

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 16:	
Question of the terms of reference of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission (<i>concluded</i>)..	219
Agenda item 20:	
International machinery for trade co-operation.....	220
Agenda item 25:	
Application from the German Democratic Republic for membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.....	221

President: Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia).

Present:

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, China, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following countries: Brazil, Canada, Greece, Indonesia.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Monetary Fund, World Health Organization.

AGENDA ITEM 16

Question of the terms of reference of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission (E/2665 and Corr.1, E/L.690/Rev.1) (*concluded*)

1. Miss KAHN (World Federation of Trade Unions) said that the reactivation of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission, with modification of its terms of reference, would contribute to the effectiveness of the Council's work. Its suspension in 1951 had left a gap in the Council's structure which had not been completely filled. As the Indian, Pakistani and Yugoslav representatives had pointed out (895th meeting), some economic problems were dealt with by the Council's functional commissions, but there was no economic commission which studied specific problems such as full employment or economic development. The regional commissions were, of course, doing valuable work in that field, but their activities did not cover the world as a whole.

2. The Council had made only one structural change since the Commission's suspension. It had established

the Commission on International Commodity Trade, whose terms of reference, however, indicated that it would not deal directly with important problems relating to employment.

3. The draft resolution (E/L.690/Rev.1) before the Council followed closely the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the organization and operation of the Council and its commissions,¹ but the earlier recommendations had been only partly implemented. The work of the former Economic, Employment and Development Commission relating to employment problems had been entrusted to the Secretariat, but the latter's studies, though admittedly valuable and important, were no substitute for full consideration at the governmental level.

4. Employment problems were common to all countries and since 1951 fluctuations in employment had caused economic instability in various industrialized countries and hampered progress in under-developed regions. The problem was, moreover, receiving less attention in the Council, owing to the pressure of work. Even the valuable material collected from Governments and compiled by the Secretariat had not been examined thoroughly.

5. The Argentine representative had pointed out (895th meeting) that most of the substantive economic and social departments of the Secretariat were paralleled by functional commissions. Yet no commission dealt on a world-wide basis with employment or economic development problems although the latter subject was discussed extensively in the Council and in the General Assembly.

6. The World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) therefore considered that the Commission should be reactivated, to deal with the prevention of wide fluctuations in economic activity and the promotion of full employment by the co-ordination of national full employment policies and by international action, and with economic development. Its new terms of reference should include the first and third sections of its old terms of reference, omitting the second section dealing with war reconstruction, but with the addition of the terms of reference of the former Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability. The WFTU urged that the draft revised terms of reference should be considered by the Council in 1956.

7. The PRESIDENT put the revised draft resolution (E/L.690/Rev.1) to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

8. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because it saw no reason to depart from the principles set forth in Council resolution 557 (XVIII), which it had supported. Sec-

¹ *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 36, document E/1995 and Corr.1.*

tion C I of that resolution had emphasized economic stability and recognized the strong desire expressed in the Council for the re-establishment of the Commission. The Council found it very difficult to deal with all the tasks entrusted to it under Article 55 of the United Nations Charter and it would therefore seem that the Commission could have made a valuable contribution to the solution of employment problems.

AGENDA ITEM 20

International machinery for trade co-operation (E/2787/Rev.1, E/L.685)

9. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet delegation had already explained in detail its position on the question of international machinery for trade co-operation at the first part of the twentieth session. A universal approach was necessary in international trade questions. The Soviet delegation had submitted a proposal appealing to Members of the United Nations to ratify the Havana Charter for an International Trade Organization,² to which it was prepared to accede. The discussions which had taken place had emphasized that the need for an international trade organization within the framework of the United Nations had become pressing. The GATT, however, failed to meet the generally recognized requirement of universality, as its membership was restricted and it was not a United Nations institution.

10. Accordingly, at the first part of the twentieth session, his delegation had submitted amendments (E/L.685) to the Economic Committee's draft resolution (E/2787/Rev.1), designed to overcome the shortcomings of that draft. They reflected a desire to achieve universality in international machinery for trade co-operation and would make further progress possible in that field.

11. Mr. KING (United States of America) recalled that similar Soviet amendments had already been thoroughly examined and rejected on three occasions in the Economic Committee and its working party. The situation had not changed since then.

12. His delegation would vote against the first USSR amendment (E/L.685), which implied that existing and proposed international organizations were not open to all Members of the United Nations. That was not the case.

13. He would also vote against the second USSR amendment, which was unnecessary because the Economic and Social Council, in operative paragraph 4 of resolution 579 A (XX), had decided to resume consideration of the problem of the expansion of world trade at its twenty-second session. International machinery for trade co-operation was an aspect of the problem and could be raised at that time, if any delegation so desired.

14. Mr. SVEC (Czechoslovakia) said that the Council's task was to ensure that the draft resolution on international machinery for trade co-operation fully reflected the principles on which agreement had been reached, namely that an expansion of trade was necessary if the economic and social aims of the United Nations were to be achieved, that trade could be expanded only through permanent machinery established for that purpose, and that the character of such machinery should take into account the interests of all

countries, regardless of the stage of economic development they had reached and regardless of their political and social systems.

15. The need for such international machinery was apparent and there should be general agreement that, by virtue of its universality, such machinery should be open to all Members of the United Nations. Only then could the United Nations fulfil its tasks in accordance with the spirit of the Charter.

16. Some representatives had stated that GATT represented a universal approach to the problem and that it should be the only method used by the Council to facilitate the development of international trade. The Council should not take such a narrow view and indirectly force countries to join an organization which they did not consider to be in their best interests. Many countries had not joined GATT for that reason and it was unfair to exclude them from international machinery for trade co-operation.

17. If the Council really intended that such machinery should be open to all Members of the United Nations, it should say so explicitly in the draft resolution.

18. He failed to see what objection there could be to the second Soviet amendment, as the Council had already decided (resolution 579 A (XX)) that it would resume consideration of the problem of the expansion of world trade at its twenty-second session. The item would therefore be on the agenda and its discussion would of course include the question of international machinery for trade co-operation.

19. He would vote in favour of both Soviet amendments (E/L.685).

20. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation's support of the first Soviet amendment (E/L.685) in no way implied any criticism of GATT.

21. The second Soviet amendment raised no new questions of substance, but merely advocated a procedure which appeared appropriate.

22. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) found it difficult to understand why the United States representative had opposed the first Soviet amendment, for it seemed that he did not object to the principle it embodied. Nor was there any valid reason why the Council should not indicate in its decision that the question of a trade organization would be discussed at its twenty-second session, an idea to which the United States representative had similarly raised no objection. As for the statement by the United States representative that the Soviet Union had introduced the same amendments several times already, he stressed that it had every right to do so in its efforts to make constructive contributions towards the Council's task of promoting international economic co-operation.

23. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom) supported the views expressed by the United States representative. There was no objection to the proposal in the Economic Committee's draft resolution (E/2787/Rev.1) that the Secretary-General should prepare a report on international procedures and bodies concerned in the development of trade co-operation. Such a report would presumably be merely a factual study and would not contain any recommendations or decisions. They would be left to the Council.

24. The first Soviet amendment (E/L.685) was unacceptable because it implied that membership of existing trade organizations was not open to all Members of

² United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1948.II.D.4.

the United Nations. The fact that some Members of the United Nations were not parties to GATT was the result of their own decision. The Soviet Union was apparently trying to destroy the whole international structure built up by the major trading countries of the world in the eight years since the signing of the Havana Charter. No one pretended that the revised GATT was perfect, but it was the result of hard negotiation and was the best that could be achieved. To put the clock back would not serve the interests of international trade.

25. The second Soviet amendment was unnecessary because the question of the expansion of world trade was in any case to be discussed at the Council's twenty-second session and any delegation would then be free to raise the question of machinery for trade co-operation. It was undesirable to commit the Council at the current stage to a discussion of any one particular aspect of the problem.

26. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the original draft resolution submitted by the Economic Committee (E/2787/Rev.1) and would oppose the Soviet amendments (E/L.685).

27. Mr. CARLSON (Secretariat) said that during the first part of the twentieth session the Secretariat had stated that it could submit the report mentioned in the draft resolution (E/2787/Rev.1) by 30 April 1956, but the position was now somewhat different. It could probably prepare the report in time for the twenty-second session of the Council. The report would deal only with multilateral bodies and would be purely factual. At the first part of the twentieth session it had been suggested that it would be easier for the Secretariat to consult the secretariats of the international bodies concerned. He agreed with that procedure, as much of the data required was unpublished, but it should be borne in mind that if, in order to expedite the production of the report, an official was sent to consult with the secretariats in question, additional expenditure might be necessary.

28. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) thought there might be some difficulty in transmitting the report in question to all Member States by the time stated and asked the Soviet representative if perhaps the date mentioned in his amendment (E/L.685) might be changed.

29. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the essence of his amendment was to have the report considered at the Council's twenty-second session and that the date did not really matter.

30. Mr. KAUL (India) suggested that the Council should defer a vote on the draft resolution and the amendments until the following day.

It was so agreed.

AGENDA ITEM 25

Application from the German Democratic Republic for membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (E/2800, E/L.691, E/L.692)

31. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia), introducing his draft resolution (E/L.692), said that, during its relatively brief period of existence since 7 October 1949, the German Democratic Republic had made notable economic, social and cultural progress. Industrial production, for example, was almost double that of 1936 and had made the Republic one of the most highly

developed industrial countries in Europe. At the end of 1954 agricultural production had been twice the pre-war figure and, from 1950 to 1954, there had been decreases in the prices of food and of consumer goods.

32. Similar progress had been registered in public health, culture and social security. According to the Minister of Culture, over 3,000 million marks had been spent in 1955 on cultural activities, twice as much as in 1951. At the beginning of 1955 there had been over 1,000 cultural institutions, 10,500 public libraries and 8,000 factory libraries. The number of schools had risen steadily. In five years 25 new universities and colleges had been founded, bringing the total to 47. So far as expenditure on education was concerned, budgetary appropriations for universities and high schools in 1954 had been 477,000 million marks, as compared with 246,000 million marks in 1951.

33. Twenty-five theatres, including the Berlin State Opera, had been reconstructed. Seventeen feature films had been produced in 1954-1955, many of which had achieved recognition at international festivals.

34. The Academy of Science at Berlin was playing an important part in the promotion of scientific knowledge and many new scientific institutes had been opened in recent years.

35. In 1952-1953, 3 million volumes had been published, including the works of foreign authors such as Balzac, Stendhal, Thackeray, Dickens and Mark Twain. There were about 30,000 amateur folklore groups in factories, agricultural co-operatives and similar establishments, with a membership of over 800,000. Ten institutes existed for the training of musicians, actors, writers and entertainers.

36. The German Democratic Republic was also an active participant in world trade and maintained trade relations with more than seventy countries. At the end of 1954 it had been a member of 30 international organizations and 150 international associations and a party to 5 international conventions.

37. The facts which he had quoted, which were far from exhaustive, clearly justified the German Democratic Republic's application for membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and were indicative of the contribution it could make to the work of that organization.

38. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom) recalled that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (E/L.691), in common with most other States, did not recognize the East German Government. The so-called German Democratic Republic was not regarded as a free, independent and sovereign State and did not therefore qualify for membership in UNESCO. He called upon the Council to support the joint draft resolution.

39. Mr. KAUL (India) said that it was his view, after careful consideration, that the German Democratic Republic should be allowed to co-operate with other States in economic, social, scientific and humanitarian activities. It was desirable to make UNESCO as nearly universal as possible; political and ideological differences should not prevent the admission of the German Democratic Republic.

40. He would therefore vote for the Czechoslovak draft resolution (E/L.692).

41. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) stressed that the one relevant fact, on the basis of which

the issue should be decided, was that UNESCO was an inter-governmental agency. East Germany had no recognized international status or independent government and was therefore ineligible for membership in UNESCO. Accordingly, the United States had sponsored the joint draft resolution (E/L.691).

42. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Czechoslovak representative had convincingly presented the case in introducing his draft resolution (E/L.692), which the Soviet delegation fully supported. The German Democratic Republic was a peace-loving democratic State with high scientific, cultural, educational and artistic standards. Such standards had been attained because they served the interests of the people and of peace. The German Democratic Republic maintained cultural relations with many States: it had welcomed an operatic company from the People's Republic of China and artists from the Soviet Union, India, France, Austria and other countries, and many foreign films were shown in its cinemas.

43. The purpose of UNESCO, according to article 1 of its Constitution, was "to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture". Yet a number of culturally advanced States, such as the German Democratic Republic, were not members. The Economic and Social Council had years previously approved the membership of the Federal Republic of Germany; it would be unjust not to do the same in the case of the German Democratic Republic.

44. Referring to the objections of the United Kingdom and United States representatives, he emphasized that those representatives did not care to admit that in recent years the development of Western and Eastern Germany had been proceeding along different lines and that two States with their own social systems had arisen in Germany. The German Democratic Republic was an independent democratic State with a population of 18 million, which maintained diplomatic, trade and other relations with many other States; the Treaty on Relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the German Democratic Republic, signed on 20 September 1955, stated that the relationships between the two States were based on equal rights, recognition of sovereignty and non-interference in domestic affairs. The German Democratic Republic was free to form its own national and international policy.

45. There was no justification for rejecting the application; the adoption of the joint draft resolution (E/L.691) would only harm the Council and UNESCO, because it was based on political considerations which had nothing in common with international cultural co-operation.

46. Mr. AKANT (Turkey), Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands) and Mr. EPINAT (France) said that, for the reasons adduced by the United Kingdom and United States representatives, they would vote for the joint draft resolution (E/L.691).

47. Mr. HSIA (China) pointed out that the so-called German Democratic Republic was a creation of the Soviet Union. Not being an independent political entity, it could not represent the free will and aspirations of

the people of East Germany. He therefore supported the joint draft resolution (E/L.691).

48. Mr. DONS (Norway), like the Indian representative, favoured the principle of universality in international organizations, but he considered that the principle was not involved, as the application before the Council had not come from a free, independent and sovereign State.

49. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) agreed with the Indian representative's approach, but had reached a different conclusion. He too was in favour of universality but, in the case of divided countries, the United Nations should first strive to effect their unification and then adopt the practical procedure which it was following in connexion with the admission of new Members. The application of the German Democratic Republic was, however, in a different category. One part of divided Germany, the Federal Republic, was already a member of UNESCO, and both parts should be treated equally.

50. He therefore supported the Czechoslovak proposal (E/L.692).

51. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia) regretted that some delegations were opposed to the application. The position adopted by the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (E/L.691) reflected their general policy, which prevented the unification of Germany on a democratic basis. The German Democratic Republic had already submitted a number of proposals on economic, social and cultural co-operation between the two parts of Germany and had obtained a favourable response from the German people. The policy of those opposing the application was not new; it had already been applied against the People's Republic of China. It was common knowledge that such a policy tended to boomerang.

52. He recalled that, during the discussion of the application of the Federal Republic of Germany for membership in the International Civil Aviation Organization, his delegation had intimated that it was in favour, provided that a similar application from the German Democratic Republic, if tendered, should be judged by the same criteria. The Council should view the application before it in the same light, as the Federal Republic of Germany had been a member of UNESCO for some time.

53. The PRESIDENT put the joint draft resolution (E/L.691) to the vote.

At the request of the representative of Czechoslovakia a vote was taken by roll-call.

Yugoslavia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, China, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Against: Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, India, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes to 5.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.