

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIALUNRESTRICTED
E/AC.24/SR.35
27 July 1949Dual DistributionECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCILNinth SessionCO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 21 July, 1949, at 10.30 a.m.Contents:RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF
SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (Item 34 of the
Council's Agenda with the reports of
the specialized agencies, items 35-42,
so far as they concern questions of
co-ordination) (Continued)

pages 4 to 24

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
Peru	Mr. PIZARRO
Turkey	Mr. MIRAS
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BORISOV
United Kingdom	Mr. LEDWARD
United States of America	Mr. STINEBOWER Mr. HYDE
Venezuela	Mr. NASS

Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Organization	Mr. JENKS
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. McDOUGALL
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. BERKELEY Mr. TERENCE
International Civil Aviation Organization	Mr. MARLIN

Specialized Agencies (Continued):

International Monetary Fund	Mr. LUTHRINGER Mr. WILLIAMS
Universal Postal Union	Mr. RADICE
World Health Organization	Dr. HAFEZI Miss HOWELL
International Refugee Organization	Mr. BLANCHARD

Consultants from Non-Governmental
Organizations:

Category (b):

Catholic International Union for Social Service))) Miss de ROMER
International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues))
International Council of Women	Mrs. DREYFUS-BARNEY

Secretariat:

Mr. Martin Hill	Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and for Economic and Social Matters.
Mr. Perez-Guerrero	Adviser on Co-ordination
Mr. Sze	Secretary to the Committee

CONSIDERATION OF RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (Item 34 of the Council's agenda with the reports of the specialized agencies, items 35-42, so far as they concern questions of co-ordination) (Documents E/1340, E/C.24/W.21, E/1351/Rev.1)
(Continued)

The CHAIRMAN reopened the discussion on the United States delegation's verbal proposal, made at the previous meeting, that the Committee recommend to the Council that the Co-ordination Committee should in future discuss the reports of the specialized agencies in their substantive aspects as well as in those strictly concerned with co-ordination.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) agreed in principle with the United States proposal and thought it should be treated as a procedural matter which should be settled before the Committee proceeded to examine the reports of the specialized agencies.

Dr. SUTCH (New Zealand) said the United States proposal raised a question of great importance to the New Zealand delegation, which had for some time been concerned at the scant consideration given to the reports of certain specialized agencies. In his view, the Council had not hitherto displayed an attitude of particular satisfaction with those reports, since it merely "took note" of them. Furthermore, if those reports continued to receive only perfunctory attention they would tend to become more and more perfunctory themselves. It was not clear how the work of the specialized agencies should be examined, whether their reports should be referred to the substantive Committees or left to the Co-ordination Committee. If the latter were to deal with the substance of the reports, it would have to study the work programmes of the specialized agencies which, in any case, had to be co-ordinated. On the other hand, certain problems raised

by a specialized agency - for instance, the problem of child delinquency, which might be raised by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization or the World Health Organization - might be of special interest to one of the substantive committees, such as, in that particular case, the Social Committee.

The Co-ordination Committee could examine the substance of the reports of the specialized agencies, while making no appraisal of the reports; but it would have to make certain that any recommendations it might make did not encroach on the terms of reference of some other United Nations organ. The difficulty might be solved either (1) by transmitting such recommendations to a plenary meeting for submission to the appropriate substantive committee, or (2) by arranging joint meetings between the substantive committee in question and the Co-ordination Committee where necessary.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) wished to clarify the points of difference between the New Zealand representative's proposal and that tabled by the United States delegation. He had misgivings about the complicated and formal procedure which the New Zealand representative had proposed. He could not understand the mutual exclusiveness of the Council's Committees, since the same delegations were represented on each. The approach of one Committee to another should be direct, and it was to be hoped that delegations could express their views on a given subject in one and the same place. As for the appraisal of the reports, as distinct from questions of substance and co-ordination, that was a matter for the appropriate committee. No doubt formal and orderly procedure was essential in the Council, but delegations should beware of being so bound by procedure as to hesitate to refer to documents because they were being

discussed elsewhere than in a particular Committee. The United States delegation thought the reports of the specialized agencies should come to the Co-ordination Committee, and that the latter should consider substantive matters raised in them and thereby, to some extent, become an additional substantive committee.

Mr. AGAPOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) agreed with the United Kingdom representative's earlier statement that the United States proposal would create difficulties for the smaller delegations. Furthermore, it would also result in a confusion of substantive with co-ordination work. Before long the Co-ordination Committee would be supplanting the Social and Economic Committees. He therefore agreed with the USSR delegation's view that the United States proposal was out of order; his delegation would oppose it.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) said he would like briefly to reply to Mr. Agapov, who had reverted to the arguments developed the previous day by the United Kingdom representative. He (Mr. de Seynes) had been startled by the United Kingdom representative's statement that delegations were not sufficiently well equipped to deal with the problems of co-ordination in accordance with the procedure suggested by the United States delegation. If that were the case, and if that opinion was shared by several representatives, they would be entitled to ask what reason there was for the Committee's existence. If delegations were not capable in one way or another of coping with the whole of the problems submitted to them, if, in other words, they could not take cognizance of and consider all the reports of the specialized agencies, the Committee was wasting its time. It would only remain for it to deal with purely mechanical questions and study minor documents. The Committee would be fully acquainted with the situation only when it had taken cognizance of the reports of all the specialized

agencies. That was an elementary point, and he wondered how objections could be raised to the proposal submitted by the United States representative. He for his part warmly supported it.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) said his delegation objected to the United States proposal on procedural grounds and regarded it as unpractical. His delegation continued to hold the view that the Council should at all times seek to obviate overlapping. For example, the report of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization had been considered by the Social Committee, from the record of whose proceedings it could be seen that the United Kingdom and the United States representatives had stressed the question of priorities during the discussion of the report. He regarded that as the correct procedure. The report of a given specialized agency should not necessarily be referred to the Co-ordination Committee.

Mr. TSAO (China) said that, if he had gauged the feeling of the Committee correctly, the United States proposal was assured of a fair measure of support. It represented an attempt to improve the work of co-ordination, which was the bulk of the work connected with the specialized agencies, so that while he agreed with the views expressed by the New Zealand representative, he did not wish to see the United States proposal entirely rejected. He therefore appealed to the United States representative and to the Chairman to find some way of bringing the United States proposal to the notice of the Council, together with a summary of the discussion it had provoked.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) said he was not clear as to whether the Chinese representative was in favour of making such a recommendation to the Council. He himself was not opposed to the inclusion in the Committee's report of contrary views on the United States proposal, but he stressed that the question must be settled by

the Committee and a mere decision to pass on the results of the discussion to the Council would leave matters exactly as they were.

Mr. TSAO (China) asked whether the New Zealand representative could give some further clarification on the alternative procedures which he had suggested.

Mr. SEN (India) said that he was far from clear as to the precise purport of the United States proposal which seemed to have passed through three distinct phases since it had been first moved. Though he found it more acceptable in its present form, he wished to know whether the United States representative was proposing that the reports of the specialized agencies should be dealt with both by the Co-ordination Committee and by one of the substantive committees. If that were so, there was no reason why the same should not apply equally to the reports of the functional and regional commissions.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) replied that his delegation was not proposing that the reports be placed on the agendas of two committees. He nevertheless hoped that his delegation's proposal would assist in eliminating the tendency to live in watertight compartments. Also, it was obvious that relations between the Council and its Commissions were entirely different from those between the Council and the specialized agencies. Whereas the Commissions were organs of the Council, each with its allotted functions, the specialized agencies had many and varied functions which called primarily for co-ordination.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said he was in favour of the United States proposal, but questioned any Committee's competence to adopt a resolution designed to add to its own powers.

On being put to the vote the United States proposal that a recommendation be made to the Council that the Co-ordination Committee should in future discuss the reports of the specialized agencies in their substantive aspects, as well as in those strictly concerned with co-ordination, was adopted by 10 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN called the Committee's attention to the draft resolution on Priorities submitted by the delegation of Brazil (Document E/AC.24/W.21).

Speaking on his delegation's proposal, Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said the problem of priorities was directly connected with the question of substance. In moving that draft resolution his delegation had in mind that it was the Committee's duty to make recommendations on priorities, but it hoped that the Brazilian proposal would be regarded primarily as a contribution to the discussion; it would be ready to consider any suggestions for its improvement. His delegation's purpose in submitting the proposal was to clarify the situation with regard to the thousands of projects which came to the United Nations from the specialized agencies, and to establish a scale of priorities for the implementation of those projects. To that end existing projects had been classified in four categories: A), B), C) and D) in the draft resolution, the general aim being to make a practical approach to a very difficult problem. His delegation thought the projects defined in categories A) and B) should be completed, whereas those defined in C) and D), should be given less favourable consideration. There was unfortunately a noteworthy lack of documentary material on projects which had reached the implementation stage.

In his view the specialized agencies had been brought into relation with the United Nations so that the United Nations itself would not have to undertake certain activities, and so that States Members should be free to participate in certain activities, or not, as they wished, for they were under no compulsion to join specialized agencies.

Dr. SUTCH (New Zealand) said the Brazilian proposal merited serious consideration, though he thought it might prove something of a straitjacket in practice. While some such solution might be an ultimate aim, he foresaw immediate difficulties. For example, it was suggested that the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should review the specific projects defined in subparagraph D). In his view, that was too much to expect in one year. The New Zealand delegation believed that the work programmes of the specialized agencies should be presented in such a way as to indicate clearly those which were financed out of the current budget. But he doubted whether it was possible for the specialized agencies to indicate priorities, and until their governing bodies had done so no action could be expected of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. He might add - though he thought that was merely a question of drafting - that the Committee was not competent to make recommendations to the Secretariat as seemed to be suggested on page 2 of the Brazilian draft resolution.

In conclusion, the Brazilian proposal seemed to suggest that projects nearing completion should be given priority; but long-term projects were frequently of equal or greater importance. A possible way out of the present difficulty might be to take note of Assembly

Resolution 210 (III), mentioned in the first paragraph of the Brazilian proposal, to request governments and specialized agencies to aim at a concentration of projects and to recommend that the work-load on States Members be reduced. An earlier resolution had recommended that only work which could be financed under the current budget should be undertaken. The same principle could be suggested to governments and specialized agencies. The need to make budgetary provision for every single item could be exaggerated, and he thought the United Nations' budget should be able to absorb new tasks in any given year. The same might be said of the budgets of specialized agencies, and any recommendation transmitted to them should leave them free to absorb such new tasks. The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should be in a position, within the next year, to report on the results achieved by the specialized agencies with regard to priorities and concentration of projects. He hoped that, while he had refrained from submitting formal amendments to the proposal, the Brazilian representative would take note of his suggestions.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America), replying to the New Zealand representative's observation with regard to the absorption of new activities, pointed out that the budget of any specialized agency able to do so might be unfairly assumed to have been excessive. Nevertheless he agreed that some absorption was possible.

With regard to the Brazilian draft resolution, he thought that it put body into the question of priorities. But he wondered whether the categories proposed were the best that could be found. If they took an extreme view, they might interpret the proposed categories

as implying that the specialized agencies should undertake no activities other than general studies. Secondly, he could see no clear distinction between categories C) and D) since, normally, the activities of a specialized agency were financed by the agency itself. He would have preferred to combine categories C) and D) into one category covering specific projects of an operational nature without reference to the question of finance. The question of special, as distinct from regular, budgets would arise at a later stage, and a distinction might then be made between operations coming under a regular budget and those coming under a special budget.

A strict application of Category D to the International Bank or the International Monetary Fund would require the Economic and Social Council to review and pass upon all the operations of those agencies and thus become a super Governing Body. He was sure the Brazilian representative did not intend that, quite apart from the fact that such a procedure would be contrary to the provisions of the agreements concluded between the United Nations and those institutions.

He regarded the proposal that the Secretariats should refrain from presenting or embarking on new projects or studies as somewhat too restrictive since the ultimate effect of such a limitation would be to turn the Secretariats into mere letter-boxes for the receipt of suggestions from governments. The Secretariats of the specialized agencies and the United Nations would thus be unable to display any energy or initiative. It was always open to governments to disagree with any project or study proposed, thus maintaining budgetary control.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that the draft Resolution submitted by his delegation (Document E/AC.24/W.21) was not intended to affect any project now under consideration. But it was clear

that the Economic and Social Council must review the activities of the specialized agencies and it was in order to facilitate that task that he had drawn up an order of priorities. It was by no means the intention of the draft Resolution to impose anything on the specialized agencies, though he must emphasize the fact that out of something like a thousand projects, only about a hundred had reached the stage of practical fulfilment. There was the danger that too much of the work in hand would remain academic. Its undoubted merits notwithstanding, 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) was very difficult to appreciate owing to its size and elaboration. If the Committee approved the draft Resolution, the sole report which would be needed was one covering those projects which were directly financed by the United Nations and the specialized agencies, and which had reached the stage of practical implementation. The burden of his proposal was directed to distinguishing between the various stages reached in various projects, as opposed to giving an analysis of their content. A number of projects needed two to three years' study and were consequently far removed from the stage of implementation. In his view, the Economic and Social Council should examine a project when the preliminary work upon it had already been completed and implementation was therefore possible.

He would point out to the representative of the United States that where the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund were concerned, those two organizations were themselves responsible for the direct financing of any projects they chose to select. The Committee and

the Council had a duty to perform in regard to projects, the financing of which ultimately depended on governments. He would be glad to hear other concrete proposals on the methods to be adopted in fixing priorities.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) admitted that in his statement the representative of Brazil had clarified various points in his draft (Document E/AC.24/W.21). The French delegation, however, was of the opinion that it would be somewhat difficult at the present juncture to implement the recommendation that the Secretariats of all the specialized agencies and the United Nations should "refrain from presenting or embarking on new projects or studies, concentrating on the existing ones". The French delegation could support that recommendation only after the Co-ordination Committee had made a complete survey of the reports, as provided for by the United States resolution that had just been adopted.

Among the enormous number of projects which had not yet reached the stage of implementation, there were perhaps some which should have second priority, but how could the Committee reach a decision on the matter if it had not yet taken cognizance of them?

It was true that in paragraphs (a) and (b) of the recommendation, the Brazilian draft provided, for certain exceptions, but he would like the Brazilian representative to make his intention clear.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) drew attention to sub-paragraphs a) and b) of the Recommendation on page 3 of Document E/AC.24/W.21, which defined the terms on which the Secretariats of the specialized agencies and the United Nations could present new projects. It was for governments to exercise initiative in order that the constant overloading of the agenda might be arrested. It went without saying that once the General Assembly had approved a project, the Secretariat must

execute it. His approach to the problem was entirely practical and governed by the practical considerations of the length and complexity of the agenda.

Mr. SEN (India) appreciated the motives underlying the draft Resolution (Document E/AC.24/W.21) submitted by the Brazilian representative but considered that the proposals on the establishment of priorities needed further clarification. Categories A, B and C did not seem to him to fall within the framework of co-ordination since decision upon them could be left to the specialized agencies concerned. In support of his argument, he would point out that no budgetary implications were involved in the projects defined under A or B. The United States representative had already pointed out the difficulties attendant on the classification proposed under C, which in some instances overlapped with D. He agreed that it might prove difficult to make recommendations to the International Bank on a system of priorities which they might not be prepared to accept. As for the proposed method of dealing with projects classified under D, it might delay implementation, for governments might refuse to authorize it on the grounds that they had not received a "special report" from the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. (paragraph III page 2, Document E/AC.24/W.21).

Finally, he doubted whether the recommendation relating to the Secretariats of the specialized agencies and the United Nations (page 3) was really necessary, since it was surely established practice that any project must first be approved by the Council and the Assembly.

It might perhaps be wise either to re-draft the Resolution submitted by the Brazilian representative or to incorporate some of its ideas in the Committee's report.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) emphasized that he had intended the draft text contained in Document E/AC.24/W.21 not as a formal resolution but merely as a contribution to the discussion. It was essential that the Committee should take action in the matter since otherwise it would not fulfill its mandate. He must reiterate that the categories A, B, C, and D had been classified not according to types but in terms of progress achieved. In the first period of research or preliminary investigation, no action was required. In the second stage, the method he had proposed for categories A and B (sub-paragraph 1, page 2) must be applied by the Secretary-General and the governing bodies of the specialized agencies. It was not his intention that work on any project should be stopped. But from the practical point of view, if categories A and B were deleted, very little would remain, since the Committee and the Council were primarily concerned with projects financed by the United Nations and not by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or by the International Monetary Fund. He must draw attention to the fact that more than 95% of the projects listed in the "Comparative Review" (document E/1351/Rev.1) were still in the stage of preliminary research and collection of data. That process could and should continue, but the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should be given a picture of those projects which had reached the operational stage. It was impossible for the Council to establish priorities for a thousand projects, all at different stages of development. It was not enough to adopt a resolution; the Council should take action and establish priorities.

In conclusion he must state that he had implicitly withdrawn his draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN ruled that the general discussion was closed. The Committee was agreed that the Economic and Social Council should take note of Resolution 210 (XVI) of the General Assembly and that, as stated in the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Brazil, it recognized the need for limiting projects. The question then arose as to how that limitation was to be achieved by the United Nations and the specialized agencies. In the course of discussion on the priorities classified by the Brazilian representative, the United States representative had felt that there was a certain amount of overlapping and contradiction in the four categories proposed and that attention should be paid to the question of the special budget for the co-operative programme of technical assistance.

Doubts had been voiced as to the possibility of expressing the recommendation on page 2 of Document E/AC.24/W.21 in such definite terms, especially since it was consequent upon the decision which must be taken on the establishment of priorities.

Representatives had also expressed their uncertainty as to the practical and constitutional validity of the recommendation, set out on page 3, relating to the presentation of new projects by the Secretariats of specialized agencies and the United Nations. The discussion had however shown that the Committee was clearly aware of the importance of the draft resolution and of the necessity of finding a solution to the problem.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he would prefer to submit an amendment when the issues had become clearer. Only the prefatory paragraphs of the resolution seemed acceptable to the Committee and it was consequently difficult for him to submit an amendment. He would do so if and when it was

made clear that the Committee was prepared to adopt the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Brazil.

Mr. SEN (India) proposed the following as a possible text to be inserted in the Committee's report:

"The Committee felt that the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should be requested to study immediately all specific operational projects which are to be financed directly by the budgets of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should submit regular reports to the Council on this subject showing clearly the total cost involved. These reports will give member governments an opportunity to review the problems as a whole and to consider their future policies."

Answering the Chairman, he added that he intended that text to record the discussion held in the meeting and not to replace any part or parts of the draft resolution submitted by the Brazilian representative.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) was prepared to accept the text proposed by the Indian representative, but emphasized that the purpose of his draft resolution was to find out the stage of progress reached in all projects, the majority of which were not yet at the operational stage. It was for that reason that he had established the four separate categories given in his draft resolution (Document E/AC.24/W.21). The Council should report only on those projects which were already in practical application, for it was thus that it would be possible to estimate expenditure. For those reasons he would suggest that the proposed text refer explicitly to "projects in the stage of operational activity".

Mr. SEN (India) was prepared to accept a wording on those lines.

Dr. SUTCH (New Zealand) was not sure how that criterion could be applied to the work of such an agency as the International Labour Organization, which was engaged on the drafting and negotiation of conventions. How far was that research and how far was it operational activity? It was by no means easy always to make a clear distinction.

It might perhaps be possible for the suggestions made in the discussion to be applied in the "Comparative Review of the Activities and Work Programmes of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies in the Economic and Social Fields" (Document E/1351/Rev.1). In the listing of the activities of specialized agencies some explanation might be given of the stage of progress reached. Although that document had not yet been discussed, he believed that reference to it might appropriately be made in the Committee's recommendations on the subject of priorities.

The Brazilian representative might perhaps be prepared to draft either a new document or a series of paragraphs to be included in the Committee's report.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) recalling that his delegation had consistently stressed the desirability of establishing priorities, considered that some progress had certainly been made in regard to the work of specialized agencies and Commissions.

He held, however, that certain parts of the Brazilian draft resolution raised the issue of the competence of the governing bodies of the various specialized agencies. But on the whole he

preferred its presentation of the subject to the text submitted by the Indian representative; it was more general and more practical.

He would propose that the Committee adopt the prefatory paragraphs on page 1 of the draft resolution (Document E/AC.24/W.21), substituting the word " Re-affirming" for the word "Recognizing" in the third paragraph, and inverting the order of the first and second paragraphs. The enumeration of the four categories might then be deleted, the paragraphs recommending the kind of action that the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should take being retained and the recommendation relating to the Secretariats on page 3 being amended as follows:

"RECOMMENDS also, that the Secretariats of all the specialized agencies and of the United Nations refrain to the fullest extent possible from presenting or embarking on new projects or studies and concentrate on the existing ones, with special reference to projects or studies where the extra workload could be met within the existing budgetary limitations, and with the present staff and facilities;"

The final paragraph of the draft resolution requesting the Secretary-General to report to the next session of the Economic and Social Council was also acceptable to him.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) was in principle prepared to accept the amendments suggested by the United States representative, and agreed that there was a constitutional difficulty involved in the case of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund.

In drafting his resolution he had considered the case of the International Labour Organization, which worked on social problems from the legal point of view. It was for that reason that he had specifically

referred in Category B to "preparatory work for conferences or conventions" (page 2, Document E/AC.24/W.21).

He had already withdrawn his resolution qua resolution but would wish the ideas expressed in it to figure in the Committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that, in accordance with the proposal of the Brazilian representative, a text reflecting the views put forward by the representatives of India and the United States of America be incorporated in the Committee's report. He would further propose that the relevant part of the report be drafted by a small sub-committee composed of the representatives of Brazil, India and the United States of America.

A proviso should be inserted in the report that the co-operative programme of technical assistance for economic development was not covered by the text, since that issue should not be prejudged. It was understood that the whole report would be examined by the Committee in due course.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) supported the Chairman's proposal.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that it was somewhat difficult to agree on the inclusion of a text which had not been submitted in written form. He himself would wish to have the opportunity of studying a document upon which he could make comments and to which he could submit amendments. It would surely be preferable to defer the whole question until a document was available.

The CHAIRMAN emphasized that when the sub-committee had drafted the relevant part of the report it would be submitted to

the Committee in advance in order that representatives might have an opportunity of studying the text. He did not wish any representative to commit himself at the present stage.

The Chairman's proposal was tacitly agreed.

Dr. SUTCH (New Zealand) though he supported the Chairman's summing up uttered a warning that the examination by a committee of its report was apt to take a very long time. He would have preferred that the Committee express its agreement there and then with the Chairman's summing up so that discussion of the question could not be re-opened later.

Comparative Review and Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects (Section IIC, Document E/1340, page 8).

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) recalled that the United States delegation had proposed that a substantive document should be transmitted to the General Assembly, in addition to progress reports. 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, contained a good deal of similar information and he was consequently led to wonder whether the two documents could not be merged into one, with appropriate cross references. He would suggest that the Comparative Review be included in the Catalogue.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) supported the United States proposal for the publication in one volume of the synoptic record and the catalogue of economic and social projects. That new form of presentation would facilitate the arrangement of the information in logical order and spare readers the necessity of consulting two sources of information.

Dr. SUTCH (New Zealand) considered that the Comparative Review (Document 1351/Rev.1) was a valuable piece of work and, while agreeing that it would be better to have one document only, thought that it was the Comparative Review that should be retained, particularly in view of the proposals made by the Brazilian representative with regard to the priorities to be established for programmes of work. He did not wish to make any definite proposals, but thought that the decisions which would be reached by the newly appointed sub-committee might govern the contents of the Comparative Review, or of any study that the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination might undertake.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) held that it would not be an easy task to improve those two documents. They did not always provide quite the type of information that the Committee needed. A case in point was the account given in the "Comparative Review" of the activities of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization under the heading: "Philosophy and Humanistic Studies" (Page 67, Document E/1351/Rev.1). That statement was extremely general and did not seem to be of any practical use to the Committee. In his view, the Catalogue should be retained but should be sub-divided in such a manner as to indicate the stage of progress reached in the various projects undertaken by the various specialized agencies. It would then be possible to gauge the situation exactly. The Catalogue, with which the Comparative Review should be amalgamated, should be published regularly, in time for each second annual session of the Council, in order that the budgetary implementations of the projects might be taken into consideration by the Council.

Mr. Martin HILL, Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and for Economic and Social Matters, reminded the Committee that the form and the purpose of Comparative Review and the Catalogue were different, the latter being compiled in order to yield general information, the former, on the other hand, being primarily intended to assist the Council in the task of co-ordination and the avoidance of overlapping. The fusion of those two documents into one was, therefore, difficult. He felt that the question of the retention of the Comparative Review should be considered in relation to the total amount of documentation desired by the Council. Since the United States resolution (Document E/AC.24/W.19) had not yet been discussed by the Committee, he would comment later on the last paragraph of that resolution relating to a possible further document; He would now record that if any substantial increase in documentation were asked for, the budgetary implications of such a request would have to be considered since the section in the United Nations Secretariat dealing with specialized agencies was very small and extra work would necessitate an increase in staff.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.