

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIALE/AC.6/SR.21
23 July 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

19

Dual Distribution for Council Members

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday 23 July, 1948 at 3 p.m.PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile)
Australia	Mr. PLIMSCLL
Brazil	Mr. MUNIZ
Byelorussian SSR	Mr. SMOLIAR
Canada	Mr. WILGRESS
Chile	Mr. VALENZUELA
China	Mr. HSIAO
Denmark	Mr. IVERSEN
France	Mr. LAMARLE
Lebanon	Mr. MIKAOUI
Netherlands	Mr. RIEMENS
New Zealand	Mr. SUTCH
Poland	Mr. RUPZINSKI
Turkey	Mr. SARPER
United Kingdom	Mr. PHILLIPS
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. MOROZOV
United States of America	Mr. STINEBOWER
Venezuela	Mr. d'ASCOLI

N.B. Will delegates who wish to have corrections made to the Summary Records please submit such corrections in writing to the Secretariat, Room C.436, within 24 hours of distribution of the Summary Records.

RECEIVED

AUG 10 1948

26 P.

UNITED NATIONS
ARCHIVES

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Civil Aviation Organization	Mr. MARLIN
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. SHARP

Consultants from Non-Governmental Organizations:

World Federation of Trade Unions	Mr. FISCHER
International Chamber of Commerce	Mr. VASSEUR

Secretariat:

Mr. OWEN	Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Affairs
Mr. LOKAC	Director, Division of Transport and Communications
Miss MOATS	Chief of Inland Transport Section, Division of Transport and Communications
Mr. DUMONTET	Secretary of the Committee

ORDER OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN announced that at its plenary meeting held that morning, the Council had decided to refer to the Economic Committee the Reports of the following Specialized Agencies:

- The Food and Agriculture Organization;
- The International Civil Aviation Organization;
- The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development;
- The International Monetary Fund;
- The International Telecommunications Union; and
- The Universal Postal Union.

Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Affairs) suggested that those Reports might perhaps be considered immediately after completion of the analogous items on the Committee's Agenda.

That procedure would entail a change in the present Agenda; on the following day, assuming that discussion of Item 1 were complete, the Committee would have to discuss the Reports of the International Telecommunications Union, the Universal Postal Union and the International Civil Aviation Organization, preferably in that order.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought there was no pressing need for the change suggested.

Consideration of the Economic and Employment Commission's Report had some time ago been announced as the second item on the Committee's Agenda and delegates had accordingly made full preparations for that event. If the new programme of work were adopted, representatives would have very little time in which to examine the three specialized agencies'

Reports.

The Committee might very well consider those three Reports once they had disposed of the Economic and Employment Commission's Report.

The CHAIRMAN, observing that no formal proposal had been made, said that there was no need to change the agenda order if objections were raised, particularly in view of the position on the Agenda of the Report of the Economic and Employment Commission.

The Committee decided that no change should be made in the order of the Agenda items.

REPORT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION (Item 1 of the Agenda) (Documents E/789, E/789/Add.1, E/AC.6/W.29, E/AC.6/0 and E/AC.6/31) (continued).

Resolution No.4 (Draft Resolution XIV of the Economic and Social Council)

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) re-emphasized the fact that in agreeing with the proposal that no action should be taken at present in regard to Resolution No.4, he was not attempting to prejudge the issue as to whether an Economic Commission for the Middle East should be set up.

It was clear that an Economic Commission would be fully entitled, under its terms of reference, to set up a body for the purpose of studying the problems of transport, and that at the same time the body best qualified to decide whether such a study should be initiated would be the regional commission itself. It was doubtful whether the Transport and Communications Commission could assess the urgency of such a study without first taking the advice of the regional commission, which would, of course, be composed of local specialists. The Resolution before the Committee therefore was premature, and was particularly untimely in view of the fact that the regional commission in question had not yet been brought into existence.

Mr. SARPÉR (Turkey) expressed the opinion that the present confused situation in the Middle East, of which some delegations had spoken, was temporary, affected only a small area of the region and was hardly likely to exert any permanent influence on life in the rest of the Middle East. The organization of transport in that part of the world was of capital importance and one of the conditions of the economic recovery of that area. He personally saw no reason why the Economic Commission for the Middle East, the formation of which had been agreed to in principle, should not decide to deal with transport problems in accordance with terms of reference to be given it. While he agreed that Resolution No. 4 should be discussed by the Committee after the Council had studied the report of the ad hoc Committee, he was definitely against deleting it from the agenda.

Mr. MIKAOUI (Lebanon) noted that there was only one difference between the amendment submitted by the representative of the Netherlands and that submitted by his own delegation; the Netherlands proposal applied to Resolutions Nos. 4 and 5 whilst the Lebanese proposal concerned No. 4 (Inland Transport in the Middle East) only. He therefore endorsed the Netherlands proposal that consideration of the Resolutions on Inland Transport in the Middle East (No. 4) and in Latin America (No. 5) should be deferred until after the Council, in plenary meeting, had studied the reports of the Economic Commission for Latin America and of the ad hoc Committee on the establishment of the Economic Commission for the Middle East.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the proposals submitted by the Netherlands and the Lebanon representatives concurred in calling for the deferment of discussion on Resolution No. 4.

The Committee also had before it the New Zealand proposal to the effect that no action should be taken on that Resolution.

On a vote being taken, the proposal of the representative of New Zealand was rejected by 8 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

On a vote being taken, the proposal of the representatives of the Netherlands and of the Lebanon that discussion of Resolution No. 4 be deferred was adopted by 11 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) explained that he had abstained from voting because he disapproved of the Committee's continually deferring items for consideration at a later stage. A provisional decision might very well have been taken in regard to Resolution 4, since, upon the creation of an Economic Commission for the Middle East it would have had a certain value; whereas if that Economic Commission were not in fact established, it would automatically have become void.

Resolution No. 3

The CHAIRMAN indicated that the joint Draft Resolution requested from the New Zealand and Soviet Union representatives was now before the Committee (Document E/AC.6/30). The proposal was that that Draft Resolution should be substituted for the Draft Resolution proposed by the Transport and Communications Commission.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) did not disagree with the objects of the Resolution. However, it had plainly been written in ignorance of the Report of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, on page 35 of which it was presumed that the Economic and Social Council would consider the question. The Transport and Communications Commission had not before the plenary session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. The latter body had

taken note of the Transport and Communications Commission's report, and had decided to convene a meeting of inland transport experts whilst awaiting the approval of the Economic and Social Council. Accordingly, the Resolution before the Committee should take account of that decision, or should be remodelled to conform more exactly with the Resolution proposed by the Transport and Communications Commission, omitting, of course, the request that the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East should convene such a meeting, and possibly also the latter part of sub-paragraph (b). The introductory paragraph should continue itself to acknowledge the Resolution of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reaffirmed that the Committee might either accept the Resolution in a generalised form, or defer examination of the subject until the report of the regional commission in question were available. In any case, the resolution could not refer to the regional Commission because the latter did not figure on the agenda of the Economic Committee and it could not be foreseen what decisions the Plenary Council would take in that regard.

If the majority of the Committee opposed the Joint Draft Resolution, he would agree to a postponement of the question.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) pointed out that if regional commissions were fully entitled to convene such expert meetings without prior authorisation from the Economic and Social Council, and if the regional Commission in question had in fact convened such a meeting, there was no need to debate the subject.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) pointed out that no reference could be made to the Resolution of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, since that body's Report had not yet been considered. In composing the Joint Draft Resolution, both the Soviet Union representative and he himself had been fully aware of the decision mentioned by the United States representative.

Replying to the United Kingdom representative, he agreed that regional Commissions were fully entitled to take action of the kind in question without prior authorisation; the object of the resolution was precisely to underline those powers. The Joint Draft Resolution referred the consideration of transport problems in that area back to the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and requested the Secretary-General to report on the outcome of those studies.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) was not impressed by the argument that the Committee should disregard a document already produced on the subject because a certain stage in the agenda had not yet been reached. If it did so, the resolution it produced would be ambiguous. No delicate policy issue was involved and the Committee need set no store by mere formalities.

In replying to the observations made by the United Kingdom representative, he pointed out that the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East had taken action on the explicit understanding that the approval of the Economic and Social Council would be sought. If, therefore, the Committee made no pronouncement on the subject, neither the Secretariat nor the regional commission itself would know how to proceed. The Committee should take both Resolutions into consideration and try to draft a joint text.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) understood that the terms of reference of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East stipulated that the Council's approval should be sought only for action on matters affecting other regions; there was no doubt that, having been asked for approval, the Council should in courtesy give it, but no constitutional obligation was involved.

The CHAIRMAN thought that under their terms of reference all regional commissions had authority to establish ancillary bodies provided the Council's approval were given.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) would also withdraw the Joint Draft Resolution were strong opposition to it to become apparent, and were members to indicate that such withdrawal would be appropriate. However, even should he do so, the problem would remain before the Committee since resolution 3, as proposed by the Transport and Communications Commission, was equally inappropriate.

It would perhaps be better to take no action in the matter at all.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the terms of reference, in that regard, of the Economic Commission for Latin America were identical to those of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. They prescribed that the Commission could, in consultation with the specialised agencies concerned, and following approval by the Economic and Social Council, establish such subsidiary organs as would aid it to carry out the work falling within its jurisdiction.

Accordingly, it was incumbent upon the Economic and Social Council to approve the action taken by the regional commission in question.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled his earlier observation that, in dealing with the decisions taken by the regional commissions on inland transport problems, the Economic and Social Council should adopt a consistent policy. They had agreed to defer discussion on the Resolution in respect of the Economic Commission for Latin America until a later stage, and they should, therefore, take the same position in regard to

the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. It was possible, in any case, that the Plenary Council would reach conclusions which would render the Resolution unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out a misapprehension of the Soviet Union delegate that it had been agreed to defer discussion on Resolution No.4. The Resolution relating to the Economic Commission for Latin America had not yet been brought before the Committee.

It was for the New Zealand and Soviet Union representatives themselves to judge whether the strength of the opposition to their proposal demanded its withdrawal.

Mr. DUMONTEN (Secretary of the Committee) read out the text of the amendment proposed by the United States representative and passed to the Chair in writing.

"The Economic and Social Council, noting the Reports of the Transport and Communications Commission and of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East on the subject of inland transport in Asia and the Far East, expresses its approval of the provisional action of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East in convening an early meeting of inland transport experts of the countries represented on the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East."

Thereafter would follow sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of the original Resolution.

Mr. WILGRESS (Canada), although he had intimated on the previous day that there was no need to defer consideration of the Resolution until a decision on the Commission's Report had been reached in the Plenary Council, remarked that they were now being called upon to approve action already taken by

the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. It would be logical to approve such action only when the Report of that Commission were to hand.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) regretted that the question could not be regulated in the summary manner he had proposed. However, the United States amendment inevitably involved a comprehensive discussion of the powers of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and its subsidiary organs.

He withdrew the Joint Draft Resolution.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) was equally anxious that an expeditious conclusion of the Committee's debate on transport problems be reached, and withdrew his amendment; he moved that the Committee should approve the text of Resolution No.3 as submitted by the Transport and Communications Commission.

Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) observed that the Transport and Communications Commission had made a request for a recommendation upon which the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East had already acted.

The Committee might therefore quite simply endorse that request.

He proposed that Resolution No.3 be adopted, amended as follows:

In the introductory paragraph, substitute for "to request to the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East to convene", the words "The Economic and Social Council endorses the recommendation of the Transport and Communications Commission that the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East should convene....."

Mr. PHILBIPS (United Kingdom) interpreted the terms of reference of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East as stipulating that only where that Commission created a subsidiary organ was prior approval by the Economic and Social Council required. That Commission had, however, merely convened an ad hoc meeting of transport experts; clearly the provisions of the terms of reference did not apply to that action. Ad hoc meetings of experts had frequently been called by other bodies in the past without prior authority from the Economic and Social Council.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that the applicable Resolution of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East stated that preparatory measures would be taken by that meeting, pending the approval of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Affairs) observed that under its terms of reference the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East could certainly take the action it had taken, without seeking the approval of the Economic and Social Council. However, he had been informed by persons who were present that that Commission had submitted its decision for the consideration of the Economic and Social Council out of courtesy to the Council; it would be an equivalent courtesy to grant the approval requested.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) adopted the Australian representative's amendment as part of his own proposal.

On a vote being taken, the United States representative's proposal, incorporating the amendment submitted by the Australian representative, was adopted by 6 votes to 1 with 9 abstentions.

Resolution No. 5

The CHAIRMAN stated that since the draft Resolution (Doc. E/AC.6/29) mentioned the Resolution of the Economic Commission for Latin America, that Resolution would be read to

the meeting. The Secretary read the Resolution of the Economic Commission for Latin America on Transport and Communications.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) pointed out that whereas the Resolution of the Economic Commission for Latin America referred the question of transport and communications to the Transport and Communications Commission, the latter body in its own Resolution had, conversely, referred the same problem to the Economic Commission for Latin America.

The anomaly had arisen because the Resolution passed by the Transport and Communications Commission had not been in the hands of representatives attending the subsequent meeting of the Economic Commission for Latin America at which that body had decided to refer the matter to the Transport and Communications Commission. The important fact was, however, that the Economic Commission for Latin America had recognized the deficiencies of the studies so far undertaken in that field by the Transport and Communications Commission.

It was essential that the present Committee should reconcile the two documents, since if the matter were deferred for discussion in the Plenary Council the divergency would have to be considered there, and it was possible that no decision would be taken on action in regard to the Transport and Communications Commission's Resolution.

He had included the mention of freight rates, since that was evidently a vital problem. He had inserted a paragraph requesting the Secretary-General to give all possible assistance to the Economic Survey of the Economic Commission for Latin America, since the next meeting of the Transport and Communications Commission would approximately coincide with that of the Economic Commission for Latin America. In the absence of a direct recommendation from the Transport and Communications Commission, the Secretariat of one body might well consult with that of the other.

Mr. d'ASCOBI (Venezuela) wished to clear up a misunderstanding. The discrepancy to which reference had been made by the United Kingdom representative did not in reality exist, as the Resolution of the Economic Commission for Latin America was perfectly clear. That Commission had felt that the question could not be left entirely to the Transport and Communications Commission. The delegation of Venezuela had noted the Report of the Economic Commission for Latin America and, in accordance with the suggestions contained therein, had sought the assistance of the Transport and Communications Commission whose co-operation it had deemed necessary.

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) pointed out that what the Economic Commission for Latin America had desired was to benefit by the experience of another Commission. Since the word "discrepancy" had been mentioned, he felt that he had better give a few explanations regarding the amendment submitted by his delegation.

Sub-paragraph (b) of the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom delegation requested the Secretary-General to bring the question of freight rates before the Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. The Government of Chile, however, considered that the body in question had abandoned any claim to competence in the matter of freight rates and was not in a position to deal with commercial problems. The draft Convention which had been the basis for discussion at the United Nations Maritime Conference had provided that the future Maritime Organization would be empowered to work towards the elimination of differential treaty action and restrictions by Governments affecting shipping.

The Swedish and Danish Governments, however, had expressed the desire that the functions and duties of the Maritime Organization should be limited and that it should not be given the power to take action in the commercial field. For its part, the Government of the United Kingdom had, before the Conference, reserved the right to raise the question of the commercial aspects of the organizations' terms of reference at the Conference.

The question underlying the whole Conference had therefore been whether the future Maritime Organization should be given powers to deal with commercial matters or not. The concessions made by the Governments which opposed the granting of such powers had been limited, and the United Kingdom, in particular, had stated that assistance and encouragement given by a Government for the development of its national shipping and for purposes of security did not constitute discrimination, provided that such assistance and encouragement did not restrict the freedom of shipping of all flags to take part in international trade.

After discussions which had lasted two months, the terms of reference of the Maritime Organization finally set up had stipulated that Governments had the right to apply certain discriminatory measures for the development of their national shipping and for purposes of security. Disputes which might arise out of that provision should, moreover, be settled through the normal processes of international shipping business, without the intervention of the Maritime Organization. If that procedure did not produce results, the parties concerned might solve their difficulties between themselves. The Maritime Organization could not intervene except to make a study of the problem.

If, however, the representative of the United Kingdom were right and the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization had decided to deal with the question of freight rates, he (the representative of Chile) wondered which of its organs would be called upon to deal with the problem. The Assembly's terms of reference were in fact limitative, and those of the Council had occasioned irksome discussions, the result of which had been that certain countries of Latin America, for example, were not in a position to present their views to that body.

It was not surprising that the representative of the United Kingdom had not been fully acquainted with the questions which had been the main stumbling-blocks in connection with the setting up of the Maritime Organization and that was the explanation of why, to remove an obvious paradox, he (the representative of the United Kingdom) was now proposing an even more patent one.

In short, the delegation of Chile considered the United Kingdom's proposal unacceptable, and to avoid any contradiction, proposed that sub-paragraph (b) of the United Kingdom draft resolution be replaced by the following text: "To recommend that the Transport and Communications Commission in its deliberations pay special attention to the study of the problem of sea freight rates affecting Latin America".

He further proposed the insertion, at the end of the third paragraph of the United Kingdom draft, of the following words: "and recommended that the Transport and Communications Commission study the problem of sea freight rates in Latin America."

Mr. MUNIZ (Brazil) supported the proposal of the Chilean delegation and stressed the disadvantages of the proposal put forward in the United Kingdom resolution that the study of the question of freight rates - which was of considerable importance to trade and economic development - should be referred to the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. The functions of that body were in fact essentially technical, as the Brazilian proposal to endow it with economic functions had not been adopted. Furthermore, the membership of the Council of that Organization was such that the interests of a large number of small countries whose shipping services were inadequately developed could not be represented thereon.

The representative of Brazil was therefore of the opinion that the proposal of the Economic Commission for Latin America should be retained and that the Secretariat of the Transport and Communications Commission should assist it in the study of the question of freight rates and that of discriminatory practices. The Maritime Organization was not competent to deal with such a far reaching problem of economic policy as freight rates, and for that reason the Brazilian delegation would support the Chilean amendment.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) emphasized the considerable importance of the question for all Latin American countries, whose points of view he felt sure were the same as his own. The draft resolution of the United Kingdom had thrown him into consternation as it was undoubtedly harmful to the interests of those countries. As the representative of the United Kingdom had always shown himself to be a friend of Latin America, the

conclusion to be drawn from his draft was that he was unaware of the consequences it would have. The study of a question so vital to Latin America could not be entrusted to an organization whose very character would impair its capacity for carrying out such a task.

The Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization was limited by its terms of reference and by its membership, and, furthermore, small countries were not represented on its Council, which comprised only the representatives of countries with large merchant fleets and with extensive interests in international sea-borne trade. Furthermore, in requesting the assistance of the Transport and Communications Commission, the Economic Commission for Latin America had not thought itself to abandon the problem.

To avoid any ambiguity, he proposed that the Chilean amendment should be amended to conform with the text of the resolution of the Economic Commission for Latin America by the insertion of the following phrase: "... in order to facilitate consideration of these matters as soon as possible by the Economic Commission for Latin America".

He further proposed the insertion, at the end of paragraph (b) as that paragraph appeared in the Chilean amendment of the words: "such study to be carried out in close co-operation with the Economic Commission for Latin America".

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) said that in the Conference which set up the International Maritime Consultative Organization, the question of how far freight rates could be discussed internationally had been considered. At that time neither the Chilean nor the Brazilian

delegations had been satisfied on the point. The Venezuelan Government, although invited, had not been represented at the Conference. The Conference had concluded a convention; that had been signed by the Chilean delegation, and voted for by the Brazilian delegation, although he understood that the latter had not yet signed it.

The point of view of the United Kingdom delegation had been simply that maritime matters should be referred in the first place to the organization set up by the United Nations to deal with them. Freight rates could not be considered as falling outside the terms of reference of the Interim Maritime Commission, even though its competence was limited to the technical field, because even if freight rates had an economic aspect they had also a highly technical one,

He felt it a pity that the Economic Commission for Latin America had not itself pursued the question further instead of awaiting further study by the Transport and Communications Commission, since that body would not meet until the spring of 1949.

The purpose of the resolution was to ask the Secretary-General to make the study himself, and not to wait until the Transport and Communications Commission was in a position to make recommendations. The United Kingdom draft resolution provided also in the absence of a meeting of the Transport and Communications Commission for the assistance of other bodies whose experience could be turned to good account. Consideration of inland transport in Latin America should be pursued at a regional level.

In conclusion, he recalled, that it has been on the initiative of the United Kingdom delegation to the Economic Commission for Latin America that a useful resolution on transport in Latin America had been drawn up. It had been confined to inland transport because it seemed as though coastal and inland communications, and not ocean transport, were the major problem for that great continent. The delegate of Venezuela had suggested another view. He thought it unfortunate, however, that during the course of the subsequent debate one particular aspect of the whole problem of Latin American Transport, namely that of ocean freight rates, should have been thus singled out.

In regard to the Chilean Amendment, he could not accept the first proposal, since the Economic Commission for Latin America recommended not only that more study should be given to the question of freight rates in the Transport and Communications Commission but to transport problems, including freight rates. The suggestion that the Transport and Communications Commission should study only the problem of sea freight rates therefore seemed unfortunate, to say the least, as it completely overlooked the fact that freight rates formed only one aspect of the whole transport problem.

In regard to the suggestion that the last paragraph be deleted, that was a question of opinion as to whether the Transport and Communications Commission was the proper organ for considering the question, or whether it should first be referred to the Interim Maritime Commission.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) suggested that the discussion on Resolution 3 had shown a reluctance to assimilate the draft before the committee with a draft identical in substance brought up in another Committee. The meeting had to decide whether, following that precedent, it would restrict itself to the resolution of the Transport and Communications Commission, which confined itself to inland transport, or whether it would enlarge the scope of the Resolution as proposed by the United Kingdom resolution. He was not sure that it would not be wise to move that the resolution should simply consider inland transport in Latin America. That would appear logical, since resolutions 3 - 7 inclusive all dealt with inland transport.

If the discussion were broadened to take in the United Kingdom resolution, he reserved his right to speak again. Here he would say simply that he was willing to accept that resolution although inclined to prefer reference in the last paragraph to the Transport and Communications Commission rather than to the Interim Commission of the Maritime Organisation. The Chilean amendment was broadly acceptable, but the wording of part (b) of the United Kingdom resolution was preferable, even if the Transport and Communications Commission were named instead of the Interim Commission of the Maritime Committee.

The CHAIRMAN, noting that the representative of the United States had not presented a formal motion, said that it would be difficult to move resolution 5 without taking into account the Resolution of the Economic Commission for Latin America referred to in the United Kingdom resolution. It was for the Committee to decide whether it would limit its action to a vote on resolution 5, or whether it would extend its deliberation to discussion of the British resolution also.

After a short discussion, in which Mr. D'ASCOLI (Venezuela), suggested that there might be no objection to accepting the United States proposal, if it could be ensured that matters relating to maritime shipping rights would be dealt with later when the Committee came to discuss the Report of the Economic Commission for Latin America, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote a proposal that the Committee consider forthwith Resolution No.5, and the Resolution of the Economic Commission for Latin America simultaneously.

There being 4 votes cast for the motion and 4 against, with 9 abstentions, the CHAIRMAN announced that in accordance with Rule No.46 of the Rules of Procedure, a second vote on the motion would be taken at the next meeting.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand), speaking to Resolution 6, said that it was premature to study regional organization for Africa. Africa was a geographical entity, but could not be considered a region in that connection. In the absence of a report from any regional commission on Africa he moved that no action should be taken.

Mr. LAMARLE (France) thought that the Committee would agree with him that the question was simpler and clearer than the earlier ones and that the representative of New Zealand had said briefly and pertinently all that required saying. There was no unity in the Continent of Africa in the matter of transport, and transport routes from North Africa to Europe or to the Middle East and from Central Africa to various countries of America were much more important than intra-African transport proper. For that reason the French delegation was of the opinion that the draft resolution should be purely and simply set aside.

Mr. LUKAC (Secretariat) explained that the recommendation that a study be made of the question of organization in the field of inland transport in Africa originated in resolutions of the Council from 1946 onwards that the Transport and Communications Commission consider the question of international organization in the various fields of transport and communications throughout the world. The Commission had, accordingly, recommended with respect to the fields of Aviation, Telecommunications, Posts, and Shipping that there should be world-wide organizations. With the establishment of the International Maritime Consultative Organization all of these fields would have been covered. Inland transport the Commission had dealt with on a regional basis. The Commission had now studied and made recommendations on the subject with respect to Europe, Asia and the Far East, the Middle East, and Latin America. Only Africa remained and the Commission had now recommended that the Secretary-General start a preliminary study. The result of such a study might, of course, be the conclusion suggested by the two delegates who had just spoken, namely that the subject was not yet ripe for action.

Mr. LAMARLE (France) stated that it had not been his intention in any way to criticize the initiative which had led to the submission of the present resolution. The remarks of the representative of the Secretariat showed that it was for the Council to consider whether in the present state of affairs it was desirable to undertake a study of the problems in question. Since, however, it was apparent from the information furnished to the Committee that Africa lacked unity in the matter of transport, the proposed study would have no real value for the time being and there was therefore no point in dissipating the energy of the Secretariat and the Council on such tasks.

Mr. RIEMENS (Netherlands) moved the closure.

The CHAIRMAN put the Netherlands proposal to vote and it was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN then put the New Zealand motion to the vote.

The proposal that no action be taken on Resolution No. 6 - Inland Transport in Africa - was carried by 13 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions.

Resolution No. 7

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela), speaking on Resolution 7 - Co-ordination among Inland Transport Experts of Different Regions - proposed that as the Resolution was patently non-controversial, a vote should be taken immediately.

Mr. PHILIPS (United Kingdom) objected that, whereas the regional commissions were free to co-operate as they thought best, a resolution advocating such co-operation might have implications which could go farther than desired: and felt the matter should be further considered.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) pointed out that the raison d'être of the resolution was made apparent by the reference in the preamble of Resolution No. 7 as adopted by the Transport and Communications Commission to the "possibility of less satisfactory co-operation than in the past" and thought it useful as tending to obviate a possible fragmentary approach to problems on the part of the regional commissions. He would therefore propose that Resolution 7 be adopted.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) deemed the intervention of the Council superfluous, and said that the Russian delegation would abstain from voting.

Mr. PHILIPS (United Kingdom) felt that the matter was one which could be left to the competence of the regional Commissions themselves, and that the Committee should therefore confine its action to taking note of the Resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had not to approve or adopt the resolutions of the Commission but to work on texts prepared for the Council.

Mr. WILGRESS (Canada) thought the Transport and Communications Commission had acted quite properly in asking the Council to draw the attention of the Regional Economic Commissions to the advantages of inviting transport experts of other regions to take part in their meetings, and said that he would therefore support the Resolution as encouraging a desirable measure of co-ordinated effort.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) on the other hand supported the United Kingdom motion.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) suggested that in case Resolution 7 were not adopted, it would be preferable

instead of adopting a Resolution taking note of Resolution 7 simply to have a statement in the Summary Record that the Committee had "taken note of the considerations advanced on Resolution 7".

The Representatives of the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agreed with the latter suggestion and withdrew their proposals.

The Chairman having put Resolution 7 as submitted by the Transport and Communications Commission to the vote, it was adopted by 7 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

The Meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.