



UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL
E/AC.24/SR.109
11 July 1952
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

Fourteenth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 30 June 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.79), E/AC.24/L.80, E/AC.24/L.81, E/AC.24/L.83, E/AC.24/L.85 and E/AC.24/L.86) (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. MASPERIOL	France
	Mr. KIA	Iran
	Mr. CASTAÑEDA	Mexico
	Mr. ISHAQ	Pakistan
	Mr. REYES	Philippines
	Mrs. MELCHIOR	Poland
	Baron von OTTER	Sweden

Members: (continued)

Mr. RASSADIN	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. ANDERSON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mr. ASHER) Mr. KOTSCHNIG)	United States of America
Mr. POLLERI-CARRIO	Uruguay

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. METALL) Mr. MORELLET)	International Labour Organisation (ILO)
Mr. ARNALDO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

Secretariat:

Mr. 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/2205; E/AC.24/L.79, E/AC.24/L.80, E/AC.24/L.81, E/AC.24/L.83, E/AC.24/L.85
and E/AC.24/L.86) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume consideration of the report of the Working Party on Priorities (E/AC.24/L.79). Consideration had been completed of Section B of the list of economic and social priority programmes. The Committee would now deal with Section C.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Working Party's report would be put to the vote or merely considered to have been adopted in the absence of formal objections. His delegation could not vote in favour of Section B or any other section if a basic amendment it had submitted was rejected.

As to the report itself, he suggested that minority views should be given there, particularly with regard to provisions put to the vote.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN stated that, in the absence of objections, sections of the report would be considered to have been adopted. However, it was open to members of the Committee to ask for a vote. The record would indicate that Section B had not met with the approval of the USSR representative in view of the rejection of an amendment he had submitted.

The Committee's decisions would be reflected in its final report. Views expressed by delegations and exceptions taken to decisions would be included in the summary records, and he would not object to the inclusion in the report of a sentence drawing attention to that fact.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the incorporation of minority views in a committee report would not constitute a departure from normal practice. He would therefore insist on the inclusion of a brief reference to the USSR delegation's views.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would include in the report a summary of the basic objections against the report as a whole.

Section C

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed the inclusion of the following sentence in paragraph (2): "Improvement in the situation of the unemployed and semi-employed by means including the introduction of state unemployment insurance, free medical service, the granting of allowances and the improvement of housing and other living conditions."

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) observed that the USSR amendment had already been discussed in the Working Party. The conclusion had been reached that, commendable though the purpose of the amendment was, its substance was already covered in the list of priorities, housing improvement under Section D and unemployment and semi-employment under Section C.

Mr. CATELIN (Argentina) agreed.

/Mr. NOVAK

Mr. NOVAK (Czechoslovakia) supported the USSR amendment. The items as listed under the various headings did not define in sufficient detail the tasks which would devolve upon the international organs entrusted with carrying out the priority programmes.

The CHAIRMAN put the USSR amendment to Section C (2) to the vote.

The USSR amendment to Section C(2) was rejected by 5 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered paragraph (3) of Section 3 inadequate. He proposed the inclusion of the following as the first sentence of the paragraph: "Re-establishment and extension of international economic ties by the renunciation of various kinds of discrimination and restriction in international trade." The paragraph as worded at present would follow that sentence.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee had two other amendments to paragraph 3 before it. The United Kingdom delegation proposed the insertion of the words "domestic and" immediately before "international trade" (E/AC.24/L.83). The Argentine delegation had submitted an amendment (E/AC.24/L.86) providing for deletion of the words "the freeing of exchanges and the lowering of customs tariffs" and substitution of "the freeing of exchanges, the lowering of customs tariffs and the recognition of fair international prices both for manufactured products and for raw materials."

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) said that the reason for his amendment was that reference had been made in other sections of the report to items such as increased production, which was a domestic matter. He had merely wished to bring Section C (3) into line with other sections. The paragraph as a whole, however, appeared to deal in substance with matters which were outside the competence of the Committee. He therefore proposed the deletion of all but the first phrase, which would now read as follows: "Promotion of a steady growth of domestic and international trade".

/Mr. CATELIN

Mr. CATELIN (Argentina) said that he would support the proposal of the United Kingdom representative and withdraw the Argentine amendment to paragraph 3.

Mr. ASFER (United States of America) supported the United Kingdom proposal. It was inadvisable to go into undue detail in providing guiding principles for the specialized agencies.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was unable to accept the United Kingdom amendment. The guiding principles had become so general that the Committee might very well confine itself to the headings under which the priority programmes were listed. The principles should be as clear as possible. The USSR amendment provided such clarification and emphasized the urgent need for extension of international economic ties which were being jeopardized by the discriminatory practices in which certain countries engaged.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) did not object to the United Kingdom amendment. He wished, however, to know whether the insertion of the words "domestic and" implied that domestic and international trade were of equal importance. Moreover, he proposed that the final phrase in paragraph 3, "with due regard to achieving an equilibrium in international accounts", should be retained. Disequilibrium in such accounts was the greatest obstacle to international trade.

Mr. NOVAK (Czechoslovakia) supported the USSR amendment since it served to clarify paragraph 3. His delegation felt that it might serve clearly to define all the tasks and difficulties to be overcome. It was impossible to speak of an expansion of international trade if, on the other hand, certain countries were taking concrete measures to prevent international trade and were applying various forms of discrimination. All that did not lead to expansion but, on the contrary, to restriction of international trade, with all its disadvantageous economic and social consequences.

The CHAIRMAN put the USSR amendment to the vote.

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

/Mr. ANDERSON

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) agreed to withdraw the words "domestic and" in paragraph 3 for the reasons advanced by the Pakistan representative. He also accepted the Pakistan amendment.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was unable to vote for Section C since two basic amendments submitted by his delegation had been rejected.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 3, under which the paragraph would read as follows: "Promotion of a steady growth of international trade, with due regard to achieving an equilibrium in international accounts".

The United Kingdom amendment was adopted by 14 votes to 3.
Section C, as amended, was adopted.

Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) observed that Section B, which had been approved by the Committee, contained a footnote stating that a minority of the Working Party had proposed the following as the fourth item under Section B: "Measures to increase the export by economically developed countries of industrial equipment and other commodities essential for the development of under-developed countries". Several representatives had felt that the footnote related to Section C more than to Section B, and he suggested that it should be transferred.

It was so agreed.

Section D

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) submitted two amendments to Section D. In paragraph 1, he proposed the addition of the words: "extension of social insurance, provision for old age, disability and sickness". He further proposed substitution of the following for paragraph 4: "Extension of housing programmes and provision of housing facilities to people in the lower income groups".

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) observed that the Working Party had dealt with those amendments and had decided against them since the subjects were already covered in Section D.

/Mr. RASSADIN

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that paragraph 1 in its present form referred to social insurance generally. The USSR amendment did not affect the substance, but made it clearer. The amendment to paragraph 4 served the same purpose.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) would prefer to retain paragraph 1 as worded. In most under-developed countries social insurance was not provided and any addition to the paragraph might therefore cause difficulties.

The CHAIRMAN put the USSR amendment to paragraph 1 to the vote.

The USSR amendment to paragraph 1 was not adopted, 4 votes being cast in favour and 4 against, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put the USSR amendment to paragraph 4 to the vote.

The USSR amendment to paragraph 4 was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

Section D, as amended, was adopted.

Section E

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the joint Cuban-French amendment (E/AC.24/L.80) to Section E.

Mr. DOMINGUEZ (Cuba), in introducing the joint amendment, emphasized that development programmes in under-developed countries were being hampered by the lack of adequately trained national staff. He knew that the Latin American countries took the view that the promotion of scientific education and research was necessary for the efficient implementation of such programmes and that that view had been brought to the attention of the United Nations Secretariat on many occasions. It would be found that the same position was taken by the authors of the document "Measures for the economic development of under-developed countries" in paragraphs 86, 88 and 91 (E/1986).

Mr. MASPETIOL (France) said that the French delegation had put forward amendments to the first United States working paper and had obtained partial satisfaction of its proposals in the Working Party, even though one item it had proposed, "Training of a cultural and social nucleus", had not /been adopted.

been adopted. Scientific education and research were of primary importance in economic and social advancement and deserved a place in the list of priorities.

Mr. REYES (Philippines) welcomed the joint amendment. There was a need not only to develop existing scientific education and research but to introduce it in some countries where it was practically non-existent. Efforts should be made to counteract the tendency of students in under-developed countries to be attracted to the prestige professions while neglecting the technological.

The Philippine delegation also supported the four priorities proposed by the Working Party. Elementary education in the Philippines was free, but owing to the ravages of war there were not enough facilities for all. Since the war, the Government had given top priority to provisions for additional facilities. His delegation attached particular importance to education in the principles, purposes and methods of international co-operation, which should help to make the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies increasingly effective.

Mr. KOTSCHENIG (United States of America) said that the interest of the United States in scientific education and research was well known. However, the Committee should not lose sight of the fact that it was establishing a list of priorities and that the promotion of research and scientific knowledge was implicit in all the items that had already been adopted. The joint amendment, while still unnecessary, might be more easily acceptable if it was amended to read: "Scientific education and research in furtherance of the priority programmes in the economic and social fields".

Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) thought that the United States sub-amendment tended to give the impression that scientific education and research were merely a means of achieving the other priority programmes. To him they represented a programme of their own, embracing not only the natural sciences but the political sciences.

Mr. MASPETIOL (France) felt that the United States proposal might be interpreted to mean that the main emphasis should be given to applied science at the expense of theoretical science. If scientific education and research were to be considered merely a means of promoting the priority

/programmes,

programmes, they had no place in the list as an independent priority. The joint amendment had something much broader in view.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) explained that his sub-amendment would not limit scientific programmes to the natural sciences. It would allow for political science and research which were certainly related to economic and social programmes.

Under the French representative's interpretation the joint amendment would amount to giving priority to any research project, however abstruse. The Committee was supposed to be establishing overall priorities for United Nations activities and could not concern itself with every detail of the programmes of individual specialized agencies.

Mr. ISHIAQ (Pakistan) drew attention to a recent statement by the United States representative in the Economic and Social Council that radio-active isotopes were being used in agriculture. The atomic research that had led to the production of those isotopes had not been undertaken to promote agriculture. That was an illustration of the application of pure research to a practical field. The inclusion of scientific education and research as a priority on its own merits seemed to be justified.

Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) did not agree that the joint amendment would give priority to any kind of research. It could certainly not be interpreted as implying that priority should be given to such a study as the use of the cuneiform in the Sumerian languages, and UNESCO could be relied upon to decide which programmes would promote scientific education and research useful to economic and social development.

The CHAIRMAN put the United States sub-amendment to the vote.

The sub-amendment was rejected by 8 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

The joint Cuban-French amendment (E/AC.24/L.80) was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN observed that with the adoption of the amendment the title of Section E would be made to read "Development of education and science".

Mr. MASPETIOL (France) submitted amendments to the French text items (1) and (2) in section E and an amendment to item (3) substituting the words "for a better understanding of" for the word "in".

The three amendments of the French delegation were adopted.

Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) drew attention to document E/AC.24/L.81, containing his amendment to item (4). Culture was not the patrimony of a privileged elite, but should be made accessible to all sections of the population.

Mr. RASSADIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to be clear about the meaning of the word "community" in the Mexican amendment. It could be translated into Russian by "obshchina" or by "obshchestvo". The former had a more restricted meaning in the sense of a local commune, while the latter had the broader connotation of society in general.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) said that he had the same difficulty. To him the word implied something narrow and might refer to a community within the larger community of the nation.

The CHAIRMAN felt that as used in the amendment the word had the broader meaning.

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) felt that the wording of the amendment did not reflect its sponsor's idea of making the cultural life of the community accessible to all sections of the population. It would be better simply to insert the words "and the cultural life of the community" between "education" and "to" in the existing text.

Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) accepted the Canadian suggestion.

/Mr. KOTSCHNIG

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) felt that the Mexican amendment would tend to make item (4) extremely broad. He recalled that the idea in the amendment had first been suggested by the UNESCO representative. It seemed to him that by making education accessible to all sections of the population UNESCO would be automatically promoting an opportunity to share in the cultural life. The adoption of the Mexican amendment would, together with item (5) already adopted, mean that every conceivable UNESCO programme would have high priority.

He reserved the right of his country's delegation to work within UNESCO for concentration upon programmes that would make that organization a fully effective tool for the betterment of the human race.

Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) pointed out that the Mexican Ministry of Education had arranged for the publication of Mexican classics in very cheap editions, thereby making them accessible to sections of the population which would otherwise not have had the opportunity to read them. Such a programme was not strictly within the sphere of education, but it was the type of programme that was urgently needed.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) said that for reasons of clarity and simplicity, he would not support the Mexican amendment. The point was already covered by implication.

Mr. TSAO (China) emphasized that the Committee was establishing vitally needed priority programmes, and not working upon a general declaration of cultural rights. Although access to classical music and books was a praiseworthy goal, it was not as important as fundamental education, for instance, in view of the UNESCO report that half the human race was illiterate.

Mr. MASPETIOL (France) said that he would support the Mexican amendment.

/Mr. ARNALDO

Mr. ARNALDO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that UNESCO was not seeking a place in the list of priorities for all of its programmes, but it did have the obligation of indicating how it could contribute best to economic and social development.

He welcomed the statement that the United States Government would assist UNESCO in its continuing effort to concentrate its programmes toward practical objectives.

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) shared some of the concern expressed by the United States representative because the Committee had already decided that the items were not to be considered as listed in order of general importance. The Mexican proposal would tend to make the list too comprehensive and thereby deprive it of the character of a list of priority programmes.

Mr. REYES (Philippines) drew attention to paragraph 7, which made the entire list of items subject to the overriding objective of promoting the economic and social development of under-developed areas. The items were therefore not an aimless grouping of programmes.

The Mexican amendment, as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

Section E, as amended, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.