

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.24/SR.108

10 July 1952

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Fourteenth Session  
CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND EIGETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 27 June 1952, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Co-ordination of the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies (E/2203; E/AC.24/L.69/Rev.1, E/AC.24/L.79, E/AC.24/L.80, E/AC.24/L.83, E/AC.24/L.84, E/AC.24/L.85, E/AC.24/L.86, E/AC.24/L.87)  
(continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. POLLOCK	(Canada)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. CATELIN	Argentina
	Mr. DELHAYE	Belgium
	Mr. CREPAULT	Canada
	Mr. TSAO	China
	Mr. DOMINGUEZ	Cuba
	Mr. NOVAK	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. RIFAAT	Egypt
	Mr. AMANRICH	France

Members (continued):

Mr. KIA	Iran
Mr. CASTENEDA	Mexico
Mr. REYES	Philippines
Mrs. MELCHIOR	Poland
Baron von OTTNER	Sweden
Mr. RASSADIN	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. ANDERSON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mr. ASHER	United States of America
Mr. POLLERI CARRIO	Uruguay

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. METALL	International Labour Organisation(ILO)
Mr. MAHEU	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
Dr. KAUL	World Health Organization (WHO)

Secretariat:

Mr. Martin HILL	Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and Economic and Social Matters
Mr. SZE	Secretary of the Committee

CO-ORDINATION OF THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES  
(E/2203; E/AC.24/L.69/Rev.1, E/AC.24/L.79, E/AC.24/L.80, E/AC.24/L.83,  
E/AC.24/L.84, E/AC.24/L.85, E/AC.24/L.86, E/AC.24/L.87) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN requested the members of the Committee to continue their consideration of the Working Party's report (E/AC.24/L.79), and drew their attention to the amendment (E/AC.24/L.87) to paragraph 11 submitted by the Swedish representative.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) withdrew his proposed amendment to paragraph 11 in favour of the Swedish amendment.

Baron von OTTER (Sweden) considered paragraph 11 to be one of the most important parts of the report. As some delegations had felt that the Working Party's text was not sufficiently flexible, he proposed that the paragraph should be reworded.

The first sentence of the first paragraph of the Swedish amendment reproduced, with some slight changes, the wording of the first sentence of paragraph 11 of the report. The words "projects which demonstrably contribute directly" were replaced by the words "projects likely to contribute directly". He drew the Committee's attention to the importance of the second sentence of the first paragraph of his amendment. It was very difficult to give an opinion on the results of priority programmes, and it would therefore be useful if the specialized agencies were to submit their comments on the matter to the Council when they formulated and reviewed their programmes. The Council would thus be able to judge the possible effects of the priority programmes, and would then decide whether it was or was not advisable to adopt new methods. At all events, it could not dispense with priority programmes, which were the only way of co-ordinating the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

The first two sentences of the second paragraph were the same as the third and fourth sentences of paragraph 11 of the report.

/Mr. CREPAULT

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) supported the Swedish amendment and proposed that the words "their comments as to the practicability of these priorities", in the final sentence of the first paragraph, should be replaced by the words "their comments on these priorities".

Mr. REYES (Philippines) also supported the Swedish amendment, in particular the deletion of the words "projects which demonstrably contribute directly". It was very difficult to judge certain aspects of the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies from that point of view; for example, the same criteria could not be applied to work connected with human rights and to the work of the Transport and Communications Commission.

Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) thought that the phrase "the Council hopes", in the final sentence of the Swedish amendment, was too weak; he proposed that they should be replaced by the words "the Council recommends".

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) supported the Swedish amendment and agreed with the change suggested by the Canadian representative. He proposed that the words "both in reviewing the existing projects and (in particular)" should be inserted in the final sentence of the second paragraph of the Swedish amendment following the word "priorities".

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) said that he had withdrawn his amendment in a spirit of compromise. He preferred the wording of the Swedish amendment to that in the Working Party's report; the former was much more precise and related the Committee's work to previous decisions. He requested members of the Committee not to submit too many changes to the Swedish amendment; in particular, he would be somewhat reluctant to accept the change suggested by the Belgian representative.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) was prepared to support the Swedish amendment provided that the various changes suggested were included. He also supported the Belgian proposal to substitute the word "recommends" for the word "hopes".

/Baron von OTTER

Baron von OTTER (Sweden) thought that the Canadian amendment, which broadened the scope of the Swedish amendment, was justified. He also supported the change suggested by the United States representative, but opposed the Belgian representative's suggestion and urged the Committee to retain the word "hopes".

Mr. POLLERI CARRIO (Uruguay) proposed that the Committee should adopt the text of the first paragraph of the Swedish amendment, with the addition of the introductory words "In accordance with resolution 402 B III (XIII)... " and with the deletion of the second paragraph, which seemed to him useless, and which might offer the commissions and specialized agencies a loophole.

The CHAIRMAN read out part B III of Council resolution 402 (XIII).

Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) urged the Committee to note that the tone of Council resolution 402 (XIII) was quite firm, and to substitute the word "recommends" for the word "hopes".

After an exchange of views, in which Baron von OTTER (Sweden), Mr. CASTENEDA (Mexico), Mr. POLLERI CARRIO (Uruguay), Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom), Mr. ASHER (United States of America) and Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) took part, Mr. AMARICH (France, seconded by Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium), proposed the substitution of the words "urgently requests" for the word "hopes".

The proposal was adopted.

The Swedish amendment (E/AC.24/L.87), as modified by the representatives of France, Canada and the United States, was adopted unanimously.

#### Paragraph 12

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) noted that under the terms of paragraph 12 the Council would invite commissions and specialized agencies to include in their next reports to the Council information on action they had taken to examine questions of priority so that the Council might review the situation at its next summer session. But some specialized agencies submitted reports only every second year, and it was therefore not known whether their "next reports"

/could be

could be made available to the Commission by the summer of 1953. Moreover, a question of that kind was best dealt with by an administrative decision; there was no need to make it the subject of a formal resolution. Lastly, the Committee should not attempt to lay down too strictly the procedure which the Council should follow. The United Kingdom delegation therefore proposed that the Committee should replace paragraph 12 by a paragraph stating that the Council would request the specialized agencies to state their opinions on the provisional list of priorities when next preparing their programmes (E/AC.24/L.83). That text would give the Council a free hand to set the date for its study of the reports of the specialized agencies and its re-examination of the question of priority programmes as a whole.

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) pointed out that paragraph 12 as it appeared in the report imposed no obligation on the Council or the specialized agencies. At its next session the Council could study any reports which had been submitted to it. The commissions and specialized agencies were not asked to report to the Council before its second session in 1953; they were merely asked to include certain information in their next reports, and no definite time-limit for submission of such reports was set. He would therefore prefer retention of the original text of paragraph 12: he felt that it had been drafted in very moderate terms.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) said that if it was clearly understood that paragraph 12 was to be interpreted in the sense which the United States representative had just explained he would withdraw his amendment.

Paragraph 12 was adopted without amendment.

List of priority programmes in the economic and social fields.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the list of priority programmes should be examined paragraph by paragraph. The first amendment relating to the list had been submitted by the United Kingdom delegation (E/AC.24/L.83) which suggested that in section A (a) (1) the words "particularly in" should be replaced by "including".

/Mr. ASHER

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) recalled that during the Working Party's discussions the representative of Pakistan had attached great importance to the drafting of the report. As that representative was absent, he wondered whether the Committee should not decide to revert to the text under discussion at some later date.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee must examine the report continuously in order to enable the Council to complete its work. If the representative of Pakistan attached great importance to the drafting of certain paragraphs he could make his observations when the Council examined the Committee's report.

The United Kingdom amendment to section A (a) (1) was adopted.

Section A of the list of priority programmes was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the authors of the report had felt that the comments of the minority should be placed in footnotes as there were no summary records of the Working Party's meetings. As the situation had changed those comments would not appear in the Committee's report to the Council unless the majority of the Committee so wished.

Mr. CATELIN (Argentina) emphasized the importance of industrial development, both nationally and internationally. The report did not sufficiently stress that point; the title of section B was not clear and the list of programmes was inadequate. The Argentine delegation therefore suggested that the title should be amended to read: "Promotion of industrial development and of the improvement of production techniques", and a new sub-section (2) added, reading as follows: "Adoption of measures to increase the export by the economically developed countries of industrial equipment and other capital goods essential to the development of the under-developed countries". (E/AC.24/L.86)

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the two Argentine amendments. It was not sufficient to state in paragraph 7 that the overriding objective was the economic and social development of under-developed areas; that fact should also be emphasized in the list of priorities.

/In addition,



In addition, the USSR delegation thought that section B should include a programme which it had already recommended, but which had been rejected by the majority of the Working Party: "Discontinuance of the reduction of civilian industry and extension of civilian production." That title should precede the new sub-section proposed by the Argentine delegation, as it was more general in scope.

Mr. CASTENEDA (Mexico) said that he would vote for the Argentine amendments; his delegation, like those of Pakistan and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, had supported Argentina's second amendment in the Working Party.

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) thought that paragraph 7, which stated that the economic and social development of under-developed areas was an overriding objective, met the purpose of the Argentine amendment. That principle was reflected in all the projects on the list, which were all means for achieving that main objective.

The object of section B as a whole was, as it should be, to increase the import capacity of under-developed countries by raising their production. The reason for the existing difficulties was not that economically developed countries refused to export industrial equipment and capital goods, but that the under-developed countries lacked sufficient funds to import them. What should be stressed, therefore, was not the need to increase exports by the economically developed countries -- which would further promote their development -- but the need to improve the position of the under-developed countries by raising their import capacity, as was provided in the list. He would therefore be unable to vote for the second Argentine amendment.

He was likewise unable to accept the USSR amendment. It would be better to maintain the general wording of section B, which made it applicable to all countries while meeting the point that the overriding objective was the development of under-developed areas. The existing text was preferable to one which would be subject to dispute because of its politically tendentious nature.

/Mr. NOVAK



Mr. NOVAK (Czechoslovakia) supported the three amendments just submitted. The USSR representative had already emphasized the importance of developing the under-developed countries; and that development could only be achieved by strengthening, within the framework of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, the economic ties and relations between the various countries. To that end, a programme of free economic development should be carried out; i.e. production for civilian purposes should no longer be limited, but on the contrary increased in order to stimulate international trade and to afford greater assistance to the under-developed countries by enabling them to obtain the capital goods which were essential to them.

Mrs. MELCHIOR (Poland) said that she would vote for the Argentine and the USSR amendments. The Council's discussion on the world economic situation had shown the dire consequences of rearmament, and her delegation thought that the Council's attention should be drawn to those vitally important problems.

Mr. POLLERI CARRIO (Uruguay) said that he would vote for the Argentine amendments, which would give the title and contents of paragraph B more positive meaning.

Mr. KIA (Iran) said that he would vote for the first Argentine amendment, since it was in conformity with the principles set forth in an amendment submitted by the Iranian delegation, which the Working Party had agreed to incorporate in paragraph 7.

The second Argentine amendment, on the other hand, seemed superfluous, as it was substantially a repetition of the paragraph in question.

Mr. REYES (Philippines) supported the Argentine amendments, which considerably improved section B of the list of priority programmes, by emphasizing the need to promote industrial development. True, paragraph 7 of the Working Party's report stated that the overriding objective was the economic development of the under-developed areas, but it made no mention of their industrial development. That point should therefore be made clear in section B of the list of priority programmes.

/Without the

Without the clarification suggested by the Argentine representative there would be nothing to prevent the continuation of the status quo in the under-developed countries, which were engaged almost exclusively in the production of raw materials for the industrialized countries. It was essential, however, that the under-developed countries should succeed in diversifying their economy. It was true that their capacity to import capital goods was limited, but the Economic and Social Council was now taking measures designed to enable the under-developed countries to obtain loans and grants, to help them to import capital goods. The Argentine amendments were therefore perfectly justified.

Mr. DOMINGUEZ (Cuba) supported the Argentine amendments for the reasons already explained by other representatives.

He asked the Secretariat to make certain that the word "promotion" in the first Argentine amendment was correctly translated into Spanish.

Mr. CASTENEDA (Mexico) also thought that a mere statement of general objectives in paragraph 7 of the report was not sufficient. There were various ways in which those objectives could be achieved; for example by development of the production of raw materials. But emphasis should also be laid on the industrial development of the under-developed countries.

Turning to the second Argentine amendment to section B he noted, in reply to the United States representative, that that amendment did not refer to exports in general, but to exports of industrial equipment and other capital goods.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) thought that the second Argentine amendment to section B was incomplete. He therefore proposed that the following phrase should be added to it: "as well as the export by the under-developed countries of the raw materials essential to the economic life of the industrialized countries".

Mr. AMANRICH (France) said that his delegation was prepared to support the first Argentine amendment to section B.

/On the

On the other hand, the French delegation doubted the expediency of the second amendment, since paragraph 7 seemed to express the idea on which the proposed amendment was based. However, if the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom was adopted, the French delegation would also vote for the second Argentine amendment.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Canada, said that he shared the Argentine representative's views on the substance of the question, but felt that the Argentine amendments would result in upsetting the balance of the document. It was already stated in paragraph 7 that the overriding objective was the economic and social development of under-developed areas. If the same principle was stated in another form in the list of priority programmes, the impression might be given that a new factor was being introduced, particularly in view of the fact that the first Argentine amendment to section B to some extent overlapped with sub-sections 3 and 4 of section B.

Moreover, the second Argentine amendment to the same section also seemed to overlap with sub-section 3 of paragraph B.

Lastly, the Canadian delegation could not accept the USSR amendment, because the purpose of that proposal was not in conformity with the spirit in which the list of priority programmes had been drawn up.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the United States delegation's attitude was illogical. The United States representative had agreed that the economic and social development of under-developed areas was the overriding objective, and that that overall priority should apply to all the projects set forth in the list of priority programmes, as was stated in paragraph 7 of the Working Party's report. There should therefore be no conflicting views on the subject.

The United States representative had stated that he could not accept the USSR amendment because under-developed countries did not reduce civilian production. Yet it had been recognized during the examination of the world economic situation in the Economic and Social Council that the reduction of civilian production and the armaments race had affected the economic situation of the world, and especially that of under-developed countries.

/The Canadian

The Canadian representative had stated that the USSR amendment was contrary to the spirit in which the list of priority programmes had been drawn up; nevertheless, the USSR amendment dealt with a highly important question and should therefore head the list of programmes set forth in section B.

The arguments advanced by the United States and Canadian representatives against the USSR amendment were therefore extremely unconvincing.

As for the Argentine amendments, other delegations had already proved that they were in no way incompatible with paragraph 7; they stressed the primary necessity of ensuring the economic development of under-developed countries and stated the means for achieving that end.

The Committee's duty was not, as the Canadian representative had said, to maintain the balance of a document, but to draw up as complete as possible a list of priority programmes.

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) said that his delegation did not oppose the industrial development of the under-developed countries, but considered that the amendment to section B overlapped with paragraph 7 of the Working Party's report. The problem might be solved by amending the second part of the first sentence of paragraph 7 to read as follows: "namely the industrial, agricultural and social development of under-developed areas". That would show clearly that what was meant was industrial development as well as other types of development.

The second Argentine amendment, as amended by the United Kingdom delegation, if anything constituted an invitation to develop trade in general; that being so, it was out of place in section B.

In reply to the USSR representative, lastly, he pointed out that the discussion on the world economic situation in the Economic and Social Council had by no means led to the conclusion that civilian production and industrial activity had been reduced in many countries, the under-developed countries included.

Mr. CATELIN (Argentina) accepted the United Kingdom amendment to the second Argentine amendment. His delegation was unable however to accept the suggestion made by the United States representative; it urged that programmes for industrial development should be given high priority.

/Mr. ISHAQ

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) thought that the United Kingdom proposal was based on a misunderstanding. It was clear that the Argentine amendments referred essentially to industrial development, since the question of food production, for example, had been considered under section A.

The Pakistan delegation therefore opposed the United Kingdom amendment; if it were adopted, as the United States representative had pointed out, the text would be out of place in section B, and would then have to be included in section C.

Mr. ALDERSON (United Kingdom) pointed out that if the under-developed countries succeeded in developing their economy thanks to the import of capital goods from economically developed countries, they would be able to increase their own exports. In return, for increased exports of capital goods by industrialized countries therefore, there should be increased exports of raw materials by under-developed countries. All economies were interdependent, and it was important to consider the various aspects of the problem.

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) thought that the wording suggested by the United States representative would make it possible to state more precisely in the first part of the report the principles to be applied to the various priority programmes on the list.

Mr. CASTENEDA (Mexico) thought that if the United States suggestion was adopted it would still be necessary to put to the vote the two Argentine amendments, which were in no way incompatible with paragraph 7; the latter text defined the overriding objective, whereas the list of priority programmes stated the practical means for achieving that objective.

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) thought that his suggestion would be of no value unless it was substituted for the amendments that had been submitted. Since the Argentine representative was unable to accept that suggestion, he would prefer to withdraw it.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN proposed to put to the vote the first Argentine amendment and then the USSR amendment; if those two amendments were adopted, the Committee would have to decide on the order in which they should be included in section B.

It was so decided.

The first Argentine amendment was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The USSR amendment was rejected by 9 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

At the request of Mr. CASTENEDA (Mexico), the CHAIRMAN stated that the second Argentine amendment, as amended by the United Kingdom, would be put to the vote in parts, the first part consisting of the original Argentine amendment and the second part of the United Kingdom amendment.

The first part of the amendment was adopted by 14 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The second part of the amendment was adopted by 6 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) said that he had voted against both parts of the amendment because he considered that they dealt with trade problems, which were out of place in section B.

After an exchange of views, in which the CHAIRMAN, Mr. CREFAULT (Canada), Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) and Mr. CASTENEDA (Mexico) took part, concerning the amendment proposed by the Cuban delegation to section B, sub-section 3 (E/AC.24/L.84), Mr. DOMINGUEZ (Cuba) said that in view of the adoption of the Argentine amendments he would withdraw his delegation's amendment, since it had lost its point.

There being no objections, section B, as amended, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.