

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS



ELEVENTH SESSION, **411th**
MEETING

MONDAY, 14 AUGUST 1950, AT 3 P.M.
PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
United Nations research laboratories (E/1694, E/1694/Add.1, E/1694/Add.2 and E/1699/Rev.1) (continued)	309	United Nations research laboratories (E/1694, E/1694/Add.1, E/1694/Add.2 and E/1699/Rev.1) (concluded)	313
Assistance for the civil population of Korea (E/1820)	311	Full employment (continued): report of the Economic Committee (E/1815)	316

President: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

Present: Representatives of the following countries:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies:

International Labour Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Monetary Fund, World Health Organization, International Refugee Organization.

United Nations research laboratories (E/1694, E/1694/Add.1, E/1694/Add.2 and E/1699/Rev.1) (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT invited representatives to continue the general discussion on the question of United Nations research laboratories pending the distribution of a joint draft resolution by the delegations of Denmark, France and the United States. He had been informed by the sponsors of the two draft resolutions (E/L.100 and E/L.101) which had been submitted at the 410th meeting that they had been able to reach agreement on most points.

2. Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) said that he had to reserve his delegation's position with regard to the joint text agreed upon by the representatives of Denmark, France and the United States, which was to be distributed later. Meanwhile, he wished to comment on his Government's general attitude towards an item which recurred annually on the Council's agenda and in dealing with which the Council had not advanced very far. Each time the Council examined the problem of United Nations research laboratories it fell back upon the usual procedure of requesting the Secretary-General to submit a report or of setting up a committee to study the problem further and report to the Council upon it. No substantial progress had been achieved since the

Council's third session in 1946. He was unable to feel much optimism about such results as might follow the implementation of the draft resolutions now before the Council (E/L.100 and E/L.101). Thus the Secretary-General's financial estimate on the report of the Committee of Scientific Experts on Research Laboratories (E/1694/Add.2), though satisfactory and accurate in terms of the specific proposals put forward in the report, would become inapplicable if an attempt were made to solve the long-range problems involved. If a far-reaching programme were to be carried out, the whole of the United Nations budget would hardly suffice to cover it. That issue had been clearly brought out by the Director-General of the World Health Organization in his statement made at the preceding meeting of the Council. His Government fully appreciated the importance of stimulating, co-ordinating and assimilating information on the research carried out on the national level. International action on those lines was also highly desirable and should be intensified in view of the possibilities offered by the technical assistance programme.

3. It went without saying that scientific research had not reached the same stage of development in all countries; it was advanced in, for instance, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, while in other countries it lagged behind owing to lack of means and their somewhat retarded economic development. But as international endeavour should, obviously, be based on the solid foundation of national research, it was essential to guard against drawing up too ambitious a programme. It was impossible to start building a house from the roof downwards. Every effort should be made to strengthen research on the national level, but he advised the Council to leave it to the future to decide the value and expediency of the sum total of the work of individual nations.

4. From the point of view of the Council, the best method of approach was through the technical assistance programme. His comments should not be interpreted as meaning that his Government was not interested in

basic research. On the contrary, it believed that research in the basic sciences should be encouraged and that the process of international collaboration and exchange, which was ultimately a process of cross-fertilization, should be stimulated by means of fellowships, but it entertained serious doubts as to the feasibility or the desirability of setting up international laboratories. Such laboratories might be necessary in certain fields of study. But no decision could be taken before those fields had been defined and specific proposals put forward. So far during the present session of the Council nothing of that kind had been attempted, and he shared the Indian representative's view, expressed at the preceding meeting, that the criteria of choice laid down by the Committee of Scientific Experts invalidated the concrete proposals put forward by them in their report (E/1694).

5. The Council had already approved the report of the Co-ordination Committee wherein were enumerated the criteria for priorities in the programmes of the United Nations and the specialized agencies (E/1810 and E/1810/Corr.1). If those criteria were applied to the proposals submitted by the Committee of Scientific Experts, he doubted whether the latter would be found deserving of further consideration. He was therefore unable to support the joint draft resolution submitted by the Danish and French delegations (E/L.100) either in relation to the specific projects referred to therein or to the proposal that a conference of scientists and specialists be convened not later than 1952. Indeed, he must express his regret that the Indian representative, who had at the preceding meeting raised certain criticisms against the Danish and French joint draft resolution, had not carried his argument to the logical conclusion, which surely was that a larger body of scientists and specialists could not be expected to succeed better than had the small committee. Indeed, he held that priorities for research work should be established not by scientists, but by governments or by such competent international organs as the Economic and Social Council.

6. He concurred with the fears regarding duplication of work and undesirable competition expressed at the preceding meeting by the Director-General of WHO. Knowledge would not be increased if national scientific personnel were transferred to laboratories or institutions working under an international label. On the contrary, progress would probably be slowed down. His country was familiar with, and had suffered from the withdrawal of, highly qualified scientific staff attracted by opportunities in the United States of America. The existence of international opportunities would make it even more difficult for Canada and for other countries to retain their best scientists and research workers in national service. Certainly his Government would be prepared to make the sacrifice if it were convinced that highly significant results would be obtained on the international level. But that was most unlikely unless expenditure on international research laboratories were so increased as to form a disproportionate part of the total United Nations budget.

7. Turning to the United States draft resolution (E/L.101), he questioned the appropriateness of addressing

an invitation to the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization rather than to the Organization itself. As for the International Computation Centre to which reference was made in the above-mentioned draft resolution, he was unable to accept the Indian representative's arguments in favour of that project. If the references to that institution were retained in the joint draft text which was shortly to be submitted to the Council, he would be obliged to ask for a separate vote to be taken on them. Further, the United States draft resolution invited the Director-General of UNESCO to examine the role of the other specialized agencies and other international organizations in assisting scientific research in their respective fields. Such a method of co-operation was of course acceptable. On the other hand, sub-paragraph (c) of the fourth paragraph of the operative part, which recommended a thorough analysis of the need for establishing specific regional United Nations laboratories, went too far in committing governments to action which would in practice necessitate expenditure on an enormous scale. If the text of sub-paragraph (c) were not read in connexion with its possible financial implications, then it was unnecessary, since UNESCO was already engaged on a general analysis. Sub-paragraph (c) had a significance only if the report which the Director-General was invited to submit covered the clauses wherein reference was made to detailed plans for staffing, an appraisal of the required physical facilities and an analysis of methods of financing. But a report which dealt with those issues would prejudice the action which governments might wish to take.

8. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) said that the detailed statement made by the French representative at the 410th meeting made it possible for him to limit himself to a few brief comments. Indeed, it was to the initiative taken by the French Government four years ago that the excellent report submitted by the Committee of Scientific Experts (E/1694 and E/1694/Add.1) was due. Moreover, that report had had the effect of influencing the thought of scientists in many parts of the world.

9. The Secretary-General should be congratulated on the choice of the experts he had made—a satisfactory choice, undoubtedly due to the fact that the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs was himself a distinguished scientist, fully acquainted with all the problems of organization in that field.

10. His Government fully agreed with the Committee of Scientific Experts with regard to the institutions, the establishment of which they had advocated in their report. There could be no doubt of the value of an International Computation Centre, or of an International Institute of Research on the Brain, as well as of a United Nations International Institute of Social Sciences. In establishing their list of priorities, the experts had been very modest, since the list of subjects which were of the utmost importance to the welfare of mankind could be extended almost indefinitely.

11. While fully agreeing with the experts' proposals, his delegation held that the terms of reference of the proposed institutions should be carefully drafted in

order that no duplication of effort might occur. Referring more specifically to the proposed institute of social sciences, he wondered whether sufficient emphasis had been placed on the important contribution that such an institute could make in the interests of peace. At the present time no one knew how the conflict in Korea would develop. The peoples of the world had no say in the matter, since the men who took the decisions were so few that they could almost be mentioned by name. How much preparation had scientists made to meet so serious a situation? UNESCO had entrusted them with the study of tensions, but it would seem to be conceived in terms too abstract. Indeed, the circumstances of the present time seemed to suggest that tensions between peoples were not the most influential factor in conflict; it was rather the outlook, the morality, the mentality and, indeed, the tension existing among any small group of men which had significant consequences in decisive times. Had the scientists so organized themselves as to create a voluntary institution or even a private association to advise the Security Council? They had not done so, nor had they prepared themselves to play a leading role in those issues of peace and war which were the cardinal concern of the United Nations. They had not given peace the priority which it should have. They had indeed failed in organizing science, despite the fact that they knew, even as did economists, that a world war might heap ruin upon mankind. Biologists knew that modern warfare was biologically insane; sociologists and social psychologists were aware that war appealed to the most irrational and sadistic instincts in man. It was true that psychiatrists were concentrating their efforts more and more on the problems raised by international politics. They had during the past twenty years advanced to a considerable extent. He wished to ask the Director-General of the World Health Organization whether that development might not justify the belief that they might contribute to improve the work of the United Nations if called upon to do so.

12. He wondered whether the Director-General of WHO could, in amplification of the observations he had made at the 410th meeting, inform the Council whether present-day knowledge of the psychological effects of chemicals such as narcotics, alcohol, etc., was sufficiently advanced to allow the creation of a branch of science which he would call "chemo-psychology". He had referred to that conception at the seventh session of the Council, but before raising it again he had preferred to await the report of the Committee of Scientific Experts. Having now learnt how that committee had established its list of priorities, he could assure the Council that the many psychiatrists with whom he had discussed the matter had wholly agreed with him that such a branch of science might be created and, in view of its importance, developed to the fullest extent possible. If the Director-General of WHO also agreed with that view, he would submit that the list of priorities in research had not been exhausted.

13. Turning to the report of the Committee of Scientific Experts, he noted that although four years ago the emphasis had been on laboratories, the institutions now proposed were not, strictly speaking, laboratories at all.

They were institutes or centres which would be entrusted with the task of organization. The reports submitted by UNESCO during the past four years had consistently and increasingly stressed the necessity for a better organization of scientific work.

14. In his view, it was time that those problems of organization should be studied at a conference, and he could not but regret that the very country which had taken so large a share in organizing the United Nations Scientific Conference on the Conservation and Utilization of Resources and in urging the application of science on point 4, was unable at present to accept that suggestion. The proposed conference should not create a central body which would, as it were, exercise a dictatorship over scientists throughout the world. It might perhaps decide to set up a science organization service which would aim at making scientists conscious of their obligations to the rest of mankind and so induce them to place peace first and foremost among their problems. It might further consider what measures should be taken to safeguard freedom of thought in science. It might also examine how scientists should be selected, how trained, how given better conditions of work and life, not for the sake of their personal advantage, but because they had so important a role to play in human development. Regarding the selection of priorities, he drew attention to the fact that the physical sciences could not be separated from the social sciences. Last, but not least, the conference should devote some attention to the mental and moral attitudes of scientists, in order that the latter might be led not only to a better understanding of the importance of organization and their duties in relation to it, but also the advantages of teamwork. Scientists should endeavour to help those entrusted with the task of governing others and induce them to look to science for assistance. He had mentioned all those points at random, in order to indicate some lines on which science should be organized and what form that organization might take. It went without saying that the cardinal problem of the application of research must also fall within the purview of such a conference. The latter would represent economy, for it would aim at a better utilization of scientific workers.

The meeting was suspended at 3.35 p.m. and was resumed at 4.5 p.m.

Assistance for the civil population of Korea (E/1820)

15. The PRESIDENT recalled that, at its 399th meeting, held on 2 August 1950, the Council had decided that the question of assistance for the civil population of Korea should be included in its agenda as supplementary item no. 2.

16. In submitting the draft resolution on that item (E/1820), he addressed the Council in the name of all the delegations present. The draft resolution was the expression of the unanimous wish of the fifteen countries represented at the Council and would, he did not doubt, receive the Council's unanimous approval.

17. In acknowledging the resolution (E/1807), adopted by the Security Council on 31 July 1950, he had had occasion to state on behalf of the Economic and Social Council that the latter was ready to carry out the task with which the Security Council had entrusted it—namely, “to provide such assistance as the Unified Command may request through relief and support of the civilian population of Korea, and as appropriate in connexion with the responsibilities being carried out by the Unified Command on behalf of the Security Council”.

18. The draft resolution which he now submitted to the Economic and Social Council categorically and unconditionally affirmed that will to co-operate. In order that the possibility of effective and timely collaboration might be assured and facilitated, the draft resolution provided that the present session of the Council be adjourned temporarily once the latter had concluded its agenda.

19. Those decisions were both logical and inevitable. The Economic and Social Council was conscious of its obligation under Article 65 of the Charter to assist the Security Council, which had the primary responsibility for the restoration and maintenance of peace. The Council was also aware that the criminal aggression perpetrated by North Korea was an attack on the United Nations and that the defence against that attack had been entrusted by the organ competent under the Charter to its Unified Command. That meant that, in answering the Unified Command's request for assistance, the Economic and Social Council would collaborate with an organ of the United Nations itself—namely, the first international army called upon to oppose aggression in the name of the principles laid down in the Charter.

20. The draft resolution (E/1820) requested the Secretary-General, the specialized agencies and the subsidiary bodies of the United Nations to lend their utmost support in providing the Unified Command with all possible assistance on behalf of the civil population of Korea. Certain bodies directly dependent upon the Economic and Social Council, such as the United Nations International Children's Endowment Fund, were in a position to provide immediate and effective help, and had indeed already begun to give it. Most of the specialized agencies also possessed the means for co-operation, and it was only proper that the Economic and Social Council should address that request to them, the relations between the Council and the specialized agencies being laid down in the Charter itself in Articles 62, 63, 64 and 70, and being defined in the agreements between the Council and each of the specialized agencies. In fact, most of those agreements contained a special provision whereby such agencies agreed to co-operate with the Economic and Social Council in furnishing such information and rendering such assistance to the Security Council as that Council might request, including assistance in carrying out decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security.

21. Section B, paragraph 3, of the draft resolution (E/1820) contained a provision of the utmost significance whereby Member States of the United Nations, the Secretary-General, and appropriate non-governmental

organizations—particularly those enjoying consultative status with the Economic and Social Council—were invited to assist in developing among the peoples of the world the fullest possible understanding of and support for the action of the United Nations in Korea and requested the Secretary-General to seek on behalf of the Council the co-operation of the specialized agencies as appropriate for that purpose.

22. At the present moment, the aggressors' propaganda was endeavouring by means of an intensive campaign of falsehood and calumny to distort the aims, causes and methods of the United Nations action in Korea to repel an attack of which not only South Korea was the victim, but the whole international community. It had actually been shamelessly alleged that North Korea and not South Korea was the victim of aggression.

23. Thus all the organs and auxiliary bodies of the United Nations had a duty, within their respective fields of competence or in concert, to lend their utmost support to the United Nations in that undertaking and to co-operate in thwarting the totalitarian campaign to destroy the United Nations and to justify aggression. That duty fell primarily on the Member States which had sworn loyalty to one another. It fell on all the principal and subsidiary organs of the United Nations, on the specialized agencies which were closely linked to the United Nations in accordance with the Charter or with agreements freely entered upon; lastly, it fell on the non-governmental organizations which had been granted consultative status by the Economic and Social Council. The privileged position granted to those organizations by the Council involved—both implicitly and under the terms of the various regulations of the Council—the corresponding obligation for those organizations to collaborate with the United Nations when asked by the latter to give assistance in matters within their competence. That was the very essence of the provisions for consultation laid down by the Charter.

24. The great concern shown by the Economic and Social Council during the past few years for the economic development of under-developed regions and countries had originated in the conviction that not only the economic stability of the whole world, but the maintenance of peace, depended on that economic development. Thus the Council was aware that the aggressors' initial success in South Korea had been encouraged by certain economic and social factors which international co-operation had unfortunately as yet been unable to remove. In that fight against time, international action in Korea had started late. He was confident that it would reach other regions in good time. The Economic and Social Council was working effectively to promote, speed and direct the progress of that co-operation.

25. It would be the duty of the United Nations, once aggression had been repelled, to assist Korea in reconstructing its devastated territory and in bringing its political, economic and social life back to normal. The United Nations would likewise have to provide effective assistance in developing the Korean economy on more progressive lines and in improving the foundations of its social system. In present circumstances, the Economic and Social Council could not carry out any direct

activities along those lines, but it was anxious to prepare the ground so as to be in a position to do so when the opportunity occurred. That was indicated in the latter part of section C, paragraph 5, of the draft resolution (E/1820), wherein the Economic and Social Council also clearly recognized the necessity for consideration in due course of long-term measures for economic and social assistance to the people of Korea.

26. He could not conclude his statement made on behalf of the Economic and Social Council without expressing the thought which was common to all its members. He wished to pay the warmest tribute to the young men of the United States of America who, in the name of the United Nations and under the United Nations collective banner, were bearing the brunt of the fight against the aggressor and had already given their lives and shed their blood in the common cause. Those troops had earned the gratitude of all free governments and all free peoples. He extended that same tribute to the people of South Korea and to the military forces of those other countries which were generously sharing in the sacrifice for the common cause under the command of the United Nations itself.

27. Since, as he had said at the beginning, the draft resolution reflected the unanimous position of all concerned, it would seem to him that it was unnecessary for it to be discussed. The Council should proceed forthwith to take a decision on it.

28. Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada), expressing his agreement with the President, moved that, in accordance with rule 60 of the Council's rules of procedure, a roll-call vote be taken on the draft resolution. He made that request not for the usual purpose of recording difference of opinion within the Council, but in order that the Council's unanimous support of the draft resolution submitted by the President might be solemnly demonstrated.

29. The PRESIDENT ruled that, in accordance with the rules of procedure, the draft resolution on assistance for the civilian population of Korea (E/1820) should be put to the vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Absent: Czechoslovakia, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

The meeting was suspended at 4.30 p.m. and resumed at 4.45 p.m.

**United Nations research laboratories (E/1694, E/1694/Add.1, E/1694/Add.2 and E/1699/Rev.1)
(concluded)**

30. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the joint draft resolution submitted by the

delegations of Denmark, France and the United States (E/L.102), which had now been distributed. The three delegations had reached agreement on the text of sections A and B of that draft resolution. Alternative texts were given for section C, the first of which was sponsored by the delegations of Denmark and France, the second by that of the United States of America.

31. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) said that, since all representatives had presumably made up their minds on the problem of United Nations research laboratories, the simplest and most appropriate procedure would be for the Council to take a vote on the substantive aspect of the matter.

32. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) said that the representative of UNESCO had stated at the 410th meeting that no international laboratories in the proper sense of the term existed in the world. Without going into by-paths of terminology, he would recall that, though they might not be working under the label "international", there did in fact exist a number of laboratories and research institutions whose work had important international repercussions.

33. As had been made clear by its representative, UNESCO was interested in the question of regional research centres, but he wished to point out that UNESCO had clearly stated that it would not contribute to their establishment or maintenance. That point was covered by resolution 2.21 adopted at the last General Conference of UNESCO held in Florence in May 1950.

34. He had already stated at the 410th meeting of the Council that his Government was unable to contribute funds to such wide, new projects. Several other representatives had already made that point abundantly clear. If small sums were devoted to the establishment of international research laboratories, the consequence would be that the results of the work done would not bear comparison with the tremendous expectations which would have been raised, and the prestige of the United Nations would suffer. He could not but agree with the enunciation of principles made by the Danish representative, but must perforce point out that those principles would not be implemented by the joint draft resolution unless the expenditure were on a scale of millions of dollars. In his view, no further action should be taken on the question, especially since the joint draft resolution (E/L.102) would seem to make it clear that it was the view of its authors that the major responsibility for the work should lie with UNESCO rather than with the Council. It was for the former to take a decision on the point at its General Conference.

35. Turning to the question of convening a conference, he warned the Council that if it agreed "in principle" that a conference should be convened, a conference would in fact be held. If a general conference such as was envisaged in the joint draft resolution met, it would produce exceedingly lengthy lists of priorities, since men who were interested in a subject always wished their own subject to have the highest possible priority.

36. He had already indicated at the preceding meeting how his delegation would vote on any resolution submitted on United Nations research laboratories. Before

concluding, he asked the sponsors of the new joint text whether they considered that the final paragraph of section A served any useful purpose. Sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) called for a great deal of work from the Director-General of UNESCO. If the draft resolution were adopted, he failed to see how the Director-General of UNESCO could carry out all that work and submit a progress report to the Council at its next session. It would be preferable to invite the Director-General to submit a final report on any action taken under sub-paragraphs (a) to (d) rather than a progress report which would take up the Council's time unnecessarily.

37. If the sponsors of the draft resolution insisted on retaining that paragraph, his delegation would be obliged to vote against it.

38. The PRESIDENT invited Dr. Chisholm, Director-General of WHO, to reply to the questions put to him by the Danish representative.

39. Dr. CHISHOLM (World Health Organization) stated that the issues raised by the Danish representative were extremely technical and that it would require a great deal of time to answer them fully. Much work, of which use could be made, had indeed been done in the field of inter-human relations, and there was enough evidence to show that the research of cultural and social anthropologists, social psychologists, psychiatrists and sociologists could be applied if properly co-ordinated. The techniques at their disposal were still somewhat crude and had not been evolved for the particular purpose which the Danish representative had in mind. Preparatory work to develop appropriate methods and to determine their usefulness would therefore be required. One of the problems to be considered was whether "chemical psychology" was both feasible and practical. His own feeling was that it could not stand by itself, but that, combined with other methodologies in the field of human relations, it could contribute something to the understanding of the problem as a whole. At the present stage of research, it was impossible to estimate either the extent or the value of that contribution.

40. Mr. WALKER (Australia), recalling that, when the Council had initiated work on the subject of United Nations research laboratories, the Australian Government had not been a member of the Council and UNESCO's work had still been in a preparatory stage, said that the Australian Government considered that a case for United Nations research laboratories could be made only if specific projects were put forward and that, although there might be need for such laboratories, the report of the Committee of Scientific Experts (E/1694 and E/1694/Add.1) did not prove that such a need existed. His Government agreed that the proposed International Computation Centre deserved further consideration, although it was not convinced that the establishment of such a centre was the best course of the many open to the Council. But the centre would not be an international research laboratory in the sense in which that term had been used by the Council in earlier discussions. No convincing proof of need for a United Nations research laboratory to work in a specific field had yet been put forward. Since the Australian Government

did not think that the time had yet arrived to convene a conference of scientists as proposed by the Committee of Scientific Experts, he preferred the text of section C proposed by the United States delegation to that proposed jointly by the Danish and French delegations. Since the need for specific regional or United Nations laboratories had not yet been established, he suggested that the word "any" should be inserted before the word "specific" in sub-paragraph (c) of section A. He was in favour of sub-paragraph (d) in that section, since it would help to make the position clear for Member governments and the public in general, and it might also help to reveal gaps in scientific research. But he was opposed to the adoption of the final paragraph of section A, since he believed it unreasonable to request UNESCO, which was the international body principally concerned with the subject, to submit a report for consideration at the next session of the Council.

41. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that, if the Danish and French representatives agreed, he was prepared to accept the deletion of the words "the Director-General of" in the second and third paragraphs of section A and the second paragraph of section B, so that the request would be addressed to UNESCO and not to its Director-General, and consequently the deletion of the words "the Director-General of" in the text of section C submitted by his delegation. If the Danish and French representatives agreed, and in response to the observations made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and of Australia, he would also accept the amendment of the last paragraph of section A to read: "Invites UNESCO to transmit to an early session of the Council a report on the implementation of this resolution". He could not agree, however, with the United Kingdom representative's statement that the adoption of sub-paragraph (c) of that section would commit governments to the establishment of United Nations laboratories; surely the words "analysis of the need" and "if appropriate" made it clear that the draft resolution did not commit governments to the establishment of such laboratories.

42. If the International Computation Centre, which was the subject of section B, was set up in the form he had in mind, it would not be a research centre, but a service centre providing machines and facilities to scientists of many branches for purposes of computation.

43. Mr. AUGER (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), commenting on the new joint draft resolution (E/L.102) before the Council, explained that the International Computation Centre mentioned in section B had been envisaged as a service to be placed at the disposal of the big international institutes and of scientists, but that the centre would necessarily include a department of pure mathematics which could put the problems submitted into the form required for solution by machines.

44. With regard to section A of the draft resolution, he observed that his organization would not be able to undertake immediately all the work requested without a decision by the Executive Board and the General

Conference. Sub-paragraph (c) of that section, however, did not raise any difficulty, since the study of regional laboratories was already included in the resolutions adopted by the UNESCO Conference at Florence, 1950, and the necessary credits had been allocated.

45. With regard to section C, concerning the steps to be taken in 1952, the necessary arrangements for a conference of scientists could be made by the Director-General of UNESCO within the programme and budget for 1952, if the Council so decided.

46. Finally, he wished to repeat that both UNESCO and its Director-General took the greatest interest in the question of research laboratories. As had been said, it was a problem which had already been examined several times by the Economic and Social Council and by UNESCO, but it might be hoped that the phase of positive action would soon be entered upon, at least in the case of the International Computation Centre.

47. Mr. BUGNARD (France) said that his delegation agreed to the drafting amendments already accepted by the United States representative and endorsed the UNESCO representative's views on the nature of the International Computation Centre, which should clearly include a department of pure mathematics.

48. The United Kingdom representative had expressed the view that a conference of scientists would be unable to reach conclusions. The French delegation entirely disagreed with that opinion. If the scientists were brought together and provided with all the necessary documents, they would be perfectly capable of drawing up a rational order of priority.

49. Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) recalled that, hitherto, his delegation had always supported the establishment of United Nations research laboratories, but said that recently certain doubts had arisen.

50. If the Council adopted section A of the draft resolution, it would appear necessary to await the report of UNESCO on the studies requested of it in that section before considering the convening of the conference of scientists referred to in section C. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that, as the Co-ordination Committee had stressed in its report to the Council, it was important to avoid the establishment of new international organizations which might duplicate the work of those already in existence. The scientists to be invited to the proposed conference were, in point of fact, already working in the specialized agencies. In any case, it did not seem advisable to convene another conference before laying solid foundations on which the scientists in question could build.

51. The Brazilian delegation would vote in favour of sections A and B of the draft resolution, but, as it was not at the moment convinced of the need for a special conference, it would abstain from voting on section C.

52. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) declared his readiness to accept the changes to the draft resolution enumerated by the United States representative.

53. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) said that it did not appear to him to be certain that the draft resolution could not be implemented without the annual

conference of UNESCO voting funds for the purpose. Some of the expenses of its implementation would be borne by the United Nations, with which it was UNESCO's duty to co-operate. It would not be necessary, as might be supposed from the statement by the Brazilian representative, to set up a new body in order to implement the draft resolution, but it was necessary that there should be co-ordination of the activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in their work on international research laboratories. It was true that UNESCO had far-reaching responsibility in the scientific field, but so had other specialized agencies. That co-ordination had to be effected through the United Nations, and it was for the Economic and Social Council, in particular, to initiate action which UNESCO was not competent to take alone. He would not press the objections he had raised at the 410th meeting.

54. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) reaffirmed that, in his opinion, the primary responsibility for the subject under discussion lay with UNESCO, and said that in fact direct relationship and agreements between specialized agencies already existed.

55. Mr. DE BIE (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) explained, in amplification of the statement made by Mr. Auger, that UNESCO could not in fact take immediate action on all the requests made in section A of the draft resolution (E/L.102), since those requests went beyond the scope of the resolutions adopted by its Conference at Florence, but that that reservation did not apply to the International Computation Centre or to the International Institute of Social Sciences, which UNESCO was prepared to consider in 1951.

56. The PRESIDENT suggested that the United States delegation's text of section C of the draft resolution might be treated as an amendment to the text proposed by the Danish and French delegations.

It was so agreed.

57. Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) requested that the first paragraph of section A, sub-paragraph (c) of section A, and section B, be put to the vote separately.

58. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the United States delegation's text of section C of the draft resolution (E/L.102) submitted jointly by the delegations of Denmark, France and the United States of America.

The text was adopted by 6 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

59. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first paragraph of section A.

The paragraph was adopted by 13 votes to 2.

60. The PRESIDENT put to the vote sub-paragraph (c) of section A.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 13 votes to 2.

61. The PRESIDENT put to the vote section B, subject to deletion of the words "the Director-General of", as agreed by the authors of the draft resolution.

Section B was adopted by 13 votes to 2.

62. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution (E/L.102) as a whole, with the United States text of section C and the changes accepted by its sponsors.

The resolution was adopted by 13 votes to 2.

63. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) said that he had abstained from voting when the United States delegation's text of section C had been put to the vote, because his delegation had no decided preference for one or other of the two texts.

Full employment (continued)¹: report of the Economic Committee (E/1815)

64. The PRESIDENT invited the Chairman of the Economic Committee to introduce its report (E/1815) on the item; he drew attention to the amendments (E/L.97, E/L.98 and E/L.99) proposed to the draft resolution in that report by the delegations of Canada, the United Kingdom and Australia respectively, and appealed to representatives to refrain from repeating arguments they had put forward in the Economic Committee, where the draft resolution had been very fully discussed.

65. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India), Chairman of the Economic Committee, said that the draft resolution had been very fully discussed, not only by the Committee, but also by its drafting committee, which had, in fact, concerned itself with matters of substance as well as of drafting. The subject of the two major amendments at present before the Council—namely, the Canadian amendment to paragraph 2 (b) and the United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 13—had also been thoroughly discussed by the Committee. The other amendments before the Council were of minor importance.

66. The PRESIDENT invited comments on the draft resolutions and the amendments thereto.

67. Mr. Arnold SMITH (Canada) said that his delegation had submitted an amendment (E/L.97) to paragraph 2 (b) of the draft resolution because that paragraph, if it were adopted in its present form, would place upon Member governments, except those of under-developed countries which could take advantage of the escape clause in the preamble, an obligation to publish "in a quantitative expression" the standard by which they defined the meaning of full employment as a continuing objective of policy. There were several countries such as Canada, which was not in the category of under-developed countries, where it was not practical to express such a standard in precise arithmetical terms. In Canada, the economy was developing at the present time more quickly than it had ever done before; there was substantial and sustained immigration. Moreover, the Canadian economy was naturally subject to considerable seasonal and climatic variations. It was also to a high degree dependent on crop yields, and on the export of primary staple products to the world market. For all those reasons, there was the possibility of appreciable variation. A rigid arithmetic standard would be a

misleading and unsatisfactory guide, in those circumstances. A level of temporary unemployment that might be of relatively minor significance at some seasons, if spread throughout the country and arising from, for example, frictional causes, might have an entirely different and serious significance if it appeared at another season or concentrated in a single industry or region. The Canadian economy was not a simple one, and unduly rigid or over-simplified concepts were not applicable or satisfactory in understanding it or in shaping the economic policy of the Canadian Government.

68. He therefore hoped that the Council would adopt his amendment, which would give the draft resolution the desired flexibility by making optional the submission of a quantitatively expressed standard. The retention of the words "such standard being expressed, wherever possible, in terms either of employment percentages or of absolute numbers of unemployed or in ranges of such percentages or numbers" would make it clear that a quantitatively expressed standard was preferred for countries whose economic structure was such that it was practicable.

69. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) supported the Canadian representative's amendment, since, in his opinion, it would leave the door open for under-developed countries to publish the best standard they could at present produce, although it was likely that much time would elapse before their statistical services would enable them to publish a standard expressed quantitatively.

70. Mr. FLEMING (United Kingdom) said that, after careful consideration of the amendment submitted by the Canadian delegation, the United Kingdom delegation had decided to support it, since, if it were adopted, two types of precision of standards would be permissible—namely, "logical" expression and quantitative expression. "Logical" precision in respect of the standard by which a government defined the meaning of full employment might, for example, involve description of the types of inactivity which the government considered as unemployment, or an analysis of the various types of unemployment according to the various causes of unemployment. The United Kingdom delegation, however, was also of the opinion that each government should describe its standards with as much quantitative precision as possible, and considered such precision of great importance; but the United Kingdom delegation, after considering the views of the Canadian and Australian delegations, had come to the conclusion that that point was adequately covered by the words appearing lower down in the same paragraph.

71. Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan) expressed support for the Canadian amendment, not in order to make the implementation of the resolution easier for under-developed countries—for paragraph 2 (b) was not mandatory for them—but because he felt that, if employment percentages were fixed as standards at the present time, when the world was still passing through a period favourable to employment, standards might be set which it would be difficult to achieve later and that that was undesirable.

¹ See 394th meeting.

72. Mr. BORIS (France) recalled that in the Economic Committee the French delegation had opposed the Canadian amendment (E/L.97), on grounds of logic. If, however, the adoption of that amendment would ensure the support of the resolution by countries such as Canada and Australia, whose co-operation was most important, the French delegation would not oppose it.

73. The text of the resolution as amended by the Canadian delegation would be sufficiently clear, and, moreover, the Governments of Canada and Australia would themselves no doubt endeavour to supply of their own accord the figures which they feared it would be made compulsory for them to supply.

74. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said his delegation had no difficulty in agreeing to the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Canadian delegation. The United States authorities expressed its economic goals and objectives quantitatively and would continue to do so. The passage quoted by the Canadian representative was sufficient to ensure that all other countries would do so to the best of their ability.

75. He suggested, instead of the first amendment (E/L.99) to paragraph 3 submitted by the Australian representative, the insertion in the English text of the words "such objectives, goals and standard as it may set for itself . . ." in place of the words "its objectives, goals and standard that it may set for itself . . ."

76. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that he was prepared to withdraw the first Australian amendment to paragraph 3 if the alternative amendment suggested by the United States were adopted.

77. He was also prepared to withdraw the Australian amendment to paragraph 7 (b).

78. Instead of the Australian amendment to paragraph 5, he suggested the substitution of the words "domestic economic objectives and, where appropriate, goals" for the words "domestic economic goals". The Australian delegation had submitted that amendment because the adoption of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution would make such goals permissive, but not obligatory.

79. The final amendment submitted by the Australian delegation was in respect of paragraph 8 (a) for the deletion of the word "actions", which, if it were retained, would suggest that the Economic, Employment and Development Commission should conduct a post-mortem upon past actions by governments. In his opinion, paragraph 8 (a) should be confined to a request to the Commission to concern itself with governments' plans for the future.

80. He supported the amendment (E/L.98) proposed by the United Kingdom delegation.

81. Mr. Arnold SMITH (Canada) suggested, instead of the Australian representative's amendment to paragraph 5, the insertion of the words "and forecasts" after the words "domestic economic goals".

82. Mr. FLEMING (United Kingdom) said that he was in favour of the adoption of the amendments proposed by the Australian representative. In particular, he agreed, with reference to paragraph 8 (a), that the

Economic, Employment and Development Commission should not discuss the past except in order to place future plans in their right perspective. However, it would be appropriate for the Secretary-General, as was his practice, to comment upon the past actions of governments in the course of his studies and reports, such as the world economic report.

83. Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that it had been difficult for him to keep the Food and Agriculture Organization informed of the development of the Council's views on full employment owing to the procedure of dealing with that item of the agenda by protracted consideration in a drafting committee sitting in closed session. The Director-General of FAO and his staff had been able to give proper consideration to the draft resolution only after its recent release to the Economic Committee. Hence his request to make before the Council a brief statement which would more satisfactorily have been made in the Economic Committee.

84. FAO was greatly interested in the Committee's report (E/1815): chiefly because of the Organization's wide responsibilities concerning products derived from agriculture, forestry and fisheries, and also because it had acquired considerable experience in the collection and analysis of data supplied by governments on their future plans for agriculture and allied industries.

85. For the past three years, FAO had been assembling such information and analysing it both from a regional and a global point of view, so as to make it possible for an annual programme review to be carried out at its annual conference. Much of the action proposed in the draft resolution represented an extension of the technique adopted by FAO to a wide range of commodities and to the balance-of-payments problem. FAO would therefore be glad to co-operate fully in the action proposed both in the domestic and in the international field.

86. It believed that, both from the national and the international point of view, ambitious and useful action might be taken as a result of the proposals contained in the draft resolution, and therefore hoped that full advantage would be taken of existing information and that questionnaires designed to elicit fuller information would be drawn up in the light of the data already being obtained. FAO was fully prepared to co-operate in that respect.

87. It also attached much importance to the time factor, and believed that the problem should be approached by stages. Present changes in the world economic situation would have important economic effects, and it would therefore be most useful to begin by making a rapid assessment of the position. It was hoped that it could be done during the coming six months. In that respect, too, FAO was prepared to assist to the fullest possible extent. Other sections of the work which would take longer to complete—such as the proposed study on trade to be undertaken jointly by the Economic Commission for Europe and the Economic Commission for Latin America and some of the studies contemplated by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund—could be put in hand at the same time. FAO also hoped that the

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and ECLA would be encouraged to prepare advance estimates of balances of payments on the lines of those made by ECE in its *Economic Survey of Europe in 1949* (E/ECE/116/Rev.1). As far as agriculture and agricultural commodities were concerned, such estimates would of course be prepared in co-operation with FAO.

88. His organization would also suggest that the group of experts—who it hoped would be assisted by the appropriate specialized agencies—would regard the formulation of recommendations as to how the work on advance plans could best be placed on a permanent footing, as one of its tasks. To that end, it would have to consider what advice should be sought and what material assembled and how the various bodies concerned could collaborate.

89. In conclusion, he stated that FAO was greatly interested in the proposal regarding a study of under-employment in less developed countries and would willingly co-operate in the work proposed.

90. Mr. FLEMING (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had submitted its amendment (E/L.98) to paragraph 13 (b) because it felt strongly that the task of compiling a report analysing and commenting on the replies to questionnaires received from governments should be carried out by independent experts on their own responsibility, and that the report should not be compiled on the Secretary-General's responsibility. The United Kingdom delegation had submitted the amendment, although it had been rejected in committee, because it had been rejected by only a narrow margin, and because it was convinced that the method of appointing independent experts to make the report would be the most effective one; the effectiveness of that method had been proved by the report of the groups of experts: *National and International Measures for Full Employment* (E/1584). The Council was clearly of the opinion that it was an effective method, because it had set up, at the present session, three similar groups. The effectiveness of such groups would obviously diminish if they were appointed to report on every subject which the Council wished to be studied; they should not be appointed when mere statistical analyses were required, but should be appointed only when the subject was of primary importance and when bold recommendations were required to stimulate public opinion and to provoke discussion. The Secretary-General's position was such that it was difficult for him to sponsor bold recommendations, and the report which the Council would call for by adopting paragraph 13 (b) should be a bold one. It was to be on a very important subject; the Economic Committee obviously would not have recommended action involving the expenditure of approximately 200,000 dollars unless it had been important. He regretted that the request for the report was placed in such an unimportant position in the paragraph, the first part of which was concerned with mere procedural matters. The request in paragraph 13 (b) was that the Secretary-General submit a report commenting on as well as analysing governments' replies to the questionnaire. Far-reaching comments on those replies were required in order to elicit action

that would achieve international balance-of-payments equilibrium and remove restrictions on trade and currency exchange; they should include recommendations as to how both debtor and creditor countries should act in order to make possible the abolition of such restrictions. Such comments could not be made by those who, like the Secretary-General, did not enjoy complete freedom of utterance. Those were the main reasons why it was important that the report should be made by independent experts acting on their own responsibility.

91. A member of the Secretariat had informed the Economic Committee that it would not cost much more to entrust the task to a group of independent experts than to the Secretary-General. He understood that the saving would not in any event amount to more than 7,000 dollars; that was only 3½ per cent of the whole project. It would be a pity to spoil the ship for a ha'p'orth of tar. He feared that, if an independent group of experts was not appointed, the report would consist merely of a compilation of somewhat inaccurate information supplied by the various governments about their balance-of-payments position.

92. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said that the United States delegation had actively opposed the United Kingdom amendment in the Economic Committee. Its opposition was not on grounds of economy; in fact, the United States delegation had assumed that, in order to be able to submit the report, the Secretary-General would have to engage the services of experts outside the Secretariat, involving approximately the same expenditure as would be necessary for a group of independent experts. The United States Government did not object in any way to the Secretary-General's engaging the services of such experts; but it was strongly opposed in the present case to the report's being made by experts acting on their own responsibility, since it involved commentary upon the actions and proposed policies of governments. The Secretary-General had the right to analyse and comment on data supplied by governments—he had often done so constructively; and it was most desirable that the report should be drawn up under the Secretary-General's responsibility and not by independent experts acting in accordance with their individual views, which might possibly be in conflict with those of other equally qualified experts.

93. Mr. MASOIN (Belgium) thought that, in approving the draft resolution submitted to them, members of the Council would feel that they were making a positive contribution to world progress and peace.

94. The Belgian delegation regretted only that that resolution, which had been long in preparation, should have been submitted at a time when the situation no longer fully accorded with the premises on which the group of experts had based their report. His delegation wished to draw particular attention to paragraph 3 (d) of the draft resolution, which recommended governments to announce "measures to avoid inflation and to prevent excessive increases in the price level". That short sentence was of special importance in the existing circumstances; unfortunately it was included only in

the section concerning national measures, while it might be necessary to take international measures to combat inflationary tendencies in world economy.

95. If his delegation found any support for that view, it would be prepared to ask that examination of measures to combat such world inflationary trends should be

placed on the agenda for the next session of the Council. That would give the Economic and Social Council an opportunity to make the type of positive contribution, in its own field, that the Security Council made in respect of matters of immediate political importance.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.