

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIALE/AC.24/SR.36
28 July 1949Dual DistributionECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCILNinth SessionCO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 22 July, 1949, at 10.30 a.m.

Contents:

RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF
SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (item 34 of the
Council Agenda with the reports of
the specialized agencies, Items 35-42,
so far as they concern questions of
co-ordination) (Continued) pages 4 - 26.

Present:

Chairman: Mr. PLIMSOLL

Members:

Australia	Mr. CUMES
Belgium	Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE
Brazil	Mr. MACHADO
Byelorussian SSR	Mr. AGAPOV
Chile	Mr. RODRIGUEZ
China	Mr. TSAO
Denmark	Mr. DAHLGAARD
France	Mr. de SEYNES
	Mr. AMANRICH
India	Mr. SEN
New Zealand	Dr. SUTCH
Poland	Miss. CZARKO
Turkey	Mr. MIRAS
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BORISOV
United Kingdom	Mr. LEDWARD
United States of America	Mr. STINEBOWER
Venezuela	Mr. NASS

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Organization	(Mr. COX (Mr. JENKS
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. McDUGALL
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. BERKELEY
International Civil Aviation Organization	Mr. MARLIN

International Organizations
(Continued):

International Bank for
Reconstruction and Development Mr. J. H. D. ...

International Monetary Fund Mr. J. H. D. ...
Mr. J. H. D. ...

Universal Postal Union Mr. J. H. D. ...

World Health Organization Mr. J. H. D. ...

International Labour
Organization Mr. J. H. D. ...

Continued:

Mr. J. H. D. ...
Mr. J. H. D. ...
Mr. J. H. D. ...
Mr. J. H. D. ...

Mr. J. H. D. ...

Mrs. J. H. D. ...

Mr. J. H. D. ...

RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES
(Item 34 of the Council Agenda with the reports of the
specialized agencies, Items 35-42, so far as they concern
questions of co-ordination) (Documents E/1340, 1344,
1344/Add.1, E/1347, E/1351.Rev.1, E/1317, E/AC.24/W.16)
(Continued)

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom), speaking to a point of order,
raised the question of press releases on the proceedings of the Committee.
Press release ECOSOC/68, dated 20 July 1949, recorded the Committee's
decision on the setting up of regional offices in the following terms:

"... the Committee decided that plans for setting up
regional offices should be placed before the Economic
and Social Council before the offices were opened.
The agencies should inform the Administrative Committee
on Co-ordination of their plans sufficiently in advance
to enable the Committee to report to the Economic and
Social Council and to allow the latter to make recommenda-
tions, if need be, regarding these plans, for setting up
regional offices."

That was not his delegation's understanding of the decision taken.

The correct manner of describing the decision would be:

"... plans for setting up regional offices should,
whenever possible, be discussed in the Administrative
Committee on Co-ordination before final decisions were
taken, and the Committee would include in its report to
the Council an account of the consultations which had
taken place on the subject and the reasons for any
decisions reached."

The press release was manifestly inaccurate, and he would ask whether the
Secretary to the Committee had checked it before publication. He would
be glad if the Committee would take note of the point, and hoped that
in future press releases would be properly checked before release.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that the second text read out by the
representative of the United Kingdom correctly summarized the Committee's
decision.

Mr. SZE, Secretary to the Committee, said that press releases
were not as a rule approved by the secretaries of committees. It was

for the reporters present to summarise the proceedings and to report on the situation with regard to the reports on the situation in the country. The Co-ordination Committee was constituted, and the Secretary of the Committee. He would endeavour to keep in touch with the press and the public. The Department of Public Information, but not the normal function of secretaries of assemblies.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) thanked the Secretary for the information and emphasized that the press and the public should be kept informed. Press releases should be accurate.

Mr. BYRN (United States of America) stated that the Secretary was also very much concerned with the problem of the press. The Secretary would carefully check press releases and would maintain close contact between the Secretariat and the press.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that certain difficulties had been given to the whole question since it involved the functioning of the organization. That was by no means the first time that the Secretary had issued a press release. The Department of Public Information had to be kept informed. There was not enough newspaper coverage, and the Secretary had to be kept informed that press releases were consequently issued at a regular interval. The necessary information. When the correspondent of a newspaper reported a meeting, he did so on his own responsibility. The information was verified by the Secretary. The Secretary had to be kept informed that the press was not informed. It was, in fact, a very serious situation should be allowed to continue as it was. The Secretary should be examined by the General Assembly. In the meantime, the Secretary of the Council should approve press releases before they were issued.

The CHAIRMAN thought the whole question lay outside the competence of the Economic and Social Council. He was not sure whether the Committee could rigidly insist that the Secretariat check press releases, the issue of which was governed by consideration of speed. The utmost care should be exercised in drafting them, but it should be noted that they were in no way binding on the Committee.

Dr. SUTCH (New Zealand) said that the Department of Public Information had throughout been consistent in accepting responsibility for press releases, and did not, in principle, accept the premise that they should be submitted to the appropriate sections of the Secretariat. No checking was done by the Departments of Economic or Social Affairs. Indeed, the Department of Public Information was, in principle, autonomous. On the other hand, it was the responsibility of the Committee to be accurate.

He would, as an example, refer to the fact that the Committee would shortly examine a report of the decisions taken by it at the present session. If one or other paragraph of that report did not happen to fit in with a representative's version of the facts, a substantive discussion would ensue. It was for the Committee to formulate its decisions precisely. He had himself at a preceding meeting handed the Chairman a document giving his views on a certain subject. It was conceivable that the Department of Public Information might have used that paper as the basis for a press release. He mentioned such a possibility as an illustration of the difficulties under which that Department worked.

The CHAIRMAN emphasised that although it certainly rested with the Committee to formulate its decisions precisely, in the

particular case referred to by the United Kingdom representative, a mistake had clearly been made by the Department of Public Information.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) maintained his contention that the Department of Public Information should not release any information unless it was certain of its accuracy; he did not consider that the Department could be exonerated from blame with regard to the press release under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN re-iterated that the matter was beyond the competence of the Committee. He said that he would raise it in the appropriate quarter and that a correction of Press Release ECOSOC/68 would be issued.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) proposed that the question be referred to the Secretary-General, who should consider what steps could appropriately be taken.

The CHAIRMAN undertook to discuss the matter with the President of the Council,

"Comparative Review of the Activities and Work Programmes of the United Nations and the Specialised Agencies in the Economic and Social Fields" (Document E/1351) and "Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects" (Document E/1340).

The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to consider the question of documents as a whole before taking a decision with regard to the "Comparative Review" and the "Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects". Was the information submitted to the Committee of the right kind, with regard to quality, type and quantity?

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that in his opinion the documents service should be limited to certain basic documents to be submitted at every session. He would suggest three such documents. First, the Report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. Secondly, the "Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects" which he assumed the Committee had agreed should be issued annually in a revised form. He attached great importance

to having sight once a year of a document, possibly printed, in which a distinction was clearly made between completed projects and those still in the process of execution. The Committee might make a recommendation to that effect to the Publications Board.

The third and final basic document which he would like to see was a report on the recommendations of the Board of Auditors. It need not be voluminous, but should bring out the Board's general comments in relation to integration.

If the Committee proposed to consider the reports of the specialized agencies, it would be good policy to request the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination or the Secretary-General to transmit all those reports to the Committee with appropriate comments, drawing the Committee's attention to specific points.

Mr. SEN (India) said that, like the problem of press releases, the problem of documents affected the whole of the United Nations Organization. Invidious though it might be to discuss defects of timing, form and value, it was unavoidable that the Committee should do so, in fairness to the Secretariat whose difficulties in that domain must be appreciated. A general outline of policy should be drawn.

The method of registering documents was such that it was impossible to tell when the publication of a document had actually taken place. That was a difficulty which all governments had encountered. He submitted therefore that documents should be issued in the order of registration, urgent documents, perhaps, being issued on paper of a different colour and being listed separately. An alternative solution would be for the Secretariat to publish a check list of documents which had been, or were about to be, distributed.

Too many corrections and additions to documents were issued. It was difficult to lay down any guiding principle on this point, except that the number of revisions and corrections should be kept to a minimum.

It would be helpful to delegations if the Secretariat were to issue at the beginning of every session an explanatory list of document classification numbers. After three years of activity the United Nations had published a check list, priced at 25 shillings, but it was only with considerable difficulty that he had been able to obtain a copy of that list at the United Nations Office at Geneva. What, moreover, was the explanation of the fact that the check list of documents for the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council had not yet been published? He was aware that that session had been held in Geneva and that special difficulties might consequently have arisen; some explanation of attendant circumstances and difficulties should, however, be given when it was proposed that a session of a United Nations organ be held in Geneva or elsewhere away from Lake Success.

The different size of the reports of the specialized agencies constituted another source of inconvenience. In view of the fact that the International Labour Organization had been publishing reports for a great many years, and that any change in the size of its reports might cause serious library and filing difficulties, he would suggest that other organizations in future made their reports the same size as those of the International Labour Organization.

With regard to the number of documents, that was in his opinion too numerous, and were frequently published too late. The distinction between restricted and unrestricted documents was also somewhat confusing. According to the Secretary-General's policy, restricted documents were distributed to delegations on request, but unless a list of restricted documents was made available it was impossible for

delegations to know what to ask for. He must urge that such a list be circulated to governments.

Finally, he would place yet another burden on the shoulders of the Secretariat by suggesting that a complete set of Council documents be given to each delegation at each session in order to enable representatives to check their own files.

Mr. MARTIN HILL, Director of co-ordination for specialized agencies and for economic and social matters, thought that an improvement had taken place during the last year in the matter of timing, since every effort was being made by the Secretariat to follow the Council's decision, taken at its eighth session, to the effect that documents must be distributed six weeks before a session. Thus, it had been possible to distribute in time the "Report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination" with its annexes (Documents E/1340, E/1343, E/1342, E/1341 and E/1347) as well as the "Report of the Secretary-General on General Co-ordination Matters" (Document E/1331). It had not been possible to make available in time either the reports of the Commissions, the meetings of which had been held during the months of May and June 1949, or the "Report of the Secretary-General on the Agreement between the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization" (Document E/1348). As for the "Comparative Review of the Activities and Work Programmes of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies in the Economic and Social Fields" (Document E/1351), the reasons for the issue of a revised version were set out in the footnote on page 1 thereof. The Secretariat would bear the whole matter in mind, but he must ask the Committee to take note of the fact that a definite improvement had already occurred.

He thought that the Indian representative's suggestions with regard to the classification of documents and the publication of a check list were

acceptable, but would suggest that the matter be referred to the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, since he could not at that moment commit the Secretary-General or the specialized agencies. The question of the format of the reports submitted by the specialized agencies was a difficult one, in that many agencies issued only one report for their own use and that of the Council. The only solution which could readily be envisaged was that of printing those reports twice in different sizes, which would be very costly. That matter, however, could also be referred to the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination.

On the other hand, there would be no difficulty at all in providing delegations with a complete set of documents.

With regard to the general question of the number of documents issued and their length, he would draw the Committee's attention to the fact that documents were issued in pursuance of resolutions adopted by the Council or the General Assembly. The possibility of summarizing certain documents in such a way as to give a general picture of the salient points might usefully be considered, though compression was certainly difficult in view of the amount of information that was normally required. He would like to reserve his right to comment further on that point at a later stage, in connection with the "Report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination" (Document E/1340).

He then referred to the Secretariat's note, contained in Document E/AC.24/W.16, which listed the documents submitted to the Committee under Item 34 of the Agenda. At the next session of the Council, the Committee would presumably wish to see the report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, together with a number of Annexes such as reports on housing and town and country planning, on the co-ordination of fellowship programmes, and on the co-ordination of migration activities, as well as a report from the Director-General of the International Labour Organization on man-power programmes. Some of those reports would undoubtedly be

shorter in future.

A more difficult problem was that of the two reports submitted by the Secretary-General under the following titles: "Organization and Allocation of Personnel of the Economic and Social Departments of the Secretariat for 1949-1950" (Document E/1344), and the "Report on Work Programmes of the Economic and Social Departments and of Commissions of the Council" (Document E/1344/Add.1). A great deal of the information contained in those reports was available elsewhere, and the Committee might consider whether it wished to have those two reports in future, although it should be noted that they had been submitted in accordance with Council Resolution 128 (VI).

Turning to the "Comparative Review of the Activities and Work Programmes of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies in the Economic and Social Fields" (Document E/1351/Rev.1) and the "Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects" he had perhaps expressed himself somewhat too categorically at the preceding meeting with regard to the difficulties entailed in combining the two documents. That might be done if the Council so desired by applying the method of full indexing under subject headings, and by adding a footnote reference to the reports of the specialized agencies. But one result of the suppression of "The Comparative Review" would be that only incomplete analyses of the work on different projects would be available. The decisions reached by Commissions whose sessions were held at the beginning of the year would have to be left out.

Finally, he must point out that several documents had been placed before the Committee in pursuance of a request made by the Council at its seventh session, namely: "Report of the Secretary-General on the Action taken in pursuance of the Agreement between the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies" (Document E/1317); "Communication from the Director-General of the International Labour Organization on the Agreement

between the United Nations and the International Labour Organization" (Document E/1320); and "Report of the Secretary-General on the Agreement between the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization" (Document E/1348).

Mr. SEN (India) wished to put two further points. First, was it correct that the United Nations Office at Geneva had no copy of "Official Records of the Third Session of the General Assembly, Part II, 5 April-18 May, 1949, RESOLUTIONS" (Document A/900)? Secondly, he must note that at Lake Success a set of working documents was provided for representatives. Finally, and he apologized for raising a somewhat irrelevant issue, how was it that photographers were allowed to interfere in the proceedings of the Council by taking photographs during meetings?

The CHAIRMAN expressed the view that the final point was beyond the Committee's competence.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that, assuming that the discussion referred to documents to be submitted to the Committee as distinct from the documents for the Economic and Social Council, the fundamental document was obviously the "Report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination" (Document E/1340). The task of co-ordination was entrusted to two bodies, the present Committee and the Administrative Committee, the latter being the executive body; since it was itself assisted in its task by different committees, the annexes to its report should presumably be the reports of such committees.

Finally, the reports of the specialized agencies should stress the order of priority established for their respective programmes of work.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) pointed out that some confusion appeared to exist with regard to the dating of documents, which were issued and classified under one date, and distributed some weeks later.

He would propose that a document should be dated by the day it left the Secretariat, rather than by the day it was cleared by the responsible office.

Certain misgivings had been expressed at the seventh session of the Council about the "Comparative Review" and its usefulness to delegations. The Secretariat had then claimed that that publication was useful to specialized agencies, even if it was not needed by the Council. In the opinion of his delegation, the "Comparative Review" should be discontinued, its useful sections being transferred to the "Catalogue". The latter could certainly be improved on the lines suggested by the Director of Co-ordination. Its major current defect was that it merely listed the activities of organizations without giving a general picture of the work that was being done.

Finally, on the basis of the comments made by the Director of Co-ordination, he concurred with the view that the "Report of the Secretary-General on the Organization of the Economic and Social Affairs Department" (Document E/1344) and the "Report on the Work Programmes of the Economic and Social Affairs Departments and of the Commissions of the Council" (Document E/1344/Add.1) should be discontinued in the future.

Dr. SUTCH (New Zealand) regretted that in the Chairman's view the Committee was not competent to consider the question of the presence of photographers at meetings of the Council and its committees. The representative of India had raised an important point. Considerable annoyance had been felt by representatives at the intrusions of photographers, whose comings and goings should at least be regulated by the Department of Public Information, since there appeared to be a need for their presence from the point of view of publicity. It was already sufficiently trying and disturbing to have persons constantly entering and leaving the public galleries. He considered that the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly should examine that very important question in all

choice would fall on the "Comparative Review". It would be helpful to the Committee to hear the comments of the Editor of the "Catalogue".

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) supported the comments of the representative of New Zealand on the necessity of unambiguous expression, whether in English, in American or in any other language. But viewing the problem historically, he must recall that a resolution had been passed relating to the lack of documents; that situation had now been remedied, but it would appear, excessively. He agreed with the representative of Brazil that the report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination was the most important document. The second in importance would be the "Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects", enriched by the inclusion of certain sections of the "Comparative Review". He was not quite sure what type of document the Brazilian representative had had in mind when he had referred to a statement from the Board of Auditors; such a document would be more appropriately submitted to the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly. But the third basic document that the Committee required was a commentary on co-ordination, together with the reports of the specialized agencies. The Secretary-General should be requested to preface such a document by an introductory, analytical statement.

He must emphasize the usefulness of the reports submitted by the specialized agencies, and he also hesitated to endorse the suggestion that the "Report of the Secretary-General on the Organization of the Economic and Social Affairs Department" and the "Report on the work Programmes of the Economic and Social Affairs Department and of the Commissions of the Council" (Document E/1344 and E/1344/Add.1) should be discontinued, even though some of the information contained therein was available elsewhere.

minute reports of the Commissions and of the specialized agencies. The Catalogue could not be issued in time for the next session of the Council if it had to be modified in accordance with the proposals made. Finally, she would like to point out that if the existing order in the Catalogue were re-arranged, it would not be possible to ascertain the entire work programme of any given agency. Nevertheless, she would welcome further comments on the potential value to the Council of the proposed fusion of the two documents.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) suggested that the information required by the Council with regard to priorities and overlapping could equally well be obtained from a document in which projects were classified, not by organs, but by activities. He agreed with the United Kingdom proposal that fusion of the Catalogue and the Comparative Review was possible. Furthermore, he would point out that the information supplied in the past had not always been of the type required by the Council, and asked whether a list of documentary material relating to each project could be included.

Mrs. GRANT (Secretariat) said that the original intention had been to group projects by subjects rather than by organs, but it had been found that such a method entailed listing certain projects more than once. It had therefore been decided to group them by organs, and to include all relevant additional information in the index of subjects which obviated repetition and cross-reference in the text. The structure of the Comparative Review had originally been based on a huge chart with vertical and horizontal columns for organs and projects respectively. The Catalogue now represented the vertical columns, and the Comparative Review the horizontal columns.

Mr. MARLIN (International Civil Aviation Organization) pointed out that if the Catalogue was to be revised, and was to replace the Comparative Review, it would have to be renamed, since the present title, "Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects", excluded all those technical activities which were of importance to many agencies, including the International Civil Aviation Organization, and which must be co-ordinated. He would cite only one example, namely, that of safety of life at sea. The new Catalogue must, in his view, also cover technical activities proposed which represented the major part of his Organization's work.

MISS HOWELL (World Health Organization) said the committee might consider a problem which had engaged the attention of the World Health Organization and doubtless other specialized agencies in preparing information for the Comparative Review, namely, that the specialized agencies required about a year to take action on any Council recommendation, because such recommendations must be placed before the governing bodies of the agencies. Therefore the most useful recommendations were those concerned with the work programmes for the following year; the annual reports of the agencies on the work of the past year would provide the material for comment.

Mr. RADICE (Universal Postal Union), referring to the suggestion that the reports of the specialized agencies should be of uniform format, said that a general convention would be required to achieve such a result. With regard to the proposal that the Comparative Review should be discontinued, he would stress that the Universal Postal Union found the Review very valuable. The objects of the Catalogue and that of the Comparative Review were quite distinct. The former was designed solely for the United Nations

organs and the specialized agencies, while the latter contained additional information for the general public. The Universal Postal Union was in favour of retaining both, and thought that the two distinct types of presentation should be continued.

Dr. SUTCH (New Zealand) thought it would be inadvisable to close the discussion at that stage, particularly in view of the statements by the representatives of the specialized agencies which should be closely examined. He himself would welcome some clarification on the possible alternatives to the Comparative Review. He had been particularly interested in the observations of the representative of the World Health Organization, and thought that the value of the Review would be enhanced if it contained information on future projects, in addition to a review of past work.

Mr. SEN (India) was largely in agreement with the views expressed by the United States representative. He thought that the Comparative Review should be maintained, although he was ready to suggest improvements in the manner of its presentation. At the same time the Catalogue could be reduced in bulk.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) pointed out that the Catalogue contained some very useful descriptive matter. It was relatively unimportant whether the Catalogue was merged with the Comparative Review or vice versa. Assuming that there was general agreement on the possibility of fusing the two documents into one, he asked whether the details could not be left to the Secretariat to work out on the basis of certain principles laid down by the Committee.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) was in favour of discontinuing the Comparative Review, of which, as distinct from the Catalogue,

his Government made hardly any use. He thought the idea would be to improve the Catalogue while discontinuing the Review.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) said his Organization, while congratulating the Secretariat on its efforts to make the Comparative Review effective, favoured the fusion of the documents under consideration; it thought that the Catalogue could be modified to take the place of both by a system of cross-indexes relating to the work done by the different specialized Agencies, and could readily be made to serve the purposes of the Council. He would point out that the provision of information for both documents had hitherto entailed considerable work for the specialized agencies.

Miss HOWELL (World Health Organization) suggested that the Comparative Review might take the form of an annotated Index to the reports of the specialized agencies.

Dr. SUTCH (New Zealand) said the Committee must not lose sight of the value of the Comparative Review. Too much attention was frequently paid in co-ordination, to administrative matters, salaries and so on. The Council's major concern in the present matter was the reports of the specialized agencies, and the Council required such a document as the Comparative Review, for the proper consideration of these reports. In his view, if any amalgamation was required, the Catalogue should be embodied in the Comparative Review rather than the reverse. He considered that the work suggested on the editors had been excessive owing, at least in part, to the difficulties they had experienced in obtaining information for incorporation in the documents. In conclusion, he repeated that the main need was for a document of the type of the Comparative Review, the more so since the Catalogue was incomplete, as the reports of the International Civil Aviation Organization had pointed out.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil), while agreeing with the New Zealand representative, with the United Kingdom representative's observations as to presentation and with the remarks of the representative of the International Civil Aviation Organization on change of title, thought that the Comparative Review should be discontinued, but stressed that he merely wished it to be discontinued in its present form, and not entirely suppressed.

The Committee decided by 7 votes to 4 with 3 abstentions, to recommend to the Council that the Comparative Review of the Activities and Work Programmes of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies in the Economic and Social Fields be discontinued in its present form.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) proposed that the material contained in the Comparative Review should be included in the Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects by cross-reference and indexing.

Mrs. GRANT (Secretariat) said that such a system would impede an overall view of the work of any particular body. A definite distinction must be drawn between the contents of the documents and the contents of the index.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) asked whether the table of vertical and horizontal columns to which Mrs. Grant had referred earlier could not be included at the beginning of the volume.

Mrs. GRANT (Secretariat) thought that suggestion was valuable; but it would require fuller consideration.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said he thought the Secretariat should be given clear instructions as to the Council's actual requirements in the matter.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) agreed with the Brazilian representative. He went on to point out that information on the organized presentation of the work of the specialized agencies was to be found in other documents, and that what the Council required in this instance was a document which would indicate at a glance the work done by the specialized agencies. Scholars and other persons wishing to study in detail the work being done would be disappointed at the elimination of the Comparative Review, but the Council's convenience must come first.

Dr. SUTCH (New Zealand) wished to stress that the Committee's recommendation had been not to abolish the Comparative Review, but merely to discontinue it in its present form. It would be produced in future as a different type of document including what were now sections of the Catalogue. He agreed with the United States representative that the adoption of a consolidated text would inconvenience scholars, but the aim must be to facilitate the comparison of fields of activity under one head.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) said his delegation felt that the index was incomplete, and that subject headings were not sufficiently specific. For example, the question of "statelessness" was not cross-indexed under "nationality."

On the basis of the proposals submitted by the United States and Brazilian representatives, the Committee unanimously agreed to recommend to the Council that the Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects should be organized on the basis of subjects and with a fuller index.

The CHAIRMAN called the Committee's attention to the proposal submitted by the United Kingdom delegation that the Secretary General's Report on the Organization and Allocation of Personnel of the Economic and Social Departments of the Secretariat (Document E/1344) should be

discontinued.

Replying to Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America), the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the United Kingdom proposal applied equally to the Secretary-General's Report on Work Programmes of the Economic and Social Departments and of Commissions of the Council (Document E/1344/Add.1).

Speaking of his delegation's proposal, Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) pointed out that most of the information contained in the first of those documents (Document E/1344) could be found elsewhere.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) thought that the same could be said of the Report of the Secretary-General on Work Programmes of the Economic and Social Departments and of Commissions of the Council (Document E/1344/Add.1), but stressed that the latter was easier to prepare, and had the virtue of familiarizing members of the Council with the structural background of the service which the Council received.

At a previous meeting the Committee had discussed methods of improving budgetary estimates, and the Report on the Organization and Allocation of Personnel of the Economic and Social Departments of the Secretariat (Document E/1344) supplied useful details regarding additions to budgetary estimates. The same was not true of the Report of the Secretary-General on Work Programmes of the Economic and Social Departments and of Commissions of the Council (Document E/1344/Add.1).

Mr. LEDWARD pointed out that the facts contained in the Report on the Organization and Allocation of Personnel of the Economic and Social Departments of the Secretariat had to be prepared in any event.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) was more than ever convinced that two Committees were engaged on the same task, and he thought that the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination could well be left to perform that task alone.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) wished to withdraw his proposal with regard to the Report on the Organization and Allocation of Personnel of the Economic and Social Departments of the Secretariat (Document E/1344,) and to maintain it only in respect of the Report of the Secretary-General on Work Programmes of the Economic and Social Departments and of Commissions of the Council (Document E/1344/Add.1).

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil), intervening on a point of order, said he considered that the Committee was going beyond its competence in considering a proposal to discontinue a report issued by the Secretary-General.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) pointed out that the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly had laid on the Council the duty of examining the budgetary implications of any recommendation before adopting it. In other words, the Council must be acquainted with budgetary matters, although it bore no responsibility for them. Resolutions involving the expenditure of funds had been approved by the Council in the past.

Mr. SEN (India) pointed out that the modified United Kingdom proposal was inconsistent, in that it proposed the retention of a document concerning personnel and the suppression of a document concerning the work of the same personnel.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil), replying to the observations of the United States representative pointed out that neither of the documents

under consideration contained any information on budgetary implications.
He was in favour of suppressing both.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed
that the discussion be adjourned so that members of the Committee might
have the opportunity of examining the implications of the United
Kingdom proposal in greater detail.

This was agreed.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.