

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.24/SR.83
17 October 1951

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH AND FRENCH

Dual distribution

Thirteenth Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-THIRD MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 4 September 1951, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Pages

Co-ordination among the United Nations and the specialized agencies (item 39 of the Council agenda) (continued):

- (c) Review of the 1952 programmes of the United Nations and the specialized agencies (E/1991 and Add.1, E/2053, E/AC.24/L.27 and Add.1, E/AC.24/L.28, E/AC.24/L.29) (continued):
- (i) Specialized agencies (continued):
 - (5) World Health Organization (continued) 4
 - (6) International Civil Aviation Organization 7
 - (ii) General discussion on priorities 8
 - (iii) Communication from the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (E/2053) 21

Present:

Chairman: Mr. KOTSCHNIG

Members:

Belgium	Mr. BLONDEEL
Canada	Mr. ROGERS
Chile	Mr. DONOSO
China	Mr. TSAO
Czechoslovakia	Mr. TRHLÍK
France	Mr. HESSEL
India	Mr. DESAI
Iran	Mr. JAZAERI
Pakistan	Mr. Atwar HUSSAIN
Philippines	Mr. REYES
Poland	Mr. URBANIAK Miss KITAJGRODZKA
Sweden	Mr. CARBONNIER
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. KORUKIN
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. ANDERSON
United States of America	Mr. CATES
Uruguay	Mr. ALVAREZ OLLONIEGO

Observers from Member States:

Brazil	Mr. MACHADO
Egypt	Mr. CORDON

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. EVANS Mr. COX
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. BERKELEY
World Health Organization	Dr. Brock CHISHOLM Dr. FORREST
International Refugee Organization	Miss BAVERSTOCK

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category B and Register:

Catholic International Union for Social Service	Mr. LUITEN
International Federation of University Women	Miss MILLS
League of Red Cross Societies	Mr. LEDERMANN

Secretariat:

Mr. Martin Hill	Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and Economic and Social Matters
Mr. Sze	Secretary to the Committee

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category B and Register

International Alliance of Women	Miss GINSBERG
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom	Mrs. BAER

Secretariat:

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

CO-ORDINATION AMONG THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES
(item 39 of the Council agenda) (continued):

(c) REVIEW OF THE 1952 PROGRAMMES OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (E/1991 and Add.1, E/2053, E/AC.24/L.27 and Add.1, E/AC.24/L.28, E/AC.24/L.29) (continued):

(i) Specialized agencies (continued):

(5) World Health Organization (continued):

The CHAIRMAN said that the statement made at the preceding meeting by the representative of the World Health Organization (WHO) had brought out very clearly the fact that the United Nations had, from the start, been dealing, knowingly or unknowingly, with both substantive and regional priorities, between which a clear distinction should be drawn. Matters which were given priority because of their substance, such as land reform, should not be confused with questions to which priority was assigned on regional grounds, such as assistance to war-devastated areas, financial assistance to under-developed countries, help to Korea and the like.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) congratulated WHO on the fact that its programme had been drawn up on a priority basis. The organization's report showed that general considerations and overall priorities had to be brought into line with the particular needs of each region. The fact that WHO had found it possible to draw up its programme in terms of the criteria established the previous year by the Council was of importance, as it indicated that the establishment of such criteria was, in fact, of practical use.

Mr. HESSEL (France) noted with appreciation that in drawing up its work programme WHO had made great efforts to apply the criteria laid down by the Council. He was glad to see that it was possible to arrange a work programme indicating first priorities, as WHO had done. In the case of the programmes of the regional organs it was necessary, when determining priorities, to apply individual criteria for each region. That should not, however, be carried too far.

As his delegation had already pointed out, when the WHO report had been under consideration in plenary meeting, there must be limits to regionalism. The relative urgency of projects within the framework of WHO's general activities should not be lost sight of. The representative of WHO had spoken of organizations such as the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), which operated in fields which in some cases bordered on those of WHO, and whose activities were equally important and should have equally high priority. Hence the Council would be well advised to take the activities of such organizations into consideration when establishing priorities among the projects of the specialized agencies in general, and among those of WHO in particular.

The CHAIRMAN emphasized the importance of the last point made by the French representative, a point which he himself had intended to take up when the discussion of the programmes of the specialized agencies had been completed.

Mr. JAZAERI (Iran) expressed agreement with the remarks of the previous speakers. He particularly wished to thank and congratulate WHO on the work it had done in certain countries of the Middle East, and especially in Iran. He hoped that WHO would continue to concern itself with the needs of those countries.

Mr. DONOSO (Chile) joined the previous speakers in congratulating WHO. He was particularly appreciative of the efforts that that organization had made to establish priorities in accordance with the criteria laid down by the Council.

It must not be forgotten that, although "priority" meant a general priority, it implied regional priority as well. It should also be remembered that emergencies might arise and call for changes in the established order of priorities. Thus, WHO had been called upon to take emergency measures in Chile to deal with an unexpected epidemic of poliomyelitis. The violence of the outbreak had taken Chile by surprise, since the country had been without experience in that field. WHO had provided all the staff and supplies required to fight the epidemic successfully. That showed how necessary it was to extend the priority system to include sudden emergencies.

Mr. DESAI (India), while agreeing with the various points made by previous speakers, wished to stress one point in particular, namely: when the allotment of priorities was discussed, the interplay of regional and global priorities ought to be taken into account. He suggested that the Committee might discuss the question of the relative importance to be allotted to regional and general priorities in the work programme of a commission or specialized agency.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the point raised by the Indian representative might be considered later, when other general points which had been raised during the debate were discussed.

Mr. REYES (Philippines) agreed with the observations of the Indian representative. He had been much impressed by the WHO representative's statement, and in particular by the way in which the needs of individual regions, and countries within those regions, had been considered without in any way neglecting the general problems which WHO had to tackle on a world scale.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) said that the work of WHO and that organization's excellent report showed the need for extreme flexibility in the interpretation of priorities.

Mr. MACHADO (Observer for the Brazilian Government) said that the application of a rigid system of priorities would not in practice produce the results it was desired to secure.

In drawing up a programme, the nature of the work done by each specialized agency must be considered. Recommendations by the Council should not refer to the specific programmes of work of each body or agency, but should ask for the specialized agencies' help in broad fields, such as full employment, long-term needs of children, migration, assistance to Palestinian refugees, reconstruction in Korea, assistance to under-developed countries, the increase of food production and so on. Having asked for help in those fields, the Council would have the right to expect reports from the specialized agencies on the action which they had taken under each heading.

In the absence of further speakers on the programme of WHO, the CHAIRMAN declared the discussion closed.

(6) International Civil Aviation Organization

In the absence of a representative of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), Mr. SZE, Secretary to the Committee, said that he had little to add to the statement made by the ICAO Assembly, which was reproduced in paragraph 66 of document E/AC.24/L.28. He pointed out, however, that in the report of ICAO (Supplementary Report of the ICAO Council to the Assembly on the activities of the Organization, 1 January - 31 May 1951, Ch. VI, first paragraph) (E/2033/Add.3), it was stated that General Assembly resolution 413 (V) had been taken into account by the ICAO Council in preparing the organization's budget estimates for 1952, and that a list of ICAO's major fields of activity had been prepared and submitted to its Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that ICAO was an operational organization, with many permanent functions of an administrative and regulatory nature. The problem of priorities arose, therefore, only in relation to a limited number of the organization's activities. The question before the Committee was whether, in accordance with the Council's recommendations, it was desirable for ICAO to do more in the way of establishing priorities regarding that restricted number of activities.

Mr. HESSEL (France) thought that ICAO might well follow the practice of the other specialized agencies and submit a work programme with some indication of the priority accorded to each project. Although it might not be possible to present the programme in the same form as those of the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) and WHO, for example, it was particularly necessary for ICAO to adopt the common procedure, because the risk it ran in dispensing with a system of priorities was rather serious. If the Council were given no indication of ICAO's own allocation of priorities, it might inadvertently allot second priority to all ICAO projects.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) agreed with the French representative. He recognized that ICAO's task was one which lent itself less easily to treatment by the system of priorities. Priorities were, in any case, not an end in themselves, but a means to an end, and ICAO had, in fact, established its own priorities by determining in what order to deal with the work referred to in the Annexes to its report. He felt, however, that it would be most useful if ICAO and other operational agencies could submit their work programmes in an easily understandable form.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) was loth to agree that ICAO should be recommended to do a great deal of work in drawing up a programme which it considered unnecessary. He suggested that it should be asked to supply further particulars of its work programme, which the Council could consider at its fifteenth session; the Council could then say whether it required fuller details about the application of the Council's criteria for priorities.

In the absence of further speakers on the programme of ICAO the CHAIRMAN declared the discussion closed.

(ii) General discussion on priorities.

The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to consider, first, whether the relevant General Assembly resolutions applied only to the Council, its technical commissions and the specialized agencies, or whether they also applied to various other more or less autonomous bodies with separate programmes within the United Nations, such as UNICEF, and secondly, whether the latter type of organization should also establish priorities.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) wondered whether the establishment of the semi-autonomous bodies to which the Chairman had referred did not, in point of fact, of itself, reflect the desire of the General Assembly and the Council to emphasize certain broad priority categories. Technical assistance was, for example, a practical aspect of the priority given to assistance to under-developed

countries. . If the programmes of such agencies were, in fact, already based on priorities, the Committee might be tending to discuss "priorities within priorities".

The CHAIRMAN said that in the case of the technical assistance programmes it was for the Technical Assistance Committee and the Technical Assistance Board to deal with the problem of priorities.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) suggested that the various resolutions on the subject adopted by the General Assembly and the Council should at least be brought to the attention of the various so-called semi-autonomous organizations of the type to which the Chairman had referred.

Mr. MACHADO (Observer for the Brazilian Government) pointed out that the very names of such organizations as UNICEF, the United Nations Korean Relief Agency (UNKRA), the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWAPR) indicated that their activities were a United Nations responsibility, and that the Council was the only organ of the United Nations which was competent to exert authority over them.

Mr. BLONDEEL (Belgium) thought that, as he had stated on an earlier occasion, the independence of the specialized and semi-autonomous agencies was not incompatible with the co-ordination of their efforts with those of the United Nations. The fact that they enjoyed a measure of autonomy made it possible for those agencies to decide to associate themselves more closely with the efforts of other United Nations organizations. There was therefore no reason why the Council should not address to them a recommendation to that effect. A separate recommendation should, however, be drawn up for each agency, since each of them had its own peculiar structure.

Mr. Martin HILL (Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and Economic and Social Matters) said that the problem, raised some weeks earlier, of how the semi-autonomous organizations could best be brought within the United Nations framework in respect of the procedures for co-ordination among the United Nations and the specialized agencies, was different from the question whether the same rules and procedures should be applied to them with regard to priorities. At the earlier discussion, it had been agreed that semi-autonomous organizations should be informed of, and asked to co-operate in, arrangements which were agreed at a high level concerning such matters as prior consultation, reasonable deadlines for the submission of new projects, respect for the obligations contained in agreements with the specialized agencies and so on. It was already the practice to invite their representatives to meetings of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), and arrangements for co-ordination with them would be intensified in the future.

He doubted, however, whether procedures with regard to priorities which were applicable to the functional and regional commissions and specialized agencies could be made fully applicable to the semi-autonomous organizations. For example, UNRWAPR was, in fact, already operating a priority programme, and its main priorities were very evident, namely: to feed the Palestine refugees and to try to find works projects which would enable them to become self-supporting. Again, in the case of UNICEF, which was a supply organization catering for a large number of different countries, priorities between programmes for one country and another would be most invidious, and unlikely to be profitable. Conditions with regard to supply and operative agencies were, in general, very different from those obtaining in the case of commissions and agencies dealing primarily with studies and investigations.

Mr. HESSEL (France) thought the statement just made by the Director of Co-ordination was of great importance, as it would induce the Co-ordination Committee to define more clearly the object of its work. It was possible that within the next two years the Council would have established the practice of drawing up a list of the main problems on which the efforts of all States Members of the United Nations should be concentrated. It would then only be necessary to bring the list to the notice of the specialized agencies and other emergency agencies, such as UNICEF or UNRWAFR, to enable them to find out where their activities stood in the general work programme of the Council. Thus the object to be aimed at was essentially that defined by the observer for the Brazilian Government, namely, the concentration of effort on the most important problems. The work at present being done by the Committee was preparing the ground for the attainment of that objective. It was important, therefore, to ascertain what was now being done in the economic and social sphere. The implication of Council resolution 324 (XI) was that it was for agencies entrusted with particular tasks to submit to the Council of their own accord indications as to what they thought should be the order of priority within their own programmes. It would then be the duty of the Council to approve or revise those priorities in the light of a number of general considerations. For that purpose, the Council would have to be informed, when it came to consider the priorities fixed by a given agency, of the importance of the activities being undertaken by other bodies in the economic and social sphere. With regard to activities coming directly under the Council, and not within the framework of the activities of its commissions, they were also matters of priority, though they formed a single whole. Once it had been seized of all the details, the Council would have a satisfactory basis for deciding as to the priority to be given to certain of its activities.

Mr. TSAO (China) pointed out that under the General Assembly resolution establishing UNICEF, the Council and its Social Commission were clearly responsible for laying down policies for that organization. Moreover, the membership of the Executive Board of UNICEF overlapped that of the Social Commission. Although

some members of the Board were not Members of the United Nations, yet the same was true of the specialized agencies, so that if the latter were bound to respect the priorities laid down by the Council, UNICEF was surely even more bound to do so. In practice, the report submitted by UNICEF enumerated its priorities, which had quite legitimately been discussed in some detail by the Social Commission.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) noted that there was general agreement that the Council's recommendations should be brought to the notice of the semi-autonomous organizations. Agreement had not, however, been reached on the action to be taken on those recommendations. He hoped that none of the funds voted by governments for emergency operations would be wasted by the operative agencies in discussions concerning priorities. Co-ordination, as the Indian representative had pointed out at another meeting in another place, was the thief of time, and time was money.

Mr. MACHADO (Observer for the Brazilian Government) felt that recommendations regarding priorities should be addressed both to those who spent and to those who supplied funds, that was, to agencies and governments alike. When lists of projects were drawn up, the money to be spent on each item should be noted. The total spent by governments on United Nations activities was from six to eight times as much as their compulsory contribution to the United Nations budget. If they had not enough money to contribute to the work of all the agencies, governments could contribute to it on the basis of the Council's priorities. Before priorities could be laid down, however, an over-all picture was required, and that existed nowhere, except, perhaps, in national treasuries. The institution of a central organ to control policy had been contemplated at the meeting of the Preparatory Commission at San Francisco. It had in the end been decided to adopt a system of decentralization; but where there was decentralization, co-ordination became essential.

The CHAIRMAN said that it might be considered that priorities were so clear in the case of operative and supply (semi-autonomous or emergency) organizations that they did not require to be stated specifically. He himself, however, felt that the complexity of the work done by organizations like UNICEF necessarily meant that some items were more important than others. It was, moreover, not logical to ask specialized agencies to follow the Council's recommendations regarding priorities, if other organizations which actually came under the United Nations direct were not required to do so.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) agreed that the very nature of certain organizations meant that priorities were not applicable to them. There was no apparent reason, however, why the Council's recommendations should not be studied by those organizations, which would not be obliged to apply them if they found them inapplicable. There was, in any event, no need to take a decision on the matter at the present juncture.

Mr. HESSEL (France) was in favour of the Council taking a further step in the same direction. The Director of Co-ordination had very ably described the special difficulties facing the various United Nations organs. The Secretary-General might draw up a table of the activities of those various organs in the economic and social field, apart from activities coming within the orbit of the Council's commissions. The table would form a useful complement to that in the Secretariat's note (E/AC.24/L.28), which threw no light on the activities of certain institutions such as the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees and UNICEF.

Mr. DESAI (India) agreed with the United Kingdom and United States representatives that recommendations regarding co-ordination should be transmitted to the semi-autonomous organizations. Those organizations should be asked to implement those decisions and suggestions so far as possible, and to report on what they had done. It could be decided what further action should be taken, when their reports had been examined by the Committee. It did not seem to him that the Committee should go any further at the present stage.

Mr. Martin HILL (Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and Economic and Social Matters) explained that the point he had wished to make was solely that such semi-autonomous agencies might find difficulty in implementing such recommendations. He had not intended to imply that recommendations should not be addressed to the agencies for them to comply with so far as they could. Where there was no direct link between the Council and such an agency, the Secretary-General would be glad to act as an intermediary in forwarding the recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee's report would contain a suggestion that recommendations should be forwarded to the semi-autonomous agencies through the Secretary-General.

He then recalled the fact that at the 82nd meeting the observer for the Brazilian Government had raised the question of what practical results were to be expected from the establishment of priorities by specialized agencies and the Council's commissions. It seemed to him a good idea that, before any details were entered into, there should be a brief paragraph in the report stating why those priorities were being considered. That paragraph might perhaps state that priorities were essential in any form of planning, for the essence of priorities, as of planning itself, was that the most important things should be put first. The priorities in question were required as was stated clearly in the relevant General Assembly and Council resolutions - specifically to bring about a greater concentration of effort, whether in the principal organs of the United Nations or in its various subsidiary organs, the specialized agencies and the commissions, and also to help such concentration by the elimination or deferment - where necessary - of less important items in work programmes. Finally, priorities were necessary when, as at present, there was a constant danger of the budgets of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and other bodies being cut down; they provided the best safeguard against arbitrary action in the financial field.

Mr. DESAI (India) quoted a passage from paragraph 18 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General on the development of a twenty-year programme for achieving peace through the United Nations (E/1900), which seemed to him to be apposite, namely:

"The United Nations and the specialized agencies, however, can only act with the support and at the invitation of the Member governments both singly and collectively. The field covered by them is so vast that only by concentrating the limited resources available on tasks of primary importance and significance can international action hope to achieve really substantial results in terms not only of the economic and social betterment of the peoples of the world but also of the development of international solidarity and the consolidation of peaceful and friendly international relationships."

It seemed to him that a reference to that aspect of the question should also be included in the general introductory paragraph, advocated by the Chairman, in the Committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN agreed.

Mr. DONOSO (Chile) said that it was very difficult to add anything more to what the Indian representative had already added to the Chairman's account of the reasons justifying the establishment of priorities. As the Chairman had suggested, it would be useful if those reasons could be mentioned at the beginning of the Committee's report to the Council.

The observer for the Brazilian Government had already indicated quite clearly what was the responsibility of the United Nations, through its appropriate organ, the Economic and Social Council, in the matter of studying world-wide economic and social problems. The Council could not evade that responsibility, and it must face it squarely, with the collaboration of the specialized agencies and the semi-autonomous agencies of the United Nations.

The Chilean proposal concerning the part to be played by the Council in that matter resembled that of the French delegation. The Council's task was to define the most urgent and most important problems calling for attention throughout the world, in the economic and social fields.

To ensure that efforts in that direction were concentrated, it was essential not merely that the Council should bring the problems to the notice of the specialized agencies, but still more that the specialized agencies themselves, and the subsidiary organs of the United Nations, should inform the Council of their work programmes and projects, so as to enable the Council to carry out its task efficiently.

Thus, the question of co-ordination and priorities was of capital importance.

Mr. ROGLERS (Canada) thought that it might be useful to decide exactly what was meant by establishing priorities. The term could be interpreted to mean that an agency or commission should list all the projects in its work programme in order of importance. Such a list was impossible to draw up, for innumerable factors had to be taken into consideration: regional, long-term, short-term, questions of administrative convenience, and many others. Again, the term could be interpreted as meaning that an organization should merely submit a statement of the most important projects in its work programme. Thus, WHO had divided up its work into broad compartments; within those compartments, certain projects could be labelled as more important than others. Finally, the term could be interpreted as meaning no more than that there should be a statement of those marginal activities which would be abandoned if budgets were curtailed. It seemed to him that the exact meaning should be made clear. The term "fields of emphasis" might, perhaps, be used instead of "priorities".

Mr. MACHADO (Observer for the Brazilian Government), outlining the history of priorities in the United Nations, said that the proliferation of the organization's activities had led his country in 1949 to raise the question of what should be done to introduce some discipline into the programmes of the United Nations. The concept of "priorities" had been introduced at that time, in an effort to control to some extent a proliferation of work that was costing a great deal of money, and making an unfavourable impression on governments and peoples throughout the world. Thus, priorities had nothing to do with co-ordination, but consisted solely in making sure that the best possible use was made of the funds available. Priorities involved the giving of advice to the bodies seeking to establish them, and to the administrations carrying out projects, and were a consequence of the limited resources at the disposal of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

The CHAIRMAN referred the Canadian representative to the Committee's report to the eleventh session of the Council, in which criteria had been established for priorities. With regard to the Council's commissions, the suggestion was that those bodies should submit detailed statements of their work programmes, listing

their projects in order of importance. The situation was somewhat different in the case of the specialized agencies, in that the relationship between the specialized agencies and the Council differed from the relationship between the Council and its commissions.

Probably all that the Council required was a statement from the specialized agencies, and from the semi-autonomous agencies, setting out the major shifts of emphasis that had occurred in their programmes of work, and as far as possible breaking down the major fields of activities into areas of different emphasis.

Mr. ROGERS (Canada) was not sure that it would be of any value to group projects in order of importance.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) said that, although the specialized agencies and other bodies could be asked in a general way to establish priorities, they could not be told what priority should be given to their various projects. Nor would agencies be likely to describe any of their activities as marginal. But as the Council came to determine what were the main fields of activity, it would gradually become clearer which were the marginal activities. The right approach would thus seem to be for the Council to establish, from its own point of view, the relative importance of projects in the light of certain criteria, and not merely to require organizations to list their less important activities. The approach should be kept affirmative, emphasizing important projects.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the affirmative approach suggested by the United States representative meant that agencies would not be informed by the Council which projects they should abandon. Indeed, the Council could not instruct them to abandon any projects; but it was possible that the Council could assist them by laying emphasis on important projects; the agencies might then abandon unimportant projects in order to concentrate on what was important.

He again suggested that the Committee should recommend that the specialized agencies should devote a small section in their reports to describing the major shifts of emphasis in their work programmes from year to year, with an indication of major projects of high priority, in so far as it was practicable for them to do so.

It was so agreed.

Mr. DESAI (India) said that between the normal work of commissions, specialized agencies and semi-autonomous bodies - work that was prescribed by their Constitution or their terms of reference - and the emergency work entrusted to them that had to be carried out forthwith, there lay a field of activities which such bodies carried out in close relation with other organizations. The suggestion he had made previously, that projects should carry symbols indicating their relative importance, could not apply to normal activities, for such normal activities were continuing in nature; but it could apply to activities in that intermediate field. If emphasis were laid on projects within that field, normal activities could be reduced and projects in the intermediate field given greater importance. It was possible that some specialized agencies paid more attention to their normal activities, and had neither the resources nor the staff to deal with projects which the Council regarded as being of high priority; that was, however, a problem the specialized agencies had to face. His suggestion was that where greater emphasis was given to a project, that project should be denoted by one or two asterisks in the Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects; the Council would then be able to see how far such a classification complied with its broad directives on priorities.

Mr. Martin HILL (Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and Economic and Social Matters) doubted whether the editors of the Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects could cope with the work of starring the projects submitted as important by the various organizations and agencies. Furthermore, there was a problem of timing. The material incorporated in the Catalogue had to be in by the end of April, and consisted of the programme for the current year. The data for the succeeding year was collected between April and July. Consequently, the programme for the succeeding year could be drawn up by April only in a very provisional form.

Mr. DESAI (India) explained that his suggestion had only been thrown out as a possible approach to the problem, and could obviously only be implemented after some delay and adjustment. He felt, however, that the difficulties could be overcome, and that the majority of projects could be starred in the way which he had suggested.

Mr. BERKELEY (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that his Organization's work programme was prepared early in the year, and that a list of projects in order of importance, and in terms of cost and time of execution, could be indicative, but only on an entirely provisional basis. Some six months later, changes in emphasis were mentioned in the organization's annual report. Finally, in the discussion of the programme in the Council, the latest information regarding such changes of emphasis could be given. There was thus the same difficulty in timing that had been mentioned by the Director of Co-ordination, but the importance attached to projects could perhaps be indicated more clearly and the timing improved.

His Organization was about to inaugurate a new system of framing a two-year programme and budget, and the task of listing priorities would therefore be rendered more difficult. The starring system would appear to be too rigid, but priorities could be indicated in the Catalogue, as suggested by the Chairman: there would be concentration on the major projects, the minor ones being relegated to the background. That would give a more precise idea of emphasis than symbols which could be applied to very broad fields.

Dr. Brock CHISHOLM, Director General of the World Health Organization, said that the question of priorities had interested his Organization for years, and six major priorities had been established early in its existence. The stage of development of the different countries in the field of public health, however, was far from uniform, and much time had been spent on building the foundations, so that those priorities had in effect become long-term targets. Each year it had been found that projects of high priority required more than the resources available, so that projects of lower priority had been eliminated, and only high-priority ones were left. Gradually there had been a shift in emphasis, as had been set out in WHO's report: now the Organization helped States and health administrations to take the next appropriate step in the orderly development of their health services.

In many cases the long-term targets would not be reached for years to come. WHO's regional committees met and considered the necessary programmes, and eliminated the low-priority projects before the programmes were submitted to head-

quarters, the Executive Board and the World Health Assembly. All the programmes were examined in the light of the general long-term programmes, and the Council's criteria were applied.

The difficulty in starring any of the projects outlined in the WHO work programme would be that the starring would necessarily have to be arbitrary, in view of the different conditions in the different countries, and would inevitably involve excursions into the political field, as the problem of the local interests of the various groups of countries would at once arise. If the Council decided that such an experiment would be of value, WHO would endeavour to carry it out, but he was not confident that it could be carried through satisfactorily.

The CHAIRMAN, noting the rather lukewarm reponse to the Indian representative's suggestion, wondered whether it would not be better to proceed slowly. If too much were attempted at once, there might be a risk of failure.

Mr. DESAI (India) had no objection to withdrawing his suggestion if it were considered unfeasible. He pointed out, however, that the suggestion had arisen, not out of the question of priorities called for by budgetary limitations, but in relation to items placed high in the programme of organizations as a result of directives issued by the Council. It would be enough, however, if the organizations indicated the major shifts of emphasis resulting from the implementation of such directives. He had made his suggestion with the sole intention of enabling the Council to see at a glance which items in the work programmes of its commissions and the specialized agencies reflected such major shifts of emphasis; it did not concern the question of priorities within those bodies themselves.

Mr. GATES (United States of America) suggested that the Indian representative's ideas on the starring of projects should be mentioned in the Committee's report. It was possible that, if certain specialized agencies and commissions adopted such a method of indicating the priorities of their projects, their example would be sufficient to secure general adherence to the practice. Organizations without any "starred" projects might be regarded as having no outstanding projects.

That polite threat might encourage adherence to the Council's suggestion.

It was agreed that the Indian representative's suggestion should be mentioned in the Committee's report.

(iii) Communication from the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (E/2053).

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the communication from the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (E/2053). That communication indicated a possible misunderstanding of the Council's wishes, but offered the Committee useful indications of the procedures and criteria used by the Advisory Committee. There remained the question of what more might be asked of the Advisory Committee in the future, or how closer co-operation might be developed with it.

Mr. MACHADO (Observer for the Brazilian Government) said that, although he was a member of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACC), he was not speaking on its behalf. General Assembly resolution 413 (V) contained a request to the Council to seek, in reviewing the programmes of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, the assistance of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the administrative and financial aspects of the matter. That request had been initiated by the Brazilian delegation, on the ground that the main pre-occupation of Member States of the United Nations was financial in nature. The Advisory Committee, however, was not competent to discuss programmes, although it could co-operate with the Council on administrative and budgetary questions not related to programmes. The Advisory Committee had taken note of its constitutional position under Article 17 of the Charter when it had examined the Council's request that it should submit observations on the administrative and financial aspects of the 1952 programmes of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies, and had decided that it would not be in a position, within the terms and the time limit set forth in the Council's invitation, adequately to perform and report on the task entrusted to it by the General Assembly resolution. It had consequently merely made recommendations relating to the administrative field.

His own view was that the Advisory Committee should meet at the same time as, and in collaboration with, the Council. The constitutional difficulty raised by such a meeting had been removed by the General Assembly resolution, and there was no reason of which he was aware why the two bodies should not meet together; indeed, he wondered why such a meeting had not been suggested earlier.

Turning to the general question of co-ordination, he said that although the task was difficult the Brazilian Government believed it to be feasible. It agreed in general with the approach to co-ordination and concentration of effort outlined by the United States delegation (E/AC.24/L.27), but suggested more practical approach to the problem. Financial limitation had been the main consideration which had compelled States to seek a method of co-ordinating United Nations programmes, and that task had been entrusted to the Council, the only organ competent to deal with it. The Council had three main functions: first, that of dealing with the work of the standing functional and regional Commissions; second, that of reviewing the execution of the operational programmes of the United Nations, in connexion, for example, with technical assistance, refugees and social welfare; third, that of reviewing the activities of the specialized agencies, with a view to co-ordinating those activities and establishing priorities for them. In addition, the Council could, as the United States delegation rightly maintained, establish over-all United Nations basic priorities, and it alone was qualified to carry out that task.

Priorities could be divided into internal and external priorities. The problem of such priorities had not arisen at the outset of the work of the United Nations, whereas co-ordination was a major and permanent feature of its work. By reason, however, of the immense expansion of United Nations activities and the alarming budgetary implications thereof, Member States had found it necessary to establish priorities, so that the best possible use could be made of the funds available. If there were no lack of funds, there would be no reason for establishing priorities; but co-ordination would continue to be necessary.

In the past five years steady progress had been made in the field of co-ordination, but it could not be denied that no progress had so far been achieved

in the field of priorities. That was the problem before the Council. Every year the budget of the United Nations and the specialized agencies increased, and every year the concern of governments with the financial implications increased accordingly. The United States delegation had rightly stated that it was "incumbent upon the Council to make its co-ordination so effective as to assure first attention to work of greatest importance and to eliminate from the current programme projects which, while worthy in themselves, might be deferred until a later time". Such deferment was necessary because the budget was too small to meet every demand. Thus co-ordination, in addition to its previous objectives, of preventing the overlapping of activities and of increasing efficiency, had assumed the new aim which was of paramount importance, of bringing about financial stability and rationalizing work in order to make it fit into the earlier framework without impairing either positive achievement or efficiency.

It was indeed possible, as the United States delegation had stated, that "ceilings of an arbitrary character will be imposed on budgets, thus over-emphasizing purely financial considerations without due regard to substantive programme considerations".

That danger could be frustrated only by making a distinction between minimum essential administrative expenditure and operational expenditure, the latter of which should be considered separately by the general conferences of the specialized agencies and by the General Assembly to enable governments to weigh the merits of each new activity. The decision would be taken by a majority in the General Assembly and in the general conferences, and there would be complete freedom to raise the necessary funds by whatever means was judged appropriate or, alternatively, to reject the project as a whole.

Two questions would arise if such a distinction were made. One was whether a recommendation should be made to agencies to separate the administrative and operational budgets. The other was whether it was even necessary to make such a recommendation. In his view, it was not. The question was a purely practical one, and depended on a number of imponderables; it should therefore be left to the Secretary-General and the administrative heads of the specialized agencies

alone. Bearing in mind the duties, rights and responsibilities of those officials, there should be no interference in the work of the secretariats, except in the suggestion of priorities and in the application of the normal procedures already envisaged.

If it were agreed that the budget should be divided into two separate parts, the first would concern administrative expenditures of absolute necessity, for which appropriate scales of contribution by governments would be established. The operational budget would deal with programmes of specific projects, and would be submitted to the general conferences, or to the General Assembly as appropriate, for approval or rejection. The decision regarding the proportion of the expenditure which should be allotted either to the administrative or to the operational budget would rest with the administrations concerned. If the administrative head of the agency concerned considered its normal activities to be excessive and beyond the means at his disposal in the administrative budget, he could approach the "programme organs", but never the appropriating bodies, for funds to increase his staff. He could, however, also approach his general conference with a request for additional funds, when the nature of the expenditure did not in his view, fall within the administrative budget. Such a division of budgets would not even entail the necessity of laying down methods of procedure, as that task could be left to the administrative heads of the various agencies. Their powers and duties would be clearly established, and arbitrary ceilings avoided. The responsibility for avoiding such ceilings would be that of the general conferences, as the appropriating bodies; but to enable them to take a proper decision, they would have to adopt certain criteria, which would be established by the Council.

The functions of the Council and its commissions in the operational field were very similar to those of the executive boards or governing bodies of the specialized agencies. If it was recognized that only the Council had the authority to review programmes and to impose priorities in United Nations programmes, that would imply that the other organizations were solely responsible for their own internal priorities. The Council should undoubtedly review programmes of work, in order to ensure that they remained within the budgetary limitations imposed by the General Assembly. To apply internal priorities, it would be necessary first to know what resources

were available. He would accordingly recommend that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the administrative heads of all the specialized agencies, with the assistance of their executive boards or governing bodies, should:

First, endeavour to stabilize their administrative budgets, and make specific proposals to that effect to the appropriate bodies, that was, to the general conferences of their organizations;

Second, include in those budgets the work to be done by the Secretariats in assisting delegations, in research, in study and in the preparation of basic documents for discussion;

Third, if in the opinion of the administrative head of the agency concerned, the work already approved could not be carried out within the limitations he (Mr. Machado) had suggested, call upon the competent organs (the Council, in the case of the United Nations) to apply internal priorities, to ensure that the work programme was carried out within the available financial resources;

Fourth, if, in his opinion, funds were required in excess of those provided in the administrative budgets in order to implement one or more resolutions, be authorized to ask for such additional funds, by means of a separate budget specifying the project involved, provided that such budget was approved by the "programme organs", namely, the executive boards, or, in the case of the United Nations, the Council.

Although internal priorities were primarily the responsibility of the specialized agencies themselves, the Council should nevertheless not be precluded from exercising its prerogative of making recommendations to them regarding priorities. Such recommendations were not binding on the specialized agencies, but they could scarcely be ignored by them.

It was obvious, from the practical approach which he recommended, that the stabilization of administrative budgets and the problem of internal priorities were closely linked. The question of external priorities was one, however, in which the Council's task should be limited to projects calling for additional funds. When the United Nations had been set up, there had been a discussion on the question whether a single policy should be laid down for all the specialized

agencies by a centralized authority. The idea of centralization, however, had been rejected in favour of decentralization and the independence of the specialized agencies. It had been agreed that there should be a central co-ordinating body, and the task of co-ordination had been entrusted to the Council. The Brazilian Government had considered ways and means of bringing about better co-ordination among the various bodies, and had endeavoured to respect the separation of powers and the independence of those bodies. Thus, while it held that internal priorities should be established by the specialized agencies themselves, it also maintained that the Council should express its views and make recommendations in the field of co-ordination and on priorities among the different operational activities of those agencies. In the interests of practicability, however, it sought to limit the duties of the Council to items other than administrative questions, that was, to operational activities. Only the administrative head of each agency could decide which items fell within one or the other category, for it was impossible to work out a universally applicable formula. The extraordinary budgets submitted by the agencies at the discretion of the heads of their administrations should, however, be accompanied by a note submitted, through ACC, to the Council, to enable the Council to make recommendations, if necessary, on external priorities to the governments concerned. It did not seem to him that there could be any real objection to such a procedure. The specialized agencies could hardly feel threatened by the possibility of the Council ascribing low priority to the projects involved. Even if they felt that their own particular projects could not compete favourably with others in technical or political interest, their administrations, in view of their independence could place the pros and cons of the matter before the governments concerned at their general conferences and persuade them, if they could, to grant the additional funds required.

Even though the specialized organizations desired to preserve their independence, it seemed to him that at the very least the General Assembly would expect the Council to make recommendations on external priorities. The system he proposed took full account of the separation of powers and responsibilities, and substantially

reduced the scope of the task of the Council regarding priorities, rendering it feasible, efficient and objective.

The Council should base its debates on external priorities on a report to be prepared by the Secretariat of ACC. The Secretary-General and the administrative heads of the specialized agencies would each year submit to ACC information concerning all extraordinary operational budgets. The data, tabled and commented upon by ACC, would be submitted to the Council for consideration. Thus, instead of applying priorities to 800 different projects the Council would have to deal only with a table containing a few operational activities. That table, if expanded to include the comments of the Council on the substance of the activities projected and on priorities, would provide the General Assembly with a complete picture, one it had never yet had.

On the other hand, that part of the regular report of ACC dealing with co-ordination in the administrative field should no longer be examined by the Council; it should be dealt with by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, for the Council should exclusively consider the programmes of the specialized agencies, never their administrative and budgetary implications. Such an arrangement would put an end to the existing overlapping and would eliminate the danger of conflicting opinions and conclusions by two different organs on the same question.

In summary, therefore, his recommendations would be: first, that the administrative heads of the United Nations and the specialized agencies should be invited to undertake a study designed to bring about the stabilization of their administrative budgets, and propose a ceiling, making allowance for such matters as salary increases and the like; second, that they should submit separate operational budgets, for which additional funds were required; third, that the various agencies should supply information on both budgets to ACC, information on the ordinary administrative budget being submitted to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and information on the operational budget to the Council; fourth, that they and the United Nations should continue

and increase their consultations regarding the elaboration of their programmes and administrative matters; fifth, that the Council should prepare for the General Assembly a report on priorities among projects of the different organizations, including the United Nations; sixth, that the Advisory Committee should include in its regular report on the administrative budgets to the General Assembly comments on the report of ACC to the Council; seventh, that the General Assembly should appeal to Member Governments to pay their contributions to the administrative budgets; and lastly that the Advisory Committee should examine the administrative part of all operational programmes exceeding the regular administrative budgets.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.