

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.24/SR.107  
10 July 1952

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fourteenth Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 26 June 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

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.82, E/AC.24/L.83, E/AC.24/L.84) [35]/(continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. POLLOCK	(Canada)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. CAMPOS	Argentina
	Mr. de la HAYE	Belgium
	Mr. CREPAULT	Canada
	Mr. TSAO	China
	Mr. DOMINGUEZ	Cuba
	Mr. NOVAK	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. RIFAAT	Egypt
	Mr. MASPETIOL	France
	Mr. KIA	Iran

Members (continued):

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

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. METALL	International Labour Organisation (ILC)
Mr. McDOUGALL	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Mr. MAHEU } Mr. ARNALDO }	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
Mr. MARLIN	International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)
Mr. LOPEZ-HERRARTE	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Bank)
Mr. WILLIAMS	International Monetary Fund (Fund)
Mr. OTTERMAN	International Telecommunication Union (ITU)
Dr. KAUL	World Health Organization (WHO)

Secretariat:

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

CO-ORDINATION OF THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES  
(E/2203: E/AC.24/L.79, E/AC.24/L.80, E/AC.24/L.81, E/AC.24/L.82, E/AC.24/L.83,  
E/AC.24/L.84) [33] (continued)

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) felt that consideration of the Working Party's report (E/AC.24/L.79) would be expedited if he replied in some detail to the criticisms that some representatives had made at the previous meeting.

The delegation of Pakistan did not consider the report as something binding on all parties for all time, that could not be reviewed or amended in the light of changing circumstances. At the last session of the Economic and Social Council his delegation had taken the stand that no attempt should be made to define specific priorities and that efforts should be limited to indicating the major fields of emphasis. However, over the preceding two years there had been a growing tendency on the part of many nations toward the establishment of definite priorities. Such priorities tended to restrict the scope of United Nations activity by operating, in effect, as indirect ceilings on the budgets of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, a trend which his delegation in common with all under-developed countries must naturally resist. At the same time, it realized that those budgets could not be appreciably increased from year to year in view of the limited resources available. It followed, therefore, that only by concentrating on tasks of primary importance could any solid progress be made towards realizing the objectives of the Charter.

That was the premise on which the Working Party's report was based and although the report was not entirely to the satisfaction of his delegation, he felt that it represented the largest common factor on which most delegations could agree.

With reference to the points raised by the United Kingdom representative he recognized that he had not the least pretension to either the knowledge or the competence which the United Kingdom representative considered necessary for the solution of the problem of priorities. However, he felt that he was in a better position to say where the shoe pinched than the cobbler who repaired the shoe but did not wear it. If the Economic and Social Council, as the only United Nations body dealing with collective economic and social problems, was

/not in

not in a position to say what the main problems were, he wondered who was. To keep the analogy used by the United Kingdom representative, in setting priorities for the Functional Commissions and the specialized agencies, all the Council was attempting to do was to indicate to the manager of the glass factory that it was more interested in the production of sheet glass than costume jewelry. Admittedly, the problem of priorities was one of immense complexity but that was no reason why an attempt to suggest a tentative solution should not be made.

The United Kingdom representative had called attention to what he had termed "serious omissions" in the report which caused him to doubt its value. He had concluded that the best course was to take note of the ACC report, make a passing reference to the existence of the Working Party's report and leave it to the specialized agencies to evolve their own priorities.

With regard to the failure to list activities of a continuing nature in paragraph 10 of the report, the Working Party had not mentioned them because it had no desire to go beyond broad programmes and wished to leave the selection of tools entirely to the specialized agencies concerned.

The representative of the ILO had agreed with the United Kingdom representative that it should be left to the specialized agencies to draw up their own programmes and had pointed out that most countries were represented in those bodies. However, the outlook of any specialized agency and of its individual members was necessarily one-sided. It did not take the same broad view of the world's economic and social problems as did the Economic and Social Council. If it was true, as the ILO representative had said, that the list of programmes prepared by the Working Party was too detailed in some respects and not sufficiently detailed in others, it must be concluded that a happy medium had been found between the broad objectives of the Charter and the numerous concrete projects that would translate those objectives into reality.

The Argentine representative's reference to insufficient emphasis on industrial development in the economic field did not appear to be altogether justified in view of the inclusion in the list of priorities of items dealing with the processing of food products, utilization of water resources, utilization of natural resources for increased production, development of incentives, institutions and attitudes favourable to increased productivity and the

/maintenance

maintenance of full employment.

A number of representatives had taken exception to the phrase "discriminatory measures of any kind" on page 7 of the report. The Working Party had found that the language of the Charter was limited to discrimination as to race, language, sex and religion and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was not at all exhaustive in that respect. The Working Party had decided that "discriminatory measures of any kind" would be more comprehensive than anything else.

A number of representatives had also criticized the statement in the report that the sub-items had been placed so far as possible in order of general importance. They had felt that they should have been listed in their logical order and the representative of Iran had made the point that the special problems of a particular region should also have a place in the priority programmes. The Iranian representative's preoccupation was met in the first sentence of paragraph 10, which recognized that the priorities listed would not apply to some urgent problems of a particular region which might call for special measures. Mr. Ishaq was not sure what was intended by "logical order" but the specialized agencies could certainly be expected not to follow an illogical order.

The representative of WHO had said that global priorities were impractical. Nevertheless, it was a fact that his organization had been drawing up global priorities in its own field every year and the formula "prevention and control of the major communicable diseases" certainly allowed for varying emphasis in different countries.

The representative of FAO had pointed out that the development of humid zones was as important as that of arid zones. Yet, it would be recalled that the Economic and Social Council had been concerned with the problem of arid zones repeatedly in recent sessions and the same could not be said of the humid zones. That indicated the greater urgency of the former problem.

If the Working Party's report was read as a whole, it formed a very satisfactory basis for recommendations to the Council and did not attempt to interfere unduly in the work of the specialized agencies. The only effect of the priorities might be to limit the interest of specialized agencies in purely academic activity, which to experts sometimes appeared as important as practical achievement.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should examine the Working Party report paragraph by paragraph along with the oral and written amendments to the individual paragraphs. He invited observations on the first substantive paragraph.

Paragraph 3

Mr. REYES (Philippines) proposed that the word "presently" should be inserted in the fourth line between "resources" and "available". The Philippine delegation would like to have it made clear that the limited resources available were not a permanent problem. The fact that available resources would continue to be limited for some time should not interfere with the long-range thinking of the Council. The magnitude of the challenge the United Nations was facing in the under-developed areas had moved the Council to set a goal of 1,000 million dollars in its recently adopted resolution on the International Development Fund although such funds were not now in prospect. The peak of the world's defence expenditures might soon be reached and the United Nations might then be in a position to give enough help to more than half of the world's population to enable them to achieve those "better standards of life in larger freedom" envisaged in the Charter.

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) found it difficult to envisage the day when the resources available to the United Nations would be unlimited, but agreed they could be less limited than now. He suggested that "now" was a better word than "presently" to indicate the present tense.

Mr. REYES (Philippines) accepted the United States suggestion.

The Philippine amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 3 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 4

Paragraph 4 was adopted without discussion.

Paragraph 5

The United Kingdom amendment (E/AC.24/L.83) was adopted.

Paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

/Paragraph 6

Paragraph 6

Mr. TSAO (China) felt that the United Kingdom amendment to substitute "examined a tentative list" for "established a list" was not fully descriptive because the Working Party had aimed at establishing a list. Perhaps the compromise wording "established a tentative list" would be acceptable to the majority.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) and Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) were of the opinion that the existing texts adequately described the situation and did not need amendment. A list had in fact been established and its tentative nature was fully described in later paragraphs.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) felt that if the tentative nature was mentioned anywhere there could be no objection in referring to it as tentative the first time it was mentioned. He would accept the Chinese suggestion.

Mr. MASPETIOL (France) and Baron von OTTER (Sweden) both supported the modified United Kingdom amendment, as did Mr. de la HAYE (Belgium), who pointed out that in the French text the word "établi" was better than "dressé".

The United Kingdom amendment to insert "tentative" before "list" was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 6 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 7

The United Kingdom amendment (E/AC.24/L.83) was adopted.

Paragraph 7 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 8

Mr. CASTENEDA (Mexico), speaking of his amendment (E/AC.24/L.81), said that he had already made the position of his delegation clear at the previous meeting. Actually he would prefer the Committee to revert to the text originally put forward by the United States Delegation in document E/AC.24/L.68.

/Mr. CREPAULT

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) recalled that it had been felt in the Working Party that to adopt the original United States proposal would not be establishing an order of priority at all but merely lumping together the programmes listed. He continued to prefer the wording in the report.

Mr. REYES (Philippines) said that he would support the Mexican proposal to use the original United States proposal.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) pointed out that the United States representative had abandoned his original proposal in the Working Party and had come out in favour of a definite order of priority. He agreed with the Canadian representative that if the items were not to be considered as listed in order of general importance, it would mean that the Working Party had wasted most of its time.

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) explained that his delegation was willing to accept the final sentence in paragraph 8 but in view of the fact that the wording seemed to give rise to confusion, he would agree to support a text along the lines of the original United States proposal.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) also supported the Mexican suggestion and felt that the Committee should not try to do more at the current session than outline the sub-headings under the six major priority programmes. It would be best to leave for consideration at a later session whether it was desirable to define the relative importance of the contributory programmes.

Mr. CASTENEDA (Mexico) pointed out that some important contributory programmes had been omitted from the list but that did not mean that the Council wished the Functional Commissions and specialized agencies to abandon them. It would therefore be better not to give the impression that the list was a comprehensive one.

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) recalled that the Working Party had constantly borne in mind the question of the relative importance of the contributory programmes in its discussions. While it was true that the specialized agencies

/from the



from the standpoint of technical considerations could be given leeway in preferring one project to another, the Economic and Social Council, from the standpoint of the objectives of Article 55 of the Charter and of the ACC report, surely had the right to indicate the programmes it considered as best promoting those objectives.

Mr. MASPETIOL (France) said that he would vote in favour of the Mexican proposal. The sub-headings would have to be more specific before their relative importance could be determined. He pointed out that in the French text the word "énuméré" would be better than "cité".

Mr. TSAO (China) agreed with the French representative's views. Other things being equal, the sub-titles were arranged in more or less logical order. However, since other things were not equal, it was inadvisable to state in writing that the sub-titles were in logical order. Nor should it be indicated that they were listed in order of relative importance. He was prepared, however, to vote in favour of the Mexican amendment.

Mr. CASTENEDA (Mexico) was unable to accept the suggestion made by the Canadian representative. The list of major priority programmes had been established on a purely tentative basis, a fact which the Committee had emphasized by adopting the United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 6.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) was able to understand the Mexican representative's position in the matter but not that taken by the representative of France and of the United States. The Mexican representative had already questioned the present wording of paragraph 8 when the draft was being discussed by the Working Party. The representatives of France and of the United States, on the other hand, had strongly supported paragraph 8 in its present form. Their present position was therefore inconsistent with the stand they had taken in the Working Party.

With regard to the Chinese representative's observations, his point might be met if the words "other things being equal" were inserted immediately before "in order of general importance" at the end of the paragraph.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee had before it a formal Mexican proposal, supported by the United States and other delegations, to amend the first sentence in paragraph 8 to read as follows: "It should be noted that neither the six major priority programmes nor the several contributory programmes have been listed in order of relative importance; the major priority programmes have been arranged by subject matter, namely economic, social and human rights." In view of the fact that the suggestions made by the representatives of Canada and Pakistan had not been supported, he invited the Committee to vote on the Mexican proposal.

The Mexican amendment to the first sentence in paragraph 8 was adopted by 12 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 8, as amended, was adopted.

#### Paragraph 9

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the first United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 9 (E/AC.24/L.83). The United Kingdom delegation proposed that, in the first line of the paragraph, the words "In its consideration of" be substituted for "In selecting".

Mr. ASHER (United States of America) pointed out that the amendment related to a proposal regarding paragraph 6 which the Committee had not accepted, namely to substitute the word "examined" for "established". Under the circumstances, he could not vote in favour of the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN put the United Kingdom amendment to the vote.

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

The CHAIRMAN invited consideration of the second United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 9. It was proposed that the words "which it endorses" be added after "ACC" in the third line.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) observed that several delegations had pointed out at the previous meeting that the Committee had not merely noted with

/appreciation

appreciation the recommendations regarding priorities contained in the tenth and eleventh reports of the ACC but had also agreed with those recommendations. His amendment was based on that view.

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) wondered whether, in its report to the Economic and Social Council, the Committee intended merely to submit the ACC reports to the Council or whether it intended to make a specific reference to those reports.

Mr. MASPETIOL (France) felt that the Committee should make a separate reference to the reports.

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) agreed with the French representative.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) pointed out that adoption of the United Kingdom amendment would imply the acceptance of the ACC reports by the Committee. That was not entirely correct in view of the fact that the wording of paragraph 10 indicated that the Committee did not fully agree with the ACC's recommendations.

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) said that, in deference to the views of the representative of Pakistan, he would withdraw his amendment.

Paragraph 9 was adopted.

#### Paragraph 10

The CHAIRMAN observed that the Belgian delegation had submitted an amendment to paragraph 10 (E/AC.24/L.82) providing for the insertion, immediately after the words "continuing nature", of the following phrase: "including the services designed to organize on the international level collaboration between specialists and technicians".

Mr. de la HAYE (Belgium) considered that co-operation between specialists and technicians was a sufficiently important factor to warrant specific reference.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) objected to the Belgian amendment in that it would make it difficult to exclude reference to other forms of co-operation.

/Mr. CREPAULT

Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) felt that reference to co-operation between specialists and technicians was unnecessary.

Mr. MASPETIOL (France) supported the amendment. Attention should be drawn to the importance of such co-operation.

The CHAIRMAN put the Belgian amendment to the vote.

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

Paragraph 10, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 11

The CHAIRMAN observed that the United Kingdom had proposed an amendment to paragraph 11 providing for deletion of the entire paragraph and substitution of the following wording: "The Council believes that the list may be of assistance to the functional and regional commission and also to the specialized agencies in determining their own programmes of work" (E/AC.24/L.83).

Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) said that his amendment was not a very radical one. The functional and regional commissions regularly reviewed their programmes and appended a carefully worked out list of priorities to their reports. Under paragraph 11 in its present form they would merely receive additional instructions which might confuse rather than clarify. The Committee, moreover, had thoroughly discussed the question of priority programmes and had reached certain conclusions. In order to avoid having the subject debated again in each of the subsidiary bodies, instructions to the functional and regional commissions should be as simple as possible.

With regard to the reference in paragraph 11 to the specialized agencies, the United Kingdom amendment covered the principal requirement which was that the specialized agencies should make known their views concerning the suggested priorities. The remainder of paragraph 11 appeared to be redundant.

Mr. MASPETIOL (France) felt that the United Kingdom amendment minimized the work of the Committee. He preferred therefore to retain the paragraph in its original form.

/Mr. TSAO

Mr. TSAO (China) agreed with the French representative. The wording of the paragraph had been carefully drafted and should therefore be retained.

Baron von OTTER (Sweden) suggested that the Committee might attempt to arrive at a compromise solution. In his view, paragraph 11 was unduly specific. The United Kingdom amendment, on the other hand, was unduly radical. The best course appeared to be to defer consideration of the paragraph until the delegations had had time to arrive at a satisfactory wording.

Replying to a question from the Canadian representative, he said that the paragraph in its present form might be interpreted as being unduly binding upon the organs called upon to study the ACC report. The United Kingdom met that difficulty to a certain extent. However, it might be advisable to retain some of the sentences in the paragraph and to delete or amend the others.

Mr. REYES (Philippines) shared the Swedish representative's apprehensions. His delegation could accept the paragraph subject to the following amendments: the deletion in the first sentence of the words "and, in so far as feasible, to concentrate upon those projects which demonstrably contribute directly to the fulfilment of these priority programmes" and the deletion of the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. de la HAYE (Belgium) was unable to accept the Swedish representative's suggestion that consideration of paragraph 11 should be deferred. It had an important bearing on the subsequent paragraphs of the report.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the first sentence of the paragraph might be amended to read as follows: "The Council requests the functional and regional commissions to appraise their own programmes in the light of the priority programmes outlined below and, in so far as feasible, to give especial emphasis to projects which demonstrably contribute directly to the fulfilment of these priority programmes." The second sentence would stand while the remainder of the paragraph could either be retained or deleted following the suggestion of the Philippine representative.

/He pointed

He pointed out that under Economic and Social Council resolution 324 (XI) the commissions were required to review each project in the light of the criteria for priorities. Under Economic and Social Council resolution 402 (XIII) they were required to follow a detailed procedure in establishing programme priorities. To require them to subject each project to scrutiny from yet another angle would involve undue formality.

Mr. METALL (International Labour Organisation) observed that there appeared to be a contradiction in the second sentence of paragraph 11. The specialized agencies were requested, on the one hand, to make known their views with respect to the suggested priorities and, on the other, to keep those priorities in mind in reviewing and formulating their programmes. He mentioned the discrepancy because the Committee intended to redraft the paragraph.

He felt that the section of the paragraph which the Philippine representative proposed to delete was of significance and should be retained.

Finally, he wished to refer to a slight discrepancy between the English and French texts of the Working Party's report. In the second sentence of ~~para~~ paragraph 11, the English expression "to keep in mind" had been translated into French as "tenir compte de" which was not quite the same thing.

Mr. TSAO (China) agreed with the representative of the ILO regarding the apparent contradiction in the instructions to the specialized agencies. He therefore suggested reversing the order of the two requests made by the Council. The specialized agencies should first be invited to keep the suggested priorities in mind and then be asked for their views.

Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan), while appreciating the change suggested by the Chairman, nevertheless preferred the original wording of the first sentence of the paragraph. There appeared to be an unfortunate tendency to refrain from drafting the paragraphs of the report in concrete terms when they involved the important question of priority programmes.

The CHAIRMAN said that consideration of the Working Party's report would be resumed at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.