



UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL  
E/AC.24/SR.71  
25 August 1950  
DRAFT  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH-  
FRENCH

Dual Distribution

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Eleventh Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Friday, 4 August 1950, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS

Relations with and co-ordination of specialized agencies  
(item 43 of the agenda) (continued);

Draft report of the Co-ordination Committee and amendments  
thereto proposed by delegations (E/AC.24/L.18) (continued).

/Present:  
E/AC.24/SR.71

Present:

Chairman: Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico)

Members:

Australia	Mr. CURTES
Belgium	Baron de KIERCIOVE d'EXAERDE
Brazil	Mr. MONTENHO
Canada	Mr. HALSEAD
Chile	Mr. BERNSTEIN
China	Mr. TSAO
Denmark	Mr. FRIIS
France	Mr. PERIER
India	Mr. VELLODI
Iran	Mr. YOTOUDAH
Pakistan	Mr. AKHAR
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. SCOPES
United States of America	Mr. ROSEMAN

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. LEMOINE
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. OLSEN
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. TEREZIO
World Health Organization	Dr. FORREST

Secretary:  
Mr. Uuhart

Secretary to the Committee

RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES  
(item 43 of the agenda) (continued):

Draft report of the Co-ordination Committee and amendments thereto proposed by delegations (E/AC.24/L.18) (continued)

Amendments No. 4 (b) and 17 (continued)

Mr. ROGEMAN (United States of America) said that following the discussion at the previous meeting on the amendments in question, he would propose that the text suggested for (a) be worded as follows: "That international action will be justified only in cases where the desired results cannot be achieved by unassisted national action with some degree of certainty and within a reasonable time".

Amendments Nos. 4 (b) and 17, in the form suggested by the United States representative, were unanimously adopted.

Amendments 5, 6 and 7 and further amendments relating to Section I(b) of the draft report.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) said that his delegation had put forward amendments 5 and 7 as suggestions, and not as formal proposals, since he was not conversant with all that had been said in the working group before the adoption of the list of criteria for priorities given on page 5 of the draft report (E/AC.24/L.18). He would be grateful if a representative of the group could give an account of its discussions on those parts of the list to which the amendments related.

Amendment 6 was self-explanatory.

Since he wished it to be made clear that, at the present stage of co-operation among the United Nations and the specialized agencies, no body could draw up a perfect list of criteria, and that as a consequence the Council could not yet take up a final position on the subject, he also proposed that the first sentence of the sixth paragraph of Section I(b) of the draft report be amended to read: "The Committee fully recognizes that these criteria are of a provisional nature and will require further elaboration and development".

/Mr. MURTIMIO

Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil), speaking on behalf of the working group, explained the ideas underlying the criteria it had established.

The working group had considered the possibility of applying forthwith the criteria adopted. After mature consideration, it had decided that it would be better to apply the criteria adopted during the interval between the eleventh and thirteenth sessions, even if they were not perfect. Consequently, he could not agree with the Danish representative's suggestion, and proposed that in the sixth paragraph of section I(b), "Priorities", the words "perhaps, at a later stage" should simply be inserted, so that the text would read: "The Committee recognizes that these criteria may perhaps, at a later stage, require further elaboration and development".

With regard to amendment No. 7, he thought that the simplest solution would, in fact, be to delete sub-paragraph (b) under "Results". It must, however, be borne in mind that the results of projects that governments wished to undertake were not always measurable, and that it was sometimes impossible to make use of them for propaganda purposes. The Committee had retained seventeen criteria, which must be considered as a whole, and the criterion appearing in sub-paragraph (b) under "Results" had no absolute value. For a project to be adopted, it was not necessary that it should satisfy all the criteria, but if the results obtained were tangible it would be possible to obtain better publicity. That was why that criterion had been included in the list.

With regard to amendment No. 5, he thought that any order of priority for the presentation of the criteria could be equally well defended. The working group had established a certain order, but that order could quite well be changed. It was not certain, however, that amendment No. 5 made matters any clearer.

With regard to the second paragraph of amendment No. 5, he explained that the working group had intended to make a distinction between the desire of governments to participate in the execution of the programme ((c) under "Feasibility") and the interest of the population, which determined local conditions, ((b), in the same section). It might in fact happen that in certain

cases governments would favour a project, whereas the population would not, so that local conditions would be unfavourable. He then pointed out that items (d) and (e) under "Results" differed from items (b) and (c) under "Feasibility". In putting these questions, the purpose of the working group had been to ascertain, first, whether a project or programme was calculated to stimulate action in the country concerned, so that it would produce maximum results in a given country, and, secondly, whether it was beneficial to several States or to the social groups which were most in need of assistance in their economic and social development.

In conclusion, he emphasized that the criteria for priorities had only one purpose; to simplify, to some extent, the work of international organizations and governments.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) said that he would agree to the Brazilian representative's suggestion and withdraw amendment No. 5, although he was convinced that the list of criteria would definitely have to be elaborated and developed later.

The Brazilian representative's version of the supplementary Danish amendment relating to the sixth paragraph of Section I(b) of the Report was unanimously adopted.

Amendment No. 6, submitted by the Danish delegation, was unanimously adopted.

Mr. HALSTEAD (Canada) said that he hoped amendment No. 7 would not be adopted, although he agreed that no programme or project should be rejected simply because it had no demonstrable results. Demonstrable results would, however, be an important additional asset of the programme or project, since they could be used for propaganda in favour of the United Nations.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) said that he would withdraw amendment No. 7 on the understanding that demonstrability was only to be considered as an additional advantage.

Amendment No. 18 (resumed from the 70th meeting)

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the words "outlay of effort and financial resources" be substituted for the words "financial outlay" in sub-paragraph (a) under the heading "Results" on page 6 of document E/AC.24/L.18.

It was so agreed.

Amendment No. 18, submitted by the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen, as amended, was unanimously adopted.

Amendment No. 9

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had put forward amendment No. 9 mainly because his Government and, he believed, other Governments, had experienced some difficulty in sending what they considered full delegations to the annual conferences of certain specialized agencies which had taken place simultaneously during May and June.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the words "Urges the specialized agencies concerned" be substituted for the words "Urges the Secretary-General" in the final paragraph of draft resolution E in the Committee's draft report, since he did not believe the action indicated in that paragraph could be achieved by the Secretary-General and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination alone.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said he would agree to the addition of the words "and the specialized agencies concerned", but hoped that the words "the Secretary-General" would not be deleted, since the Secretary-General could view the problem as a whole and consequently make a special contribution to its solution.

/Mr. FRIIS

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) said that he would abstain if the amendment were put to the vote, since he had doubts about the practicability of the action recommended.

The Council itself had insisted on the concentration of the annual conferences in the first half of the year. In those circumstances, it would perhaps be inadvisable to give further directives about the timing of these conferences.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) said that since there were still exceptions to the rule that specialized agencies should hold their annual general conference in the first half of the year, he would propose the addition at the end of draft resolution E of the following paragraph: "Hopes that further progress will be made in the direction of scheduling annual conferences in the first half of the year."

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) accepted the Australian representative's amendment.

Mr. OLSEN (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that the Food and Agriculture Organization held its general conference in the second half of the year because one of the main functions of that conference was to review world food and agricultural prospects, and it was not practical to do so until the results of the harvests in the northern hemisphere were known.

Subject to the reservation by the Danish representative recorded above, the Committee adopted amendment No. 9, submitted by the United States delegation, with the words "and the special agencies concerned" inserted after the words "Urges the Secretary-General" in the final paragraph of draft resolution E, and with the addition of the final paragraph proposed by the Australian representative.



Amendment No. 10

Amendment No. 10, submitted by the United States delegation, was unanimously adopted.

Amendment No. 20

Mr. URQUHART (Secretary to the Committee) said that the Secretariat hoped the Committee would adopt amendment 20, because, since the draft report had been written, it had been pointed out that the following complications might arise if the system described in Section I(d) of the draft report were applied without modification: people might wrongly suppose from the date of issue of a document that it was more up-to-date than it really was; if the system were adopted, it would have to be applied to the documents of the Second and Third Committees of the General Assembly, and consequently to all the documents of the General Assembly; and the versions in the different working languages of the same document would in most cases bear different dates. For those reasons the Secretariat would like time to examine the question further.

Mr. SCOPES (United Kingdom) said that if the amendment were adopted much of the good done by the adoption of draft resolution B would be undone. Since his delegation attached great importance to the system of dating documents described in section I(d), he hoped that the paragraph in question would not be weakened further than by the insertion of some such words as "and requests the Secretariat to examine the possibility of introducing such a system", at the end of the second sentence.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) suggested the substitution of the words "the best means of" for the words "the possibility of", in the United Kingdom amendment. Although the proposal to include the date of issue on future documents involved difficulties for the Secretariat, he felt that those difficulties could be overcome. He was not prepared to accept any wording which implied that it might not be possible to give Governments an assurance that Rules 9 and 10 of the Council's rules of procedure were being effectively implemented.

/Mr. HALSTEAD



Mr. HALSTEAD (Canada) said that he was in favour of the adoption of the original text with the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom representative; for the points raised by the Secretary were not insurmountable obstacles to the adoption of the system. The inclusion of both the date of completing the drafting of a document and the date of its issue should prevent people thinking that a document was more up-to-date than it really was. It was true that the system could not be adopted for the Council's documents without the General Assembly making it applicable to all United Nations Documents; but it would often be useful to know the dates of issue of each of the versions of a document in the different working languages.

The Committee unanimously adopted Section I(d) of the draft report, with the addition of the words "and requests the Secretariat to examine the best means of introducing such a system" at the end of the second sentence.

Amendment No. 11.

Mr. SCOPES (United Kingdom) said that his delegation's reason for putting forward amendment No. 11 was that the text in its present form made it appear that the Committee believed that the establishment of comparable administrative and personnel standards and practices was essential to building up an adequate international civil service. His delegation believed that they were desirable, but not a sine qua non.

Amendment No. 11, submitted by the United Kingdom delegation, was unanimously adopted.

Amendment to Section II of the Draft Report

Mr. URQUIHART (Secretary to the Committee) pointed out that the second sentence of Section II of the draft report was not logically drafted, and suggested that a full stop should be placed after the word "locality", and that the words "The study should cover the ...." should be substituted for the words "to avoid the inefficiency that may arise from the maintenance of separate....".

It was so agreed.

/Amendment No. 13

Amendment No. 13

Mr. PERIER (France) said that the reason for his delegation's submitting the amendment in question was that it did not consider it the normal procedure for the Committee to draw the Social Committee's attention to any particular document.

Mr. SCOPES (United Kingdom) was opposed to the amendment and asked that his attitude be noted in the summary record.

The CHAIRMAN, recalling that the Committee had generally come to unanimous agreement, considered that paragraph III(c) merely recorded a factual situation. In his view no very significant precedent would be created if the attention of the Social Council were called to a particular document.

Mr. PERIER (France) declared that the views of the French delegation on the question were diametrically opposed to those of the United Kingdom delegation, and he did not see any possibility of reconciling their differences. His delegation considered that the paragraph in question should not be included in the report, and that its inclusion would create a dangerous precedent. It did not see why the Co-ordination Committee should draw the Social Committee's attention to a document of which the United Kingdom delegation approved, but which was not to the satisfaction of the French delegation.

Mr. SCOPES (United Kingdom) recalled that the suggestion put forward by the United Kingdom delegation that document E/CN.5/201 be transmitted to the Social Committee, had been adopted at the fifty-ninth meeting of the Co-ordination Committee, and that that decision had been duly reported in the summary record (E/AC.24/SR.59, pages 8 - 9). He presumed that since reference to that point had been included in the draft report (E/AC.24/L.18, page 11), the working group had had no objections to raise with regard to it.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) felt that the issue was largely academic, especially in view of the fact that discussion in the Social Committee on long-range activities for children had by now been practically completed. If the amendment were put to the vote, his delegation would abstain.

/Mr. PERIER

Mr. PERIER (France) pointed out that the draft report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/AC.24/L.18) had not been drawn up entirely by the working group. Part of it had been prepared by the Secretariat, probably with the expert advice of the United Kingdom delegation. Since the various delegations had been requested to submit their comments on that document in writing, it was in order for the French delegation to request such corrections as it deemed essential. It had therefore acted quite correctly, and declined to withdraw its amendment.

Mr. SCOPES (United Kingdom) indicated that, having made his point, he did not wish to hold up the Committee's work on a procedural point that had now become of purely academic interest, and that he would therefore abstain if the amendment were put to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN said that he wished it to be noted in the summary record that the draft report of the Committee to the Council had been prepared on the basis of the documents submitted to it by the working group, as well as on the basis of the summary records of the Committee's meetings. He himself, the Vice-Chairman, and members of the Secretariat had alone taken part in the work of drafting the report.

He then put amendment No. 13 to the vote.

Amendment No. 13, submitted by the French delegation, was adopted by 2 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Amendment No. 14

Mr. ROSHINI (United States of America) said that he would be prepared to accept the suggestion made at the preceding meeting by the Secretariat that the first two sentences of the proposed new Section IV be transferred to the beginning of Section III, on the grounds that they referred to documents which had already been considered by the Committee, and not to the documentation which should be prepared for future sessions.

With regard to the rest of his amendment, it endeavoured to give general directives for future reports from the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination

/(ACC),

(ACC), particularly in relation to the reports submitted by specialized agencies and to problems of co-ordination.

He believed, however, that paragraph (c) of the proposed new Section IV was somewhat too detailed, and therefore proposed that sub-paragraphs (1) - (4) thereof be deleted, the last clause of the text therefore reading: "..... such as those indicated in the Secretary General's report on Regional Co-ordination of Programmes of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies (E/1984)." The text of paragraph (c) thus amended would suffice to indicate to ACC that the Committee was particularly interested in co-ordination at inter-regional level.

Mr. HALSTEAD (Canada) had no comment to make on the introductory paragraph of the new Section IV as amended by the Director of Co-ordination. He was less sure about the pertinence of paragraphs (a) and (b), which, in his view, merely requested the Secretary-General to supply information which the Committee would receive in any case. The Secretary-General would undoubtedly carry out the recommendations made in the draft resolution B, if that were adopted by the Council. Although he agreed with the United States representative that it would be desirable for the Committee to have a comprehensive report, it would be unfortunate if the task imposed on the Secretariat proved too heavy, and the Committee itself were faced with an unnecessary number of documents.

With regard to paragraph (c), it certainly added a new element, and by its direct reference to document E/1984 covered the issue of inter-regional co-ordination. It was indeed desirable that the Committee should give the Secretary-General some guidance as to the form of the document which he should submit for the Council's next session. In his (Mr. Halstead's) view the report on that aspect of co-ordination should consist of a supplement to the basic report, the Secretary-General paying particular attention to the regional application of draft resolution B.

Mr. CURRIE (Australia) supported the United States amendment in general, and in particular that section of sub-paragraph (b) which

contemplated that future reports to the Co-ordination Committee should draw attention to any difficulties encountered in the development and execution of joint or complementary programmes by the various agencies of the United Nations, as well as giving a tally of adjustments in that field.

He felt that, especially at a regional level, there should not simply be an account of progress made, but also one of unresolved difficulties. He therefore suggested that the paragraph should include a specific request that future reports on regional co-ordination should outline any difficulties encountered in the co-ordination of regional programmes.

Amendment No. 16

The CHAIRMAN requested the Canadian and Australian representatives to draft a text of their proposed amendments, and invited representatives to consider, meanwhile, amendment No. 16, to the effect that the words ".... both as essential services to governments and....." be added after the words "while necessary....." in the second sentence of the first paragraph of section (b): "Priorities" of Part I of the draft report (E/AC.24/L.18, page 4).

Amendment No. 16, submitted by the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, was unanimously adopted.

The CHAIRMAN moved that the following text be included in the proposed section IV:

"The Committee considered the preparation and the submission to the Council of a special document giving information relating to the organization and allocation of personnel of the economic and social departments of the Secretariat and of the staff of the executive office of the Secretary-General concerned with relations with the co-ordination of specialized agencies as no longer necessary and recommends that they should be discontinued."

The purpose of that proposal was to avoid the compilation of reports which were neither urgent nor essential. If at any time the Committee wished

/to have a report

to have a report on personnel matters, it could make a request for it.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) supported the Chairman's amendment. He wondered whether it would not be appropriate for some part of the information on co-ordination matters to be included in the Catalogue of Social and Economic Projects.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said that references to projects as such would naturally be included in the Catalogue, but that a report on the regional co-ordination of programmes must emphasize methods and techniques.

Supporting the argument that the number of documents should be reduced, he wondered whether it would not be possible for the Secretariat to compile for the next session one single document dealing with all questions of co-ordination. At the present session the Committee had been faced with a series of documents, the inter-relationship between which had not always been easy to establish.

Mr. WALSTEAD (Canada) stated that his proposal was not intended to suggest the complementary listing of new projects at regional level, but to ensure that the Secretariat compiled a report on regional co-ordination wherein new projects would be included and described from the co-ordination point of view.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said that the purpose of his proposed text for paragraph (c) of section IV was to draw attention to certain lacunae and shortcomings. He feared that the situation described in the report submitted to the present session (E/1684) erred somewhat on the side of optimism. It was for that reason that he would welcome the more critical approach formulated by the Canadian representative.

Mr. PERIER (France) wished to make it clear that document E/1684 was not a supplement to the previous year's report, but constituted a new document. On page 3 thereof it was stated that: "The first part represents an expansion of the report previously submitted to the Council (E/1091) and brings it up to the beginning of 1959."

/He therefore



He therefore approved the United States delegation's suggestion that it would be desirable to have a single document on co-ordination, even if it had to be a very long one.

The CHAIRMAN feared that the United States representative's proposal that co-ordination reports be combined in a single document would only add to members' difficulties. It must be kept in mind that reports emanated from different agencies and dealt with co-ordination in its different aspects. A single document might therefore prove to be both cumbersome and inconvenient.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), recalling that there was a great deal of unnecessary duplication of content in the various documents submitted to the Committee, hoped that the Secretariat would give serious consideration to the possibility of combining them.

The CHAIRMAN considered that a reference to the desirability of simplifying documents and to the possibility of submitting all reports on co-ordination in the form of one document might appropriately be included in paragraph (b).

He called upon the Secretary to read the amendment agreed by the representatives of Australia and Canada.

Mr. URQUHART (Secretary to the Committee) read out the following text for a new paragraph (d) to be included in the proposed section IV:

"Any difficulties of co-ordination encountered in the execution of programmes and the application of draft resolution B at the regional level."

The adoption of that amendment would necessitate the consequential amendment of the introductory paragraph of section IV by the substitution of the words: "an account of" for the words: "its views on the following".

Amendment No. 14, submitted by the United States delegation as amended, was adopted.

Mr. URQUHART (Secretary to the Committee) read out the drafting amendments proposed by the Secretariat to the text of the report.

/the drafting



The drafting amendments proposed by the Secretariat were adopted.

The draft report to the Council of the Co-ordination Committee (E/AC.24/L.18) was adopted, as amended.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Vice-Chairman and all members of the Committee for their co-operation in what had been an arduous task. The same spirit of goodwill had been manifested throughout by the representatives of the specialized agencies. As a result, he believed that the report as it now stood would prove to be a useful document.

Mr. ROEMAN (United States of America) said that the excellent quality of the draft report was largely due to the skilful and patient work of the Chairman, to whom, on behalf of the Committee, he must express its grateful thanks.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

-----