

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL  
E/AC.24/SR.110  
15 July 1952  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

Fourteenth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND TENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 1 July 1952, at 10.30 a.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.83, E/AC.24/L.86)

|                  |               |                |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <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. MASPETIOL | France         |
|                  | Mr. KIA       | Iran           |
|                  | Mr. CASTANEDA | Mexico         |
|                  | Mr. ISHAQ     | Pakistan       |
|                  | Mr. REYES     | Philippines    |

Members: (continued)

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Mrs. MELCHIOR                  | Poland  |
| Baron von OTTER                | Sweden  |
| Mr. RASSADIN                   | Union of Soviet Socialist<br>Republics                  |
| Mr. ANDERSON                   | United Kingdom of Great Britain<br>and Northern Ireland |
| Mr. KOTSCHNIG )<br>Mr. ASHER ) | United States of America                                |
| Mr. POLLERI-CARRIO             | Uruguay   |

Representatives of specialized agencies:

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Mr. METALL )<br>Mr. MORELLET ) | International Labour Organisation<br>(ILO)                                      |
| Miss BANOS                     | Food and Agriculture Organization<br>(FAO)                                      |
| Mr. ARNALDO                    | United Nations Educational,<br>Scientific and Cultural<br>Organization (UNESCO) |

Secretariat:

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Mr. HILL    | Director of Co-ordination for<br>Specialized Agencies and<br>Economic and Social Matters |
| Mr. SCHWELD | Assistant Director of the<br>Division of Human Rights                                    |
| 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.83, E/AC.24/L.86)

List of priority programmes in the economic and social fields

Section F

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Argentine delegation had withdrawn its amendment to Section F (E/AC.24/L.86).

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) proposed that Section F, item (2) as modified by the United Kingdom amendment (E/AC.24/L.83), should become item (1). The present item (1) would become item (2).

/The reason

The reason for his delegation's amendment to item (3), which would reduce it to the phrase "Promotion of freedom of information", was the vagueness of the second part of the original text.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that in the Working Party his delegation had already had occasion to propose amendments to section F.

He formally moved that the words "discriminatory measures of any kind" at the end of item (2) should be replaced by the words "...discrimination on grounds of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status", which were used in the first sentence of article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. A complete enumeration of that kind was perfectly appropriate in section F of the list of priority programmes.

He also proposed that item (3) of section F should be replaced by the words "Promotion of freedom of information, with the objective of assisting the development of friendly relations and co-operation between nations in solving economic, social and humanitarian problems" (E/AC.24/L.79, page 7, footnote 3).

He further proposed the insertion in section F, of a new item (3) to read as follows: "Participation of women in the fight for international peace and security, action to eliminate discrimination against women in political and economic matters, including measures to secure the full implementation in all countries of the principle of equal pay for equal work as applied to men and women" (E/AC.24/L.79, page 7, footnote 1).

He also proposed the addition of a new item, to become item (4), reading as follows: "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 110 (II) concerning measures to be taken against propaganda and the inciters of a new war" (E/AC.24/L.79, page 7, footnote 1).

If the various USSR amendments were adopted, the revised text of item (3) of the original draft of section F would become item (5).

The CHAIRMAN noted that there was no amendment to item (1) of section F.

Baron van OTTER (Sweden) recalled that during the general discussion in the Working Party he had pointed out that one of the basic tasks of the United Nations and the specialized agencies was to promote freedom of information and its dissemination in order to prevent discrimination on grounds of race, sex, language, religion or other considerations. To some extent, the Soviet Union amendment met the view he had expressed on that occasion. Unlike the Swedish delegation, however, the USSR proposed that that view should be expressed in the form of a heading in the list of priority programmes. The Swedish delegation could not support that proposal because so detailed a formula was out of place in a list of priority programmes.

Mr. CASTANEDA (Mexico) said that in the Working Party, his delegation had advocated that the language of article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be used in section F; the proposal had not, however, been supported by the majority. The United Kingdom wording, which referred to the discriminatory measures condemned in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, was an acceptable compromise.

Mr. ISAQ (Pakistan) and Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) also supported the United Kingdom proposal.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) suggested that the word "condemned" in the United Kingdom amendment to sub-paragraph (2) of paragraph F should be replaced by the word "mentioned".

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) accepted that change.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment to section F, item (2). The amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom amendment to section F, item (2) with the change suggested by the United States representative.

The United Kingdom amendment, as so modified, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) suggested that the United Kingdom amendment to section F, item (3) should be modified to read: "Promotion of freedom of information and of the press". He recalled that the Working Party had incorporated the last phrase in the original text of item (3) as a compromise. The wording was not clear, however, and should be deleted especially as the idea it expressed was already contained in the first part of the text.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) considered that in English the words "responsible media" were capable of various interpretations and should therefore not be used.

Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) to some extent supported the Soviet amendment to section F, item (3) because it stressed one of the basic objectives of freedom of information. The promotion of freedom of information, however, was also intended to achieve other goals such as the improvement of standards of living. It would therefore be wiser not to attempt to list the aims to be achieved. He did not really believe that the use of the English words "responsible media" would give rise to any difficulties. Of course, it was for other United Nations bodies to determine to what extent the media for the dissemination of information were "responsible" but it was essential to state in the list of priority programmes that the media for the dissemination of information should be free and responsible.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the Mexican representative, noted that the Soviet amendment to item (3) would be in fact help to achieve the aims to which the Mexican representative had referred

/since

since the development of friendly relations and co-operation between nations would undoubtedly contribute to the improvement of standards of living.

The USSR amendment to section F, item (3) was rejected by 7 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) felt that the words "and of the press" in item (3) were a duplication of the phrase "freedom of information" and accordingly suggested that the item should be amended to read: "Promotion of freedom of information and of responsible media for its dissemination". If the principle of freedom of information was to be stated, the means of disseminating it should also be mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Canadian proposal to add the words "and of the press" to the United Kingdom amendment.

The Canadian proposal was adopted by 8 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

After a discussion between the CHAIRMAN, Mr. CREPAULT (Canada), Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) and Mr. CASTANEDA (Mexico) regarding the question of voting on the Pakistani amendment, Mr. CASTANEDA (Mexico) suggested that the procedural difficulty might be solved by putting to the vote the original text of item (3) instead of the amendment.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) accepted the proposal.

That procedure was adopted.

The original text of section F, item (3) was rejected by 9 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom amendment, as modified by Canada, reading: "Promotion of freedom of information and of the press".

The amendment was adopted by 8 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the first USSR proposal to add a new item to section F. The text of the proposal appeared in footnote 1 to page 7 of the Working Party's report (E/AC.24/L.79).

Mrs. MELCHIOR (Poland) said that women could not dissociate themselves from the problem of peace and security at a time when certain countries were preparing for a new war. Like the USSR representative, she thought that women should take part in the struggle for peace. They suffered more from war than men. The adoption of the USSR resolution would enable women to take part in the building of a better world.

In resolution 532 (VI) the General Assembly had stated that the task of the Commission on the Status of Women was not yet completed since the principle of equal rights for men and women had not yet achieved universal recognition and that in many countries women had not yet been granted equal rights with men.

It was not sufficient to decide that women should have equal rights with men; they must be given the possibility of exercising those rights. The problem must receive the attention it deserved and it was altogether proper that it should be included in the list of priority programmes.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation could not accept the USSR proposal for a number of reasons, in particular because the text seemed to imply that only women wanted to fight for international peace.

As regards the elimination of any kind of discrimination, to which the USSR proposal referred, the Committee had just adopted a text, in connexion with section F, item (2) which provided for the elimination of all the discriminatory measures referred to in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That wording obviously applied to wages also. The USSR proposal was therefore superfluous.

/Mr. RASSADIN



Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Polish representative had brought out very clearly the importance of the USSR text. He failed to see how the United States representative could interpret that text as implying any discrimination against men; if that line of reasoning were followed, it would have to be argued that the Commission on the Status of Women was endeavouring to improve the position of women to the detriment of that of men.

The objectives defined in the USSR proposal were of the highest importance, and it was essential that the text should be incorporated in section F.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 8 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the second USSR amendment, the text of which appeared in footnote 2 on page 7 of document E/AC.24/L.79.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation attached great importance to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 110 (II), in particular in regard to information. That resolution must be implemented if the priority programmes in the list under consideration were to be carried out effectively.

Mr. NOVAK (Czechoslovakia) supported the USSR proposal, which was based on a resolution adopted by the highest organ of the United Nations.

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) was opposed to any propaganda in favour of a new war, but could not vote for the USSR proposal which in its present form did not appear to serve any useful purpose.

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

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) reminded the Committee of his proposal to reverse the order of items (1) and (2) of section F so that they would be placed in logical sequence.

/Mr. RASSADIN



Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) doubted whether the United Kingdom proposal served any useful purpose.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) was surprised that the United Kingdom representative should raise the question of logical order at the present stage, in view of the fact that, when the Working Party's list had first been examined, he had been opposed to the listing of items in logical order.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) withdrew his proposal. He suggested, however, that in the final document items should not be numbered, so as to avoid giving the impression that the programmes had been listed in order of importance.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Secretariat should add a footnote at the beginning of the list, explaining that the programmes were not listed in order of importance.

It was so decided.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would be unable to vote for section F as a whole as the Committee had not adopted the basic proposals submitted by his delegation.

Mr. NOVAK (Czechoslovakia) also said he would be unable to vote for section F. He was also not prepared to vote for the report as a whole.

Section F was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

In reply to a question by Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had decided at its preceding meeting that the Secretariat would include a paragraph in the report summarizing the minority views. The Committee could therefore either approve the report at the present meeting, on the understanding that that paragraph would be submitted to it for approval later, or wait until a subsequent meeting to approve the complete text of the report.

/Mr. RASSADIN

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that in the paragraph the Secretariat should include not only the views held by the minority but also the texts of the various proposals which the Committee had not adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) said that while he had taken an active part in the examination of the Working Party's list, his delegation had already expressed its doubts regarding the value of a list of that kind. He asked that that view should be reported among the minority views, and announced that he would be obliged to abstain in the vote on the report as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN confirmed that the Secretariat would incorporate the minority views and reservations in a special paragraph; but explained that the full text of proposals which the Committee had rejected would be found in the summary records of the meetings and in the relevant documents. In deference to the USSR representative's request he proposed that the Committee should postpone the vote on the report as a whole to a later meeting.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the United States draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.69/Rev.2).

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) said that since the drafting of the original United States draft resolution the Committee had received the text of the resolution adopted by the General Committee of the Thirteenth Congress of the Universal Postal Union (E/AC.24/L.85). Under the revised United States draft, the Council would take note of that resolution and call upon the specialized agencies to submit to the Secretary-General any proposals which they might make so that they could be made the subject of consultation with the Universal Postal Union before consideration by the General Assembly.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) supported the United States draft resolution, but proposed that in the English text the words "calls upon" should be changed to "requests".

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) accepted that suggestion.

/Mr. ANDERSON

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) supported the United States draft resolution. He agreed that in that matter the specialized agencies should adopt that uniform method, with regard to which the Universal Postal Union should be consulted.

Mr. HILL (Secretariat) pointed out to the Committee that a working group had been set up by the ACC to formulate proposals, within the framework of the UPU resolution, whereby the United Nations might act on behalf of the specialized agencies in this matter. This working party had been meeting and proposals would in due course be considered by the Secretary-General and the ACC.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opposed the United States draft resolution which in his view would result in the fusion of the activities of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies with regard to postal matters.

The United States draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

Mr. HILL (Secretariat), replying to three questions raised by the United Kingdom representative at the Committee's 103rd meeting, recalled that the United Kingdom representative had asked whether the study on population growth, contained in the 47th Epidemiological and Vital Statistics report of the WHO, had been undertaken in consultation with the Secretariat.

The WHO before publishing the article had not consulted the United Nations Secretariat which had at the time been preparing a report covering much the same ground. But the WHO article was intended to make available to the readers of the Epidemiological and Vital Statistics reports the data collected by the United Nations Statistical Office and Population Division and was not conceived as a separate study. Although the WHO figures for 1900 diverged from those used in the United Nations report referred to, there was agreement between most of the data.

/The United Kingdom

The United Kingdom representative had also asked whether the Social Science Department of UNESCO had consulted the United Nations Secretariat before undertaking surveys of demographic problems in Equatorial Africa and whether such studies should not have been undertaken by the United Nations.

In July 1950 UNESCO's committee of experts on that matter had decided that studies of demographic problems in countries in the process of industrialization fell within the scope of the United Nations. Nevertheless, it had felt that UNESCO could usefully undertake a programme of supplementary studies on aspects of the problem which were of particular concern to it. The representatives of the United Nations had concurred in that view, on the understanding that UNESCO would keep in close touch with the United Nations Secretariat. The competent officials of UNESCO had accordingly consulted the United Nations Secretariat before undertaking the field of studies in question.

The United Kingdom representative had also pointed out that his Government had received two questionnaires on vital statistics, one from the United Nations Secretariat, and another from WHO.

In 1947, in accordance with the Statistical Commission's recommendations regarding the co-ordination of activities in the statistical field, a procedure had been adopted for the co-ordination of requests for statistical information addressed to Governments by international organizations. As a general rule statistical programmes were announced in a preliminary note, the draft questionnaires were sent to the various agencies, which submitted their observations on them, and copies of the final questionnaire sent to all the interested organs; lastly, the information collected by one agency was made available to all the others. The United Nations Statistical Office acted as the co-ordination centre. It had been agreed that the information collected by the United Nations for the Demographic Yearbook covered WHO's needs.

Duplication of questionnaires was therefore avoided. However, a specialized agency could still apply to Governments for special information. In the case in question, WHO had asked the United Kingdom Government for information it urgently required to complete a study which was about to be published. It had been unable to wait to receive the information through the United Nations.

/Mr. ANDERSON

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) thanked Mr. HILL for his explanation.

The CHAIRMAN announced that at its forthcoming meetings the Committee would examine the programmes of the various specialized agencies. The question of the participation of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions would have to be considered in that connexion.

Mr. HILL (Secretariat) recalled that General Assembly resolution 413 (V) had requested the Economic and Social Council, in reviewing programmes to seek the assistance of the Advisory Committee on the administrative and financial aspects of the matter. In resolution 533 (VI), the General Assembly had asked the Council to continue its procedures.

At its last summer session, the Council had decided to invite the Advisory Committee to supply it with any comments on administrative and financial co-ordination which in its view would help the Council in its review of the various programmes. It had also asked the Secretary-General, in that connexion, to transmit to the Advisory Committee the programmes of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. After consultation with the President of the Council and the Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee, the Secretary-General had accordingly invited the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to transmit the Committee's views to the Council if possible by the third week in July. The Secretary-General had also communicated to the Advisory Committee the 1953 programmes of the Commissions and specialized agencies, as well as the Secretariat's summary of those programmes.

The CHAIRMAN decided that, in those circumstances, the Committee would reconvene on 21 July to study the programmes of specialized agencies.