



UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

PROVISIONAL /

E/AC.34/SR.22

27 June 1951

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE
COUNCIL AND ITS COMMISSIONS

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 27 June 1951, at 3 p.m.

- CONTENTS: United States proposals concerning regional economic commissions
(E/AC.34/L.13, E/AC.34/L.14)
- Financial implications of economic and social projects and
programmes (E/AC.34/L.16)
- Geographical representation in the subsidiary organs of the Council
(E/AC.34/L.17)
- Recommendations regarding the organization of the regional
economic commissions

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SANTA CRUZ	Chile	President of the Economic and Social Council
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. BRENNAN	Australia	
	Mr. de ALMEIDA	Brazil	
	Mr. TSAO	China	
	Mr. de SEYNES	France	
	Mr. RAJAN	India	
	Mr. ZONOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	

51-13917

Any corrections to this record should be submitted in duplicate in either of the working languages (English or French), within two working days, that is to say, not later than 1030 hours on 17 July, to Mr. H. Roigt, Director, Language Services Division, Room 1241, Headquarters. Corrections should bear the appropriate symbol number and be enclosed in an envelope marked "URGENT". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily if delegations will be good enough to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

Members (continued)

Mr. OVERTON

United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland

Mr. MURDEN)

United States of America

later Miss BELL)

Representative of a non-governmental organization:

Miss KAHN

World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU)

Secretariat:

Mr. OWEN

Assistant Secretary-General in charge of
the Department of Economic Affairs

Mr. MYRDAL

Executive Secretary of the Economic
Commission for Europe

Mr. GUNDEL

Department of Economic Affairs

Mr. HOGAN

Secretary of the Committee

UNITED STATES PROPOSALS CONCERNING REGIONAL ECONOMIC COMMISSIONS (E/AC.34/L.13,
E/AC.34/L.14)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to discuss the United States proposal (E/AC.34/L.13) that a paragraph should be inserted in the Committee's report asking the Council to review the work of the regional economic commissions at the same time as it examined the work of the Council and its functional commissions and to invite the regional economic commissions to propose any changes which they deemed necessary in their terms of reference.

Mr. MURDEN (United States of America) did not wish to reopen the debate on the question of maintaining the regional economic commissions but reiterated his Government's anxiety that the Council should review simultaneously the result of the Committee's recommendations regarding the functional commissions and the work of the regional economic commissions.

Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that he had asked for the discussion of the United States proposal to be adjourned. As the Committee had decided otherwise, he was prepared to discuss that proposal but not to vote on it, as the text had not been circulated on the previous day. There was no need to include such a text in the Committee's report since the Council could at any time decide to review the work of its subsidiary bodies. He suggested that the vote on that proposal should be postponed until the next day.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal just made by the USSR representative was in accordance with the rules of procedure but added that, if the vote were not postponed until a later meeting, the Committee could finish the discussion on the important parts of its report at the current meeting and could then adjourn until its report was drafted.

Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted that he could not withdraw his proposal although he was in favour of finishing the Committee's work as quickly as possible. The proposals before the Committee had not been submitted early enough to enable the USSR delegation to examine them properly.

The CHAIRMAN said that the United States proposals would be put to the vote at the forthcoming meeting.

Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil) believed that by his proposal the United States representative was trying to combine two types of reviews by the Council; the review of the work of the commissions and the examination of their organization and structure.

The Council was already required periodically to review the work of the regional economic commissions; it did so when it studied the reports submitted to the Council by the Commissions each year. The review of the organization of the functional commissions referred to by the Committee on page 6 of its first report was justified because the Committee recommended regulations for the functional commissions which would be applied provisionally and which should therefore be the subject of special review at the end of a trial period. A similar trial period was not necessary for the regional economic commissions which had been established and had gone through an experimental period in the last three years. That experiment had been conclusive and the Committee recommended that they should be maintained. It merely made recommendations on points of detail with regard to those organs. If, therefore, there was no need to review the organization of the regional economic commissions, was there any reason to

/undertake

undertake a special review of their work in 1953? Would that not give the impression that in previous years the review which had been made of their work on the basis of reports submitted by those bodies had been incomplete?

He did not see the point of the United States proposal if it referred to a review of the work of the regional economic commissions and if the United States was thinking of a review of the organization and structure of those bodies, it would be a mistake, particularly from the psychological viewpoint to adopt the text before the Committee. In order to conform to the recommendation contained in that proposal, the regional economic commissions would have to work under unfavourable conditions. Their work would suffer from the fixing of a specific date for its review for their activities often related to problems of economic development which were long-term matters. Furthermore, they would be faced with more difficulty than at the present time in recruiting competent staff members if they could only offer contracts which must necessarily be short-term.

For those reasons he could not vote for the proposal before the Committee and requested the United States representative to withdraw it.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) fully agreed with the Brazilian representative. He also doubted whether the United States proposal was really justified. He recalled that the eight members of the Committee had been divided when recommendations to the Council on the functional commissions were being drafted and it was only after lengthy debate that agreement had been reached. As the problem was a very complicated one, it would be wiser to provide for a trial period.

It was an entirely different matter in the case of the regional economic commissions. The members of the Committee unanimously recognized the effectiveness of their methods and organization and had recommended that they should be maintained. The General Assembly had taken the same view in one of its resolutions.

/He saw

He saw no reason therefore to adopt recommendations on the regional economic commissions similar to those which had been adopted for the functional commissions. Such recommendations, as experience had shown, would present certain difficulties for the executive secretaries of regional economic commissions would be unable to offer staff members sufficiently long-term contracts.

If the proposal was maintained, the French delegation would be compelled to vote against it.

Mr. MURDEN (United States of America) explained that his delegation's proposal bore no relation to the question of maintaining the regional economic commissions but was intended to ensure that the work of those commissions would be reviewed when the Council in 1953 undertook the general review recommended by the Committee. After hearing the arguments put forward by the representatives of Brazil and France, he agreed to withdraw his proposal on the understanding that the United States delegation's position would be stated in the summary record of the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the United States proposal (E/AC.34/L.14) relative to the need for a close integration of the work of the regional economic commissions with that of the Council. He recalled that the USSR representative had proposed an adjournment of the discussion.

Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked the Chairman to allow the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe to present that Commission's views.

The CHAIRMAN said that he could not grant the USSR representative's request unless the proposal for adjournment of the discussion was withdrawn.

/Mr. ZONOV

Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) having declined to withdraw his proposal, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the question whether discussion of the United States proposal should be adjourned.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. MYRDAL (Executive Secretary, Economic Commission for Europe) thanked the Chairman and the members of the Committee for giving him the opportunity of presenting the views of the governments members of the ECE. The main purpose of the United States proposal was to ensure close collaboration between the Council and the ECE. All the governments represented in the ECE recognized that collaboration between the two organs should be as effective as possible. The terms of reference of the ECE, which the Committee had decided to maintain, referred twice to the relationship between the Commission and the Council. It was stated in those terms of reference that the Commission might "with the approval of the Council, establish such subsidiary bodies as it deems appropriate", and that it should "submit for the Council's prior consideration any of its proposals for activities that would have important effects on the economy of the world as a whole".

Mr. Myrdal felt that the members of the ECE would find the United States proposal somewhat confusing. The Commission had been placed at the disposal of the governments, and should therefore enjoy a certain degree of autonomy. It should be able to submit recommendations directly to the governments of its member countries, not all of which -- and that was an important point -- were Members of the United Nations. He feared that the governments represented on the Commission might be in doubt as to the correct interpretation of the last part of the second sentence of the proposal, which read: "...they should continue to undertake any major projects only after the prior approval of the Council". For example, if the political atmosphere in Europe improved and it became possible to resume normal trade relations between eastern and western Europe, would the convening of a conference to consider such relations be considered as a "major project" upon which the Council must be consulted before a conference could be called? The Commission was not refusing to consult the Council, but it felt that it should enjoy a certain measure of autonomy.

/Mr. de SEYNES

Mr. de SEYNES (France) thanked Mr. Myrdal for his clear statement of the Commission's point of view. In his opinion, the idea set forth in the United States proposal was worthy of support, but should be differently expressed. Using the terms of Mr. Myrdal's statement, he proposed that the words "and they should continue to undertake any major projects only after the prior approval of the Council" should be deleted, since, as Mr. Myrdal had indicated, that part of the proposal might be hard to interpret. He proposed that following the word "are", in the third line of the document, the following words should be inserted: "...instruments for regional economic co-operation placed at the disposal of interested governments by the United Nations, and are...". The following sentence should then begin with the words "It is the opinion of the Committee...".

Mr. MURDEN (United States of America) accepted the French representative's amendment.

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) did not think it was true to state that the commissions were "placed at the disposal of" the governments. He preferred the phrase "instruments...created for the benefit of" the governments.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the regional economic commissions had been created not only for the benefit of the countries of a particular region, but for the benefit of all the countries of the world. The commissions had their headquarters and carried on their activities in particular regions, but they must, in all their work, bear in mind world economy as a whole.

Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil) thought that the French representative's amendment covered the point raised by the representative of Australia. General policy would always be laid down by the United Nations.

Mr. TSAO (China), supported by Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil), proposed the deletion of the word "regional", in the French amendment, since the main objective was not to solve the problems of a given area on a purely regional basis, but also on an international basis, taking into account the problems arising in other regions.

/Mr. de SEYNES

Mr. de SEYNES (France) agreed to the deletion of the word "regional" in the text of his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN said that, since the USSR representative had requested a postponement of the vote, he would put to the vote the United States proposal, with the French amendment accepted by the United States representative, at the next meeting.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES (E/AC.34/L.16)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider a United Kingdom proposal relative to the financial implications of projects and programmes.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) explained that his proposal was of a purely administrative nature, intended merely to bring the practice of the regional economic commissions into line with that of the Economic and Social Council and the functional commissions. He asked the representative of the Secretariat whether there would be any administrative difficulty in adopting the proposal.

Mr. GREEN (Department of Economic Affairs) said that the Secretariat was already arranging for the regional economic commissions to supply the financial information needed. He pointed out that a resolution recently adopted by the Economic and Social Council had made it more difficult to estimate the cost of each project separately. Moreover, the information hitherto submitted by the Secretariat had dealt merely with the additional cost of a given project, not with its total cost. He pointed out that at the last session of the ECLA a new method had been tried out; if it produced good results, it would be put into general use. With those reservations, he could approve the United Kingdom proposal.

Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil) said that his delegation had found the information on the financial implications of projects communicated at the previous session of ECLA extremely satisfactory. He wondered whether that method could not be extended to other regional economic commissions, as well as to the Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions.

/Mr. OVERTON

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) proposed that the procedure adopted for regional economic commissions should be the same as that to be followed by the Economic and Social Council, which might be the same as that just applied by ECLA.

Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil) agreed that it was important to have a uniform procedure but he did not think it advisable to impose upon the regional economic commissions a procedure which had not yet been adopted by the Council. It would be better to wait until the Council itself took a decision in the matter.

In reply to a question by Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom), Mr. GREEN (Department of Economic Affairs) confirmed that the method introduced by ECLA would be extended to the other regional economic commissions. When in the past the Secretariat had provided an estimate of the additional costs necessary for a new project, the estimate had been arrived at after consideration of what modification of existing projects might be achieved. Now that any decision on work programmes had to be taken by the Council, an extra stage had been interposed before a financial estimate could be submitted.

In reply to a further question from Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom), Mr. GREEN (Department of Economic Affairs) stated that it would be very difficult to give the exact cost of individual projects rather than the additional costs involved. Some cost accounting process would probably have to be adopted and that would prove an expensive operation.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) agreed that it might be better not to take a decision on the subject in the absence of any clearly defined procedure and he therefore agreed to withdraw his proposal, reserving the right to bring it up at some later stage if necessary.

/GEOGRAPHICAL

GEOGRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION IN THE SUBSIDIARY ORGANS OF THE COUNCIL (E/AC.34/L.17)

The CHAIRMAN opened discussion on the question of geographical representation in the subsidiary organs of the Council.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) said that owing to some mistake the document submitted by his delegation (E/AC.34/L.17) on the question of geographical representation in the subsidiary organs of the Council had been given the title of "proposal". His delegation had never intended to make a formal proposal but had simply wished to help the Council in studying that important question by submitting a working document. It held the view that the principle of equitable geographical distribution was one of the most important aspects of the question of representation in the subsidiary organs of the Council. In his opinion, the Committee would be making a grave mistake if it did not bear that in mind, since the Governments of Member States might consider that, in proposing the elimination of certain subsidiary organs of the Council, the Committee had not taken into account the provisions of resolution 207 (III) in which the General Assembly had recommended that the Council should, in the election of Member States entitled to nominate members of functional commissions, take all Members of the United Nations into consideration, with due regard to an equitable geographical distribution.

It was to avoid any such criticisms that his delegation had thought it necessary to draw attention to the matter. The working document set forth four principles which the Council should apply in electing Member States to the functional commissions. The Committee could consider whether it should simply mention in its report to the Council that it had held a discussion on the subject or whether it should include a definite recommendation on the principles involved.

The CHAIRMAN was glad that the United Kingdom representative had raised the question. He recalled that, in 1948, the General Assembly had first studied a proposal clearly defining the principles which should govern the distribution of seats in the subsidiary organs of the Council. However, after certain Members

/had mentioned

had mentioned the difficulties inherent in the procedure of election and had pointed out that a State could be particularly interested in a subject which came within the terms of reference of a given commission, the Assembly had decided to adopt a recommendation couched in very general terms. Since then, the application of the principle of "equitable geographical distribution" had given rise to many difficulties. Some countries had complained that they were inadequately represented or even totally unrepresented in ^{one} or other of the commissions. There was a danger that the situation would become still worse since the ad hoc Committee had just recommended the elimination of two functional commissions and of certain sub-commissions, a decision which might curtail the participation of certain Governments in the economic and social work of the Council. It seemed appropriate therefore to recommend that the Council should, if necessary, review its existing procedure of electing members to the functional commissions.

Miss BELL (United States of America) approved the paper submitted by the United Kingdom with the exception of sub-paragraph (c) in which the Committee recommended that the Council should ensure that only those governments submit nominations which were really interested in being represented upon the commission concerned and in making a positive contribution to its work. In its existing form that sub-paragraph did not take into account the fact that the governments nominating candidates had first been elected by the Council itself and it might be very difficult to apply the recommendation in practice.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) was grateful to the United Kingdom representative for having made suggestions on the highly important question of geographical representation in the subsidiary organs of the Council. He could not state his views on the principles set forth in the working paper without first studying them carefully. He felt however that one of the most interesting parts of the document was the suggestion that it might be desirable for the qualifications of candidates to be discussed before elections were held, on the basis of comprehensive information provided by the nominating Governments.

/He wondered

He wondered whether the Council had ever elected Member States to nominate representatives on a functional commission if the States concerned did not wish to take part in the work of the commission. It was obviously unfortunate that such a situation could arise and steps should be taken to prevent its recurrence. It was difficult however to be absolutely certain on that point and he wondered whether the United Kingdom representative could give any further information on the subject.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) explained that he had noticed that the representatives nominated as members of the functional commissions had not always taken an active part in the work of those commissions; it was in order to avoid any recurrence of such a state of affairs that he had included the principle in sub-paragraph (c) of his document. However, in the light of the remarks made by the United States representative, it seemed that the drafting of that sub-paragraph should be altered.

The CHAIRMAN said that certain delegations had sometimes informed the Council of their desire to be represented on one or other of the functional commissions; in such cases the Council had always done its best to meet their requests. That however was not a rigid principle and it might be useful to consider a procedure whereby the Council would be able to study requests made by States and the qualifications of candidates before embarking on the elections.

He pointed out that sub-paragraph (c) of the United Kingdom document might derogate from the inalienable right of Governments to nominate their own representatives to functional commissions without any interference.

Mr. TSAO (China) said that the three criteria listed in sub-paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of the United Kingdom proposal might jeopardize the principle of equitable geographical representation instead of safeguarding it. If those provisions were applied, the subsidiary organs of the Council might perhaps acquire candidates with higher expert knowledge and their work would thus naturally be of greater value, but geographical representation in those organs would become less equitable than at present.

/It was

It was obvious that by encouraging the nomination of persons of the highest possible degree of expert knowledge, the Council would rule out countries unable to propose candidates fulfilling such a requirement. Consequently, there was some contradiction between the principles proposed and the aim the Council had in mind.

Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that sub-paragraph (a) of the United Kingdom proposal merely set forth a principle which had been recognized and applied by the United Nations for a long time past. Referring to sub-paragraph (b), he remarked that although the Council elected the Member States which were to submit nominations, it could not order their governments to nominate persons with any particular qualifications. It was obvious that governments nominating representatives to the Technical Commissions themselves tried to nominate persons of the highest possible degree of expert knowledge. There might have been cases when the Council had elected States which did not wish to be represented, but they had been exceptional; moreover, the government concerned could always decline the offer.

In those circumstances, he could see no useful purpose in recommending the Council to adopt a proposal which would be of no help in solving the problem of geographical representation.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) said he had never maintained that his proposal would provide a final solution to the problem of geographical representation and he was quite prepared to examine any concrete measures which the USSR representative might propose to ensure the effective participation of all countries in the work of the subsidiary organs of the Council.

He had never accused any government of not nominating the best qualified persons; it could not be denied, however, that in some cases representatives on Technical Commissions had not had all the necessary knowledge.

Furthermore, governments elected by the Council could obviously state that they did not wish to send representatives to a given commission; thus far, however, no government had ever declined an offer. Certain States had sometimes even preferred to send representatives who were unable to take part in the work of their respective commissions.

/Mr. de ALMEIDA

Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil) said that the United Kingdom proposal contained two principles which were to some extent mutually exclusive.

He felt that the suggestion in the last paragraph was of particular interest because it would certainly be desirable for the Council to discuss the qualifications of candidates before elections were held, on the basis of information provided by the nominating governments. If the elections to the Technical Commissions could be held during the ordinary session of the General Assembly, it would be very easy for the Governments of the 60 Member States to provide all the necessary information on their nominees. At present, however, those elections were held during the session of the Council, so that the number of governments that could submit their candidates orally was only a third of what it would be during the General Assembly.

If it were impossible for the Council to meet during the session of the General Assembly, the Assembly itself might perhaps be asked to elect States to the Technical Commissions; it could entrust that task to its Joint Second and Third Committee.

At present, when a government was elected to a Technical Commission it had no incentive to try to nominate the most competent candidates; by electing three governments for a given region instead of only one, the Council would encourage healthy competition between those Governments, since they would naturally try to secure the election of their own candidates by nominating the most qualified persons.

Such a measure would make it possible to raise the level of representation without jeopardizing the principle of equitable geographical representation. Under that procedure, even if the Council was unable to choose the best of the three candidates, it would still choose the best candidate of a given country. Furthermore, no country would stand as a candidate unless it knew that it could nominate at least one person acceptable to the Council.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) said he could not support the Brazilian representative's suggestion that the General Assembly should take over the

/election

election of members of Technical Commissions. Apart from the constitutional difficulties which would be raised by such a change in the Council's rules of procedure, the General Assembly was obviously much less qualified than the Council to hold those elections, because the Council alone knew the work of its Technical Commissions.

The second suggestion of the Brazilian representative was more interesting: the French Government had always attached great importance to the principle of equitable geographical representation. That principle, however, could not be applied too rigidly and should therefore continue to be expressed in general terms only.

The debate had brought out the need for serious discussions before the election of members to a Technical Commission, so as to avoid some of the drawbacks of the existing method of recruitment.

The Committee might accept the United Kingdom proposal provisionally. More positive measures could be adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its 13th session.

Miss BELL (United States of America) shared the French and Brazilian representative's views and thought the United Kingdom proposal was interesting, but difficult to put into practice. The proposal raised three distinct

problems -- the question of electing to functional commissions a greater number of countries than were represented at present, of ensuring the widest possible extent of geographical representation on each commission, and of ensuring that members of commissions had a high degree of expert knowledge.

She did not see what practical steps could be taken to attain those objectives and proposed that the report should mention the General Assembly resolution and recommend the revision by the Council of the electoral procedure of functional commissions.

Mr. RAJAN (India) recognized the importance of the questions raised in the United Kingdom proposal. The main difficulty arose because the two objectives to be attained, namely the widest possible extent of geographical representation and the nomination of persons of the highest possible degree of expert knowledge, might be incompatible.

/He recalled

He recalled that the Committee, having studied the functional commissions, had decided not to change the provisions relating to the competence of members of commissions. Geographical representation could be widened by increasing the number of commissions (the Committee had, however, decided to reduce them), by increasing the membership of commissions, or by ensuring wider geographical representation on the commissions. The Committee might state that geographical representation should be more varied and, in case of need, the membership of commissions increased.

Too much importance should not be attached to the appointment to commissions of persons with as high as possible a degree of expert knowledge as that might stand in the way of diversification of membership.

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) did not think that the objectives of the United Kingdom text were contradictory. Sub-paragraph (a) did not imply that world specialists should be recruited by international competition, but merely invited governments to send their best qualified representatives. Sub-paragraph (c), however, seemed to go beyond the scope of the Economic and Social Council. An effort should rather be made to interest governments in the work of commissions. He supported as a whole the principles enunciated in the United Kingdom proposal.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) was very interested in the ideas expressed by the representatives of India and Australia. He thought it dangerous to insist that candidates should have the highest possible degree of expert knowledge. It was absolutely essential to ensure that governments were really interested in making a positive contribution to a commission's work and he suggested that a phrase to that effect should be substituted in paragraph (b) for the reference to expert knowledge, and that all of sub-paragraph (c) coming after the words "commission concerned" should be deleted.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) had no objection to the proposed amendment and suggested the addition of the following phrase at the end of sub-paragraph (b): "and the most varied background."

Miss BELL (United States of America) doubted the practical value of

/sub-paragraph (c).

sub-paragraph (c). The countries concerned were always free to send alternates in the place of regularly appointed members.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the word "member" applied to Member States and not to the persons representing them.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom), on the contrary, considered that the term referred to the representatives themselves.

Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil) thought that if that were the case, the phrase was too categorical.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) suggested that it should be drafted as follows: "that only those governments are elected who are interested in the commissions concerned".

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) accepted the amendment but wished to retain the clause "of the highest possible degree of expert knowledge" in sub-paragraph (b), as in the Committee's report.

Miss BELL (United States of America) wanted to know the precise meaning of the phrases "the widest geographical and regional representation" and "the most varied background". She wondered whether the intention was to ensure diversification not only in the expert knowledge of the members of commissions but in their nations of origin.

Mr. TSAO (China) considered that there was a contradiction in the objectives sought in the document under discussion and said that sub-paragraphs (c) and (d) mitigated against fair geographical distribution.

Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil) noted that, as the working document dealt with the whole question of representation in the commissions, the word "geographical" could be deleted from its title.

/Mr OVERTON

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) agreed to the deletion and noted, in reply to the United States representative, that a balance had to be achieved among various areas in their representation in the commissions. It would also be desirable for the members of a commission not only to be of different national origins, but to have special knowledge in different branches of the subject with which the commission was dealing.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) found the discussion very useful and interesting but did not think a satisfactory text could be drafted quickly. He therefore suggested deferring continuation of the discussion until the following meeting and letting the representatives of India and the United Kingdom work out a re-drafted text for the Committee's consideration.

Miss BELL (United States of America) said she would introduce an amendment to insert a new sub-paragraph (e) requesting the Council to ensure a balanced composition of the commissions.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE ORGANIZATION OF THE REGIONAL ECONOMIC COMMISSIONS (proposal submitted by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Brazil)

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to consider a proposal of the United Kingdom and Brazil containing a draft text to be inserted in the report dealing with the maintenance of the regional economic commissions and possible amendments of their terms of reference. He suggested deletion of the word "unanimously" in the third sub-paragraph in view of the objection made by the USSR representative.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) noted that he had incorporated in his initial text the first sentence of the second paragraph suggested by the representative of Brazil.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that a separate vote should be taken on each of the paragraphs of the text.

Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to consider the

/report as

report as a whole before deciding on any of its parts. He therefore requested deferment of the vote until the following meeting.

The CHAIRMAN emphasized that the Committee had already voted on the major portion of its report and had already approved the provisions under discussion.

He announced that the Secretariat would prepare a preliminary draft of the report for the following meeting, containing provisional texts of the proposals submitted by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.

13/7 a.m.