, which had shown that that body was performing an increasingly useful role in attaining one of the fundamental aims of the Charter—namely, to “promote social progress and better standards of life”.

29. The Commission's work was mostly of a long-range nature and the real value of its endeavours must depend on its ability to help to create such conditions as would make possible a permanent improvement in the relationship between man and man, between the individual and the society in which he was called upon to live, and between the nations as members of a world community bound together by an inevitable interdependence. Research work and studies, the compilation of data, the definition of principles and standards, and the formulation of plans in various fields of social welfare, all helped to lay a solid foundation for fruitful action in the social sphere by the specialized agencies, the Council and the General Assembly.

30. But there was room for improvement. A higher priority might be assigned to such projects as the Commission could carry out without delay and the tendency to dispersal of effort should be discouraged. At the same time, the Commission should constantly look for opportunities to include in its programme of work aspects of social security which did not fall within the competence of other agencies.

31. His Government was keenly interested in many items of the Commission's work, more especially the training of social workers and the organization and administration of social welfare. The Philippines Constitution contained a declaration that the promotion of social justice to increase the well-being and economic security of all the people was a fundamental concern of the State. That solemn obligation had been reaffirmed when the Philippines had signed the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But to approve a constitution, to enact a law or to sign an international agreement was only the first step along the path leading to the goal of social progress. His Government had found that its task was not merely that of alleviating suffering and of smoothing out, by means of legislation, the social and economic inequalities between various sections of the population; it was also necessary to create new conditions and to modify the habits, attitudes and psychology of the people in order that the fabric and structure of society might ultimately be changed for the better. Such a process could be achieved only by education and by corrective measures, and the very best expert guidance and assistance were needed in both. The Social Commission, the specialized agencies and the Secretariat of the United Nations had given valuable help, for which his Government was deeply grateful.

32. Section IX of the report referred to the need for regional action in the social field. His Government would like to draw attention to the fact that, at the conference held at Baguio in the Philippines in May 1950, and attended by delegations from seven States in South and South-East Asia, representing over 600 million people, there had been unanimous agreement to co-operate for

the benefit of all in the social, economic and cultural fields. It had also been agreed that, whatever common action might be taken, it would be supplementary to the work of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) and strictly in accordance with the principles of the United Nations as well as within its framework. In adopting that attitude, the participating States had been inspired by the conviction that progress in individual countries was inseparable from the general raising of the standard of living of all peoples.

33. Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was unable to join in the French and Philippines representatives' laudatory remarks about the work of the Social Commission. At its seventh session held in March and April 1951, the Commission had devoted most of its time to drawing up its programme for 1952-1953; but instead of working out methods which would have enabled it to implement the provisions of the Charter, and its terms of reference as laid down by the Council, it had concentrated on secondary problems. Thus its work would not bear, in the future any more than in the past, upon the serious problems affecting the masses. True, such topics as training for social work, criminology, coca leaf addiction, etc., were important, but only very relatively so when compared with the problem of raising the standard of living of the peoples the world over. That problem was mentioned explicitly both in the Charter and in the resolution establishing the Commission (resolution 10 (II)). It was general knowledge that the present rearmament race, which was accompanied by rising taxation and prices and a reduction in all social services, had a most serious effect upon millions of working families. President Truman, in his message to Congress in January 1951, had given figures for direct taxation representing a 23 per cent increase. The United Kingdom was the most heavily taxed country in the world, £3,668 million sterling, or 45 per cent of the total national revenue, being derived from taxation. The unsatisfactory situation of the social services of various capitalist countries was revealed by the following facts. At a meeting of the Social Committee during the present session, the Soviet Union representative had stated that only 4.5 per cent of the United States budget would be allocated to social services in 1952. The new social insurance legislation enacted in that country in 1950 made no provision for the insurance of workers totally or temporarily disabled. No provision was made for medical funds or for *pro rata* compensation in cases of sickness or accident. The trade union journal *Economic Outlook* for September 1950 described the law as being applicable to the dying or to the very aged, but not to the sick or the disabled. Meanwhile, the figures for accidents occurring in employment were very high. According to the statistics of the United States Department of Commerce for 1950, 187,000 industrial accidents had occurred in 1949, of which 16,600 were either fatal or had caused total disability. Moreover, the law did not provide for free medical assistance nor for compensation for loss of earnings during illness. Workers organized in trade unions had succeeded in getting certain minor privileges. According to the *Monthly Labor Review* for February 1951, out of a total of 16 million

workers belonging to trade unions, only 7.5 millions enjoyed the benefits of a certain measure of social security through agreements concluded with employers. But what of the remaining 30 million workers who did not belong to trade unions and were not organized for the defence of their interests?

34. The situation was equally unsatisfactory in regard to unemployment. Many categories of workers did not come under any benefit schemes, or received benefits only during a certain stipulated period of unemployment. As a general rule, weekly unemployment benefit varied between 15 and 36 dollars. Members of an unemployed man's family were entitled to 1 or 2 dollars a week. The periods during which unemployment benefit was payable varied from state to state, the maximum being twenty weeks and the average twelve to sixteen weeks. After that, an unemployed worker who had not found work could claim no further benefit for the rest of the current year. Highly unsatisfactory as it had been in its original form, the law on social insurance had, at the instigation of certain senators, been amended in the interests of the capitalists so as to stipulate that the employer's contribution to the social insurance fund should not exceed 3 per cent and that both employers' and workers' contributions should be administered by the government of the State and spent in accordance with State legislation under the supervision of the Department of Labor. During the debate on that law in the Senate committee on finance, various United States trade unions had unsuccessfully put forward proposals for higher benefits.

35. In spite of the militarization of the United States economy, unemployment in that country was very high. The January 1951 figures had been: 2,502,000 wholly unemployed; 2,024,000 unemployed registered as working; 2,559,000 partially employed, working from 1 to 14 hours a week; and 7,028,000 partially employed, working from 15 to 24 hours a week. The total was therefore 14,114,000. According to the *Social Security Bulletin* for December 1950, only some 800,000 to 900,000 persons received benefits, or about 6 per cent of all the unemployed.

36. In France there was no unemployment insurance law, though that was one of the oldest demands of the French trade unions. Assistance to the unemployed was "voluntary" in the French communes and dependent on the good will of the mayor and the inspector from the Ministry of Labour. Funds were made available with the mayor's consent if there were at least five registered unemployed. Assistance amounted to 100 to 125 francs a day for an unemployed person and 75 francs a day for a dependant. Furthermore, various stringent conditions had to be fulfilled by the applicant before he became eligible for any benefit.

37. Circumstances were no better in regard to old-age insurance. According to the official statistics of the United States Treasury, about 18 million workers were entirely outside the government social insurance system, but according to the calculations of a correspondent of the newspaper *New York Post* the true figure was 35 millions. Old-age pensions were paid only to persons of 65 years and over, and after the payment of contributions, part of which went to the government. The pensions provided

by the new law averaged from 45 to 50 dollars a month, and were thus wholly inadequate to secure the minimum standard of living, the cost of which, on 1 April 1951, had been calculated at 135 dollars a month for one person, 194 dollars a month for two persons, 240 dollars a month for three persons, and 296 dollars a month for four persons. According to the electrical workers' trade union over 21 million families in the United States had an income below that minimum.

38. The instructive case of a worker in the United States Steel Corporation had recently been cited by the newspaper *Daily Compass*. After 44 years' service, the Corporation had allotted him an annual pension of 3.21 dollars, or rather less than one cent a day. But the same Corporation had given one of its directors a pension of 76,537 dollars. If that was the position in the United States, what could be said of countries with more limited resources?

39. The problems of social insurance had been wholly neglected by the Social Commission in its future programme of work. It intended to deal neither with unemployment nor with old-age and disability insurance. Nor would it touch upon questions of health and education although they undoubtedly fell within its competence and were of the utmost urgency, since in the majority of the capitalist countries medical assistance was not within reach of the masses, and millions of children remained illiterate because their parents could not afford the high cost of education. The sums allocated to health services in capitalist countries were small and recently had been reduced still further. As regards education, a great many countries did not have enough elementary schools because their governments failed to provide the necessary funds. For instance, according to the paper *La Raison* for 6 October 1950, the Government of Bolivia had allocated 1,700,000 dollars for defence in 1950 and 250,000 for health, while 120,000 dollars had had to suffice for education. The United States health budget for the same year amounted to 394 million dollars, representing about 1 per cent of the total budget. Yet, in January 1950, President Truman had informed Congress that millions of citizens in the United States were deprived of medical services because they were unable to pay for them. In Colombia, according to the newspaper *El Tiempo* for 27 December 1950, expenditure on health represented 4 per cent and on education 7 per cent of the budget.

40. It was unnecessary to dwell on social conditions in the colonies and dependent territories, where, as was well known, social services were almost completely lacking. The living conditions of the native populations were dreadful; they were almost totally illiterate and totally deprived of medical care. It was inadmissible, in the Soviet Union delegation's view, that the Social Commission should not deal with those problems, the more so that under the Charter the United Nations had assumed certain obligations towards such territories.

41. At the Social Commission's seventh session, the Soviet Union delegation had submitted a draft resolution (E/CN.5/L.139) aiming at rectifying those shortcomings in the Commission's work by the inclusion in its programme of an item calling for the study of all those prob-

lems. Although no objection of substance had been made to any of the points enumerated in that draft resolution, it had nevertheless been rejected on procedural grounds. It was indeed regrettable that United Nations organs should refuse to face their responsibilities and study the serious social problems affecting millions of workers.

42. As a contrast to the tragic circumstances in the capitalist countries, he had merely to draw attention to the remarkable social development that had taken place in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union Constitution made full provision for social security. The 1951 social services budget amounted to over 21,000 million roubles. In 1950, the Government had expended on behalf of the population a sum of 120,000 million roubles, which was three times as high as that spent in 1940. Moreover, as a result of the reduction of prices effected as from 1 March 1950, the purchasing power of the workers had risen by 15 per cent, while the expenditure of farm workers for the purchase of consumer goods had fallen by 16 per cent. The further decrease in prices which had occurred with effect from 1 March 1951 had given the population a further 7,000 million roubles to spend.

43. During the past five years, the health services of the Soviet Union had been greatly improved; in 1950, the number of hospital beds in towns and villages had increased by 24 per cent over 1940, while the number of doctors had risen, during the same period, by 75 per cent. The 1951 budget provided for an expenditure of 59,000 million roubles on education, 21,900 million roubles on health services and gymnastics, 22,300 million roubles on social security, and 4,100 million roubles for large families.

44. The PRESIDENT, intervening, said that the Soviet Union representative's description of social conditions in various countries was irrelevant. He must remind the Soviet Union representative that, when the question of the Council's sessions had been discussed, in the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Organization and Operation of the Council and its Commissions, the Soviet Union representative advocated one annual session only to last for four weeks.

45. Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the facts and figures he had given were closely related to the work of the Social Commission. His delegation and his Government could not take responsibility for the fact that the Social Commission did not deal with those problems, the importance of which he desired to stress.

46. He would, however, conclude by saying that, in submitting its draft resolution (E/L.184), his delegation hoped that the Council would adopt it and so enable the Social Commission to make good the present shortcomings in its work.

47. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) said that the Social Committee's report showed the full extent of the discrepancy between the Social Commission's activities and the vigorous action required in that field. It was apparent from the discussion in the Council on the world economic situation and on conditions in Africa and in the Middle

East that a situation obtained in the capitalist countries and the territories placed under their administration which made it necessary for certain governments to be reminded of their duties in the social sphere. In the People's Democracies, on the other hand, social action was an end in itself. The reconstruction of Warsaw provided an example, inspired as it was, in the words of the President of the Polish Republic, "by a desire to create optimum conditions for the creative flowering of mankind". That desire was the motive force behind all the plans and all the achievements of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Democracies. All publications on achievements in reconstruction gave accounts of the social progress that had been made. Thus, chapter 7 of the Polish National Economic Planning Commission's publication on the fulfilment of the national economic plan in Poland dealt with progress in education, health and welfare. It showed that, during 1950, the number of pupils in seven-grade elementary schools had increased by 10 per cent, that the number of secondary school certificates was 38 per cent greater than in 1949 and the number of students double what it had been before the war. The campaign against illiteracy had reached 620,000 people, or 26 per cent more than in 1949. New hospitals had been built and old ones enlarged, with the result that the number of beds had increased by 4,000. In tuberculosis sanatoria, there were 28 per cent more beds than in 1949.

48. He then described the objectives of the six-year plan, which would give the population a standard of living 60 per cent higher than in 1949. The armament programmes of the capitalist countries reduced the purchasing power of the working classes as well as the appropriations in their national budgets for educational and social work; it was therefore the duty of the Economic and Social Council to remind the various governments of their obligations with regard to social problems, and it had to draw the necessary conclusions from the inadequate work done by the Social Commission. The resolutions submitted in the Social Committee's report were concerned with secondary problems, whereas the need for large-scale social action was more evident than ever. The Soviet Union draft resolution, on the other hand, took account of the existing world situation in regard to welfare work, its aim being to induce the Council and the Social Commission to engage in activities that answered to the legitimate aspirations of vast masses of the world's population.

49. Mr. KAYSER (France) stated that, in view of the comments made in the course of the debate on unemployment relief machinery in France, the French delegation was prepared to supply members of the Council, if they so desired, with documentation on its national unemployment legislation and on the working of the French unemployment relief fund and the official labour exchanges.

50. Turning to the Soviet Union draft resolution, he wondered whether the recommendations it contained would be effective. The Council was the third body before which such a draft had been discussed. The Social Commission, which had studied the draft in a constructive spirit, had singled out the one paragraph which could be inserted in its work programme; the

other paragraphs, which reappeared in the present draft, had been rejected by the Social Commission and, later, by the Social Committee, the reason being that the Social Commission could not arrange to study problems which were being dealt with by the specialized agencies. The Social Committee, after consulting the representatives of the specialized agencies, had come to the conclusion that the problems covered by points (a) and (d) of the Soviet Union resolution were being dealt with by the International Labour Organisation, while that mentioned under point (b) was being studied by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and point (c) was under examination by both the International Labour Organisation and the World Health Organization (WHO). The Social Commission should not encroach upon the fields of activity of the specialized agencies. In that respect its terms of reference were very clear—namely, "to advise the Council on social questions of a general character, and in particular on all matters in the social field not covered by specialized inter-governmental agencies". The Soviet Union draft resolution had been rejected in order to avoid duplication and to ensure the smooth running of United Nations machinery in the social welfare field. If it were adopted, it would mean upsetting the Social Commission's programme of work for 1952-1953, several items of which had already been transmitted to Governments and were being studied.

51. Contrary to the opinion expressed by the Polish representative, he considered that the resolutions in the Social Committee's report were by no means concerned with secondary problems. In fact, some of them were of the utmost consequence. He was particularly surprised that the resolution on probation should have been referred to as being of secondary importance, since hitherto emphasis had been placed on the work accomplished by the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies in what was considered the extremely important field of the rehabilitation of delinquents.

52. Again, if, in its proposal, the Soviet Union delegation had recommended the conclusion of conventions, instead of the framing of recommendations, a different aspect of the question would have arisen. But, when it came to conventions, the Soviet Union retired behind the dogma of national sovereignty. Thus, while a number of international labour conventions had been signed and were being applied by many States, the Soviet Union had not acceded to them. He regretted that the representatives of the countries of Eastern Europe were only in favour of vague recommendations and not of conventions.

53. The French delegation considered that the method adopted by the Social Commission made for progress. For that reason it could not support the Soviet Union draft resolution.

54. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that it was not the first time that the Council had heard the kind of speech just made by the Soviet Union representative. The speech had been practically the same as that made by the Soviet Union representative a few days previously at the Social Committee's meeting, full of

false, distorted and misleading statements which had been repeated many times over.

55. In the Social Committee, he (the United States representative) had said that some of the statements made by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics might be unwittingly false. He could not say the same on the present occasion because he had pointed out in the Social Committee why, for instance, the figures for social insurance and welfare for the United States, as quoted by the Soviet Union representative, were much too low; he had explained that the figures in the United States federal budget did not represent all the expenditure on social programmes in his country, since the individual States and municipalities spent large sums on such programmes. Yet the Soviet Union representative had just repeated the same false statements on the subject.

56. Anyone who compared the social legislation and the social benefits under the free system obtaining in countries such as the United States and the same legislation and benefits in totalitarian States could see that the workers' conditions were far better in terms of real wages in the former. The Soviet Union representative had said that the standards of living of the workers in the United States of America were steadily deteriorating; but in 1951 real wages of factory workers had been some 40 per cent higher than immediately before the Second World War. Anyone who had read a book on the United States not written by a communist would know that the Soviet Union representative had been talking nonsense when he had said that State expenditure on education and culture in the United States was almost negligible. He would not repeat all the figures he had mentioned in the Social Committee, but he would give a few out of the many examples he could quote to show that the workers' standards of living were far higher in the United States than in the Soviet Union. Annual *per capita* expenditure for social programmes was 65 dollars in the Soviet Union and 161 dollars in the United States. The number of doctors per thousand inhabitants in the United States was approximately twice as great as the corresponding figure for the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union representative had suggested that the United States social security law had been passed only in 1950; in actual fact it had been passed in 1935; in 1950 it had been amended so as to cover a far larger proportion of the population.

57. Again, the Soviet Union representative had said that there was no compensation law in the United States; the truth was that every one of the forty-eight States had its own compensation laws. The author of those false statements about the United States came from a country where millions of human beings were confined behind barbed wire and were starving to death without any social benefits. The Soviet Union representative had suggested that no housing was being constructed in the United States of America; in actual fact, 1,400,000 houses had been built there in 1950 and it was estimated that as many as a million would be built during the current year. The Soviet Union representative had said that there were 14 million unemployed workers in the United States. In July 1951, the number of unemployed was

1,850,000, most of them temporarily out of work and many of them young persons who had just left school. The Soviet Union representative had said that taxation in the United States was anti-social and that taxes were increasing. It was true that taxes were increasing, but so was the national income. Nor were United States taxes increasing as rapidly as the Soviet Union representative had indicated. Moreover, the increases had been freely voted by the freely chosen representatives of the people and they had been freely accepted; they represented the price that had to be paid for the security of those who believed in a free world. By contrast, the tax structure imposed upon the people of the Soviet Union was truly anti-social; at the core of it were sales and turn-over taxes amounting to up to 100 per cent of the cost price; such taxes were most anti-social since they weighed most heavily on the poor.

58. The Soviet Union draft resolution was most deceptive and destructive in purpose. One of its purposes was to provide false propaganda designed to make it appear that the free world was against the social measures enumerated in the final paragraph. Needless to say, the non-communist members of the Council were not opposed to unemployment insurance or to care for the families of the unemployed and the other measures suggested. Those measures were, however, within the competence of the specialized agencies which had been set up to work on them. The other and main purpose of the draft resolution was to undermine and bring about the destruction of those specialized agencies. It accused the Social Commission of having failed to do what it had been instructed by its terms of reference not to do—namely, to deal with problems being dealt with by other inter-governmental organizations. The United States delegation would not be a party to the manoeuvre of the Soviet Union delegation aiming at the destruction of the specialized agencies. The Soviet Union was not a member of the International Labour Organisation which was successfully attempting to improve working conditions throughout the world, nor of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), which was helping to develop agriculture in areas of the world where agriculture was backward, nor of UNESCO, which was trying to spread literacy and learning; nor did they participate in WHO's efforts to fight disease. The Soviet Union and other communist regimes had thus clearly demonstrated that they were not interested in social and economic progress achieved through international co-operation. Now they were going one step farther in attempting to undermine and eventually destroy the most effective international instruments—the specialized agencies—for economic and social progress in a free world. That destructive move must not be allowed to proceed.

59. Mr. CABADA (Peru) said that, although the President had pointed out the embarrassing situation that was created by members of the Council criticizing countries which were not represented on the Council and consequently could not answer charges brought against them during the debate, the Soviet Union representative had made statements about two Latin American countries not represented on the Council—namely, Bolivia and Colombia. The figures he had quoted for those



countries were misleading. Perhaps he did not know the truth about the public health situation in Colombia. In actual fact, there was considerable decentralization in that country and many departments and municipalities had their own budget and spent money on public health. There were many hospitals which were maintained by voluntary contributions or which were subsidized by charitable organizations. The departmental and municipal authorities also spent large sums on education, whereas the national budget was more concerned with expenditure on defence, the direction of foreign relations, etc.

60. As for the Soviet Union representative's statements about public education in Bolivia, he (Mr. Cabada) felt bound to point out that, owing to the configuration of the country, communications were difficult, and that a large proportion of the population was composed of Indians who were not so receptive to education as other peoples. Some countries, through no fault of their own, but for reasons such as those which he had already given, were unable to achieve as much progress as other countries. An illustration of the great importance attached to educational development in Bolivia was to be found in the speeches made by Bolivian teachers at a conference recently held in Peru and in the Bolivian Government's request for one of the largest technical assistance missions which had been sent to any country by the United Nations.

61. Mr. HADI HUSAIN (Pakistan) said that he was speaking without specific directions from his Government, but he wished to state that it was painful for the smaller countries to see the stage which had been set for practical work on the world's economic and social problems occupied by irrelevant discussions. Pakistan had become a member of the United Nations believing in its ideals and intent on giving all the help it could to promoting those ideals. It was in that spirit that his delegation in the Social Committee had tried, unsuccessfully, to act as a mediator between the two contending camps.

62. The measures advocated in the Soviet Union draft resolution were all highly desirable. It was not for his delegation to read into the draft resolution anything that it did not contain. The draft resolution asked in effect that the Social Commission should work on a higher plane and in a wider social field. But the real question was whether the adoption of the draft resolution would make the Commission's work more comprehensive and more practical. During discussions in the Social Committee, his delegation had felt that its adoption would place a heavy burden on the Commission and would have one of two results: either the Commission would have to spend an inordinate amount of time on the problems referred to it, or it would deal with them superficially. The Commission had been specifically instructed to deal only with problems not covered by the specialized agencies, one of its functions being to ensure that every international problem in the social field was receiving attention. He had therefore proposed amending the draft resolution in such a way that the Commission would be entrusted with the task of reviewing the work of the specialized agencies on the problems enumerated in the

resolution and of making appropriate recommendations. He had withdrawn that proposal when it had been agreed to include in the Committee's report to the Council the passage appearing in paragraph 4, since he had felt that to be sufficient. His delegation was still of the same opinion. The adoption of the Soviet Union draft resolution would result in a duplication by the Social Commission of the work of the Council and its Social Committee. The Council and its Social Committee automatically reviewed the activities of the specialized agencies every year when it examined their reports. It was therefore open to the Council to suggest to the specialized agencies what further action it thought they should take, more especially in the social field.

63. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that, as his delegation had pointed out in the Social Committee, the Social Commission had considered only secondary problems and had neglected the principal social problems affecting the millions of workers throughout the world. His Government was far from satisfied with the Commission's work. The Commission had not even considered it necessary to discuss the decrease in the living standards of the workers of capitalist countries whose economies were being militarized. It had ignored the unemployment in those countries, and the need to improve health and education and to provide social insurance. According to the *New York Times* of 1 August 1951, the President of the United States of America had said that there had been no increase in the incomes of one-half of the families in the United States during 1950, that many of them had suffered decreases of income, and that the inflation due to the increasing militarization of the country's economy meant immediate deprivations for them.

64. It had been argued by many representatives of capitalist countries that the Social Commission should not deal with the important problems enumerated in the Soviet Union draft resolution because they were within the competence of certain specialized agencies. The real purpose of that argument was to prevent proper discussion of those problems, which on the contrary ought to be discussed by the Social Commission in practical terms so as to provide the Council with useful recommendations. The specialized agencies examined those problems from the purely technical point of view. His delegation therefore warmly supported the Soviet Union draft resolution.

65. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) said that he would not repeat what he had said in the Social Committee, as a summary record containing his statements and of those of other representatives had been duly circulated. However, in reply to what the Soviet Union representative had not said about conditions in his country, he would merely point out that that representative could come and go freely in the western countries, whilst the western countries had to rely on the publications of the Soviet authorities for information about conditions in that country. But even those publications, which were written to suit the authorities issuing them, showed that the standards of living in the Soviet Union were not very high. He would give just two examples of the many he could quote. Family allowances in the Soviet Union



compared very unfavourably with those in free countries; large family benefits were not paid to mothers until the birth of their third child, when they received a single payment of 200 roubles; regular payments were not made until after the birth of the fourth child and they ceased when that child reached the age of 5. Pensions in the Soviet Union compared very unfavourably with pensions in free countries; the maximum old-age pension for a worker was 240 roubles a month; 600 roubles, the monthly wage of low-paid workers, was scarcely sufficient for the subsistence of a single man. The qualifications required for obtaining a pension were very restrictive. That was doubtless one of the reasons why so many beggars were to be seen in the towns of the Soviet Union. It was obvious that the real purpose of the Soviet Union draft resolution was to give the false impression that members of the Council were opposed to the measures enumerated in it. The Council must decide what the programme of the Social Commission for the next two years should be. The United Kingdom delegation was of the opinion that the wisely restricted programme which the Social Commission had drawn up for itself was the best programme for that Commission and it would therefore urge the Council to reject the Soviet Union draft resolution.

66. Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that many representatives had asserted that the problems enumerated in his delegation's draft resolution were not worthy of the Council's attention. In fact they were the most important of all the problems in the social field. No subterfuge or reference to specialized agencies could conceal the fact that those representatives did not wish the problems to be properly discussed. The United Kingdom representative had asserted that the draft resolution had been submitted for purely propaganda purposes. It was, on the contrary, obviously aimed at helping the workers of the world. And was it not right to make more than one attempt to improve social conditions in the world?

67. It was not the first time that the Council had heard the statements just made by the United States representative. He (Mr. Zonov) would reply that his delegation's proposals were based on lofty principles and on undeniable facts. The United States representative's assertion that the main purpose of the draft resolution was to bring about the destruction of the specialized agencies was completely untrue. The United States representative had referred to the specialized agencies only in order to try, unsuccessfully, to conceal the truth—namely, that the Social Commission did not concern itself with the problems of primary importance mentioned in the draft resolution, but only with questions of secondary importance. The Council could not agree that the Social Commission should ignore those problems; it should therefore adopt the draft resolution, which was entirely in accordance with the basic articles of the Charter.

68. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland), replying to the United States representative, expressed the opinion that the radio of communist countries would be telling the truth if it asserted that, contrary to what was being said by the "Voice of America" and the radio of capitalist countries, those who had voted against the Soviet Union draft

resolution were opposed to the adoption of measures for the development of social and unemployment insurance, public education and medical care.

69. He repeated that the real reason why the representatives of capitalist countries were opposed to the Soviet Union draft resolution was that the money which could, otherwise, have been used for social purposes was required for rearmament.

70. He asked the French representative whether the International Labour Organisation's activities during the last thirty years had had any effect whatever on the situation in Equatorial Africa, where there were no labour codes.

71. The Soviet Union draft resolution represented the only way to bring about the social measures which the world economic situation, as described in the Council during the last few days, required.

72. The PRESIDENT declared the general discussion closed. He put to the vote the Soviet Union draft resolution (E/L.184).

*The Soviet Union draft resolution was rejected by 15 votes to 3.*

73. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution A in the Social Committee's report (E/2065) on the report of the Social Commission (seventh session).

*Resolution A was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

74. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution B concerning training for social work.

75. Mr. VAN ISTENDAEL (Belgium) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution B, but, with regard to sub-paragraph (a) in the second paragraph, he wished to point out that Belgium would prefer that the contemplated formulation of minimum standards for the training of social workers should refer more particularly to minimum standards for the training of qualified social workers, and also that, as far as was practicable and expedient, consideration should be given to the creation and legal protection of the official title of "social worker". His suggestion was based on the situation obtaining in Belgium, where the standard of training of social workers had been raised and their sense of responsibility increased, with the result that social workers enjoyed enhanced prestige.

76. Mr. LESAGE (Canada) stated that, for the constitutional reasons which he had explained in the Social Committee, his delegation would abstain from voting on draft resolution B, and also on draft resolution G.

77. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution B to the vote.

*Resolution B was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

78. The PRESIDENT, after ascertaining that no representative wished to speak on draft resolution C, put that resolution to the vote.

*Resolution C was adopted unanimously.*

79. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution D concerning the use of community welfare centres as effective instruments to promote economic and social progress throughout the world.

80. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that, in view of the lateness of the hour, he would say only part of what he had intended to say on the draft resolution. The United States delegation considered that the proposals in the draft resolution were of great importance and that they should receive priority. In the light of the experience with community welfare centres in Egypt, India and Haiti, it believed that they provided an excellent means of dealing radically with the health and social welfare problems of all countries, including the United States. Social progress through local action was one of the primary principles which should be followed by the United Nations in its efforts to raise the world's living standards.

81. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution D to the vote.

*Resolution D was adopted unanimously.*

82. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution E on probation.

83. Mr. BERNSTEIN (Chile) said that he would abstain when the draft resolution was put to the vote: first, for the general reason that his delegation was concerned at the tendency of the Social Commission to study problems of secondary importance and little urgency with the result that its attention was diverted from more important problems, and secondly, because he did not agree with the methods outlined in the draft resolution. It urged governments to adopt and develop probation, which, although a humane method of preventing crime and dealing with offenders, and which might be very satisfactory in countries such as Sweden and the United Kingdom, would certainly be less effective in countries with other legal systems. He considered that an exchange of information on the subject between experts would be much more useful than the very theoretical proposal made in the resolution.

84. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution E to the vote.

*Resolution E was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

85. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution F concerning criminal statistics.

86. Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would vote against the resolution, since the subject of criminal statistics was outside the competence of the Social Commission.

87. Mr. MEYKADEH (Iran) pointed out that, in paragraph 1 (b) (ii) of the French text, the word "humaine" should be added.

88. Mr. KAYSER (France) asked whether the expression "vol avec violence et vol avec effraction" was really the equivalent of the English term "robbery and burglary".

89. The PRESIDENT replied that the Secretariat would ensure that the French and English texts tallied. He added that, in order to meet the wishes of the Mexican representative, the Secretariat would provide a Spanish translation of document E/2065. He then put draft resolution F to the vote.

*Resolution F was adopted by 15 votes to 3.*

90. The PRESIDENT called for comments on draft resolution G concerning assistance to indigent aliens.

91. Mr. VAN ISTENDAEL (Belgium) confirmed the reservation already made by Belgium in the Social Committee. It was not that Belgium did not approve the recommendation made to governments, but that Belgian law as it stood was only partly in accord with some of the provisions of the resolution.

92. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) said that he fully appreciated the humanitarian motives which had inspired the resolution and he sympathized with the plight of indigent aliens. He considered, however, that responsibility for assisting indigent persons rested primarily with the government of which they were nationals. He was opposed to the adoption of a recommendation urging governments to help indigent aliens at the expense of their own nationals. Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was to the effect that governments should not deport aliens for the sole reason of their indigence or of their becoming public charges; aliens were admitted into the Philippines on condition that they did not constitute a public charge; if they became a public charge they were liable to deportation. But the Philippines authorities administered that rule with justice and liberality. They made exceptions in favour of persons who had rendered valuable service to their country of residence and in favour of stateless persons and political refugees. The Council could rely on the Philippines Government to exercise discretion in the matter. It was with those qualifications that he would vote in favour of the resolution.

93. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution G to the vote.

*Resolution G was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

94. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution H concerning recognition and enforcement abroad of maintenance obligations.

95. Mr. BERNSTEIN (Chile) said that the draft resolution contained a request to the Secretary-General to convene a committee of experts to formulate the text of a model convention or model reciprocal law on the subject of the recognition and enforcement abroad of maintenance obligations. In his opinion, the Secretary-General already had material which, together with the assistance he could obtain from governments and non-governmental organizations, was sufficient to enable his staff to prepare such a model reciprocal law for adoption by governments. A convention on the subject would scarcely be practical. In the Social Committee, his delegation had proposed the deletion of paragraph 2 (b)

of the resolution. Since that proposal had been rejected in the Committee he would not take up the Council's time by making it again, although he was still of opinion that the paragraph should be deleted. He would abstain when the draft resolution was put to the vote.

96. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution H to the vote.

*Resolution H was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

97. The PRESIDENT stated that the Council's work on the report of the seventh session of the Social Commission was concluded.

#### **Programme of work**

98. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Organization and Operation of the Council and its Commissions had recommended that the Council request its Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to review and make recommendations regarding the regional commissions' rules of procedure concerning consultation with non-governmental organizations (E/1995/Add.1, paragraph 8). He proposed that the matter be referred to the Committee.

*It was so agreed.*

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.