

UNITED NATIONS

NATIONS UNIES

UNRESTRICTED

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

E/AC.6/SR.31
11 August 1948
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Dual Distribution for Council Members

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTYFIRST MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
Wednesday, 11 August 1948, at 10 a.m. //

CONTENTS

REPORT OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE
STATISTICAL COMMISSION (Item 13 of
the Council Agenda) (Continued).

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

RECEIVED

AUG 25 1948

28p.

UNITED NATIONS
ARCHIVES

Present:

Chairman:

Australia	Mr. SANTA-CRUZ (Chile)
Brazil	Mr. WALKER
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. CAMPOS
Canada	Mr. SMOLIAR
Chile	Mr. POLLOCK
Denmark	Mr. HSAIO
France	Mr. IVERSEN
Lebanon	Mr. RIVET
Netherlands	Mr. HARFOUCHE
New Zealand	Mr. PATYN
Peru	Mr. HAMPTON
Poland	Mr. MONGE
Turkey	Mr. RUDZINSKI
United Kingdom	Mr. SARPER
	Mr. PHILLIPS
	Mr. WARNER
United States of America	Mr. LORWIN
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. MOROSOV
Venezuela	Mr. d'ASCOLI

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Office	Mr. OSMAY
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. McDOUGALL

Secretariat:

Mr. Bruce	Assistant Director, Statistical Office
Mr. Dumontet	Secretary of the Committee

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE STATISTICAL COMMISSION (Item 13 of the Council Agenda) (Documents E/795, E/795/Add.1 and E/795/Add.2/Rev.1).

The CHAIRMAN opened the general debate on the report of the Statistical Commission.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) wished to associate himself with the remarks made by Dr. Evott at the previous meeting on the very great importance of the work of the Statistical Commission. The United Kingdom delegation recognised the importance of practical achievements and wished to encourage such organs of the United Nations as achieved progress towards the solution of practical problems; it therefore wished to express appreciation of the work done by the Statistical Commission. It approved the list of projects established by the Commission for priority treatment in the next twelve months, with particular reference to:

- the revision of the minimum list of commodities for international trade statistics;
- the index of numbers of industrial production;
- the statistics of prices; and
- the statistics of national income and related subjects.

He felt that the statement of subjects chosen for priority treatment was adequate.

The Brazilian representative had wisely drawn attention to the requirements of countries where statistical services were less developed; the United Kingdom delegation warmly supported his suggestion. The need for improved statistical services was very much in the minds of those who had

attended the session of the Economic Commission for Latin America, recently held at Santiago de Chile. Further development of statistical services in Latin America would be very useful. He was not very happy, however, about the form of the Brazilian proposal. It had been submitted as an amendment to the resolution on Regional Statistical Activities, which was primarily applicable to Europe and there was some difficulty in adapting the Brazilian proposal to the terms of the resolution presented by the Statistical Commission. The United Kingdom representative thought that it would be more suitable if the substance of the Brazilian proposal were presented independently of the resolution on Regional Statistical Activities, thus allowing the Committee to pass a resolution relating to European problems separately. To achieve that end, the United Kingdom delegation had drawn up Document E/AC.6/W.23, which embodied the contents of the Brazilian proposal, and presented them in the form of an independent resolution.

He wished to draw attention to the language used by the Commission in paragraph 21 of the Report, in which an important principle was enunciated:

"The important principle to be observed in all cases is that statistical activities in the international field must not be fragmented but they must be integrated with regional needs and reflect regional interests. This implies that regional statistical activities should be integrated with plans developed or approved at United Nations headquarters under the authority of the Secretary-General."

His delegation warmly endorsed the recognition by the Commission of that important principle.

With regard to the financial implications of the proposals contained in the report of the Statistical Commission, his delegation would support the appropriation of the necessary additional expenditure, because it felt that the practical and useful proposals contained in the report

made it worthwhile. If, however, other delegations could make suggestions as to how economy could be effected, he would give them careful consideration.

Mr. LORWIN (United States of America) was very happy to express his delegation's appreciation of the high standard of the Commission's report, which provided a clear statement of work done and progress made in the solution of the problems with which the Commission was dealing. The United States delegation wished to congratulate the Commission particularly on its activities in connection with the development of an international standard industrial classification of all economic activities. The economic activities of most of the countries of the world could be logically arranged within the framework provided by the Commission. He appreciated the collaboration extended by the International Labour Office in the preparation of an occupational classification, and considered that the programme worked out by the Statistical Commission was satisfactory and that the projects outlined were indeed of great importance. He supported in particular the project relating to the proposal for making assistance available to Governments for the population censuses to be taken in 1950.

In regard to the Commission's programme of work he felt that their notion of priority might well be analysed. The Statistical Commission seemed to consider priority as identical with importance, but all the items classified as enjoying priority were in fact equally important. The United States representative felt that some of the work contemplated could be carried out by the Statistical Office of the Secretariat before consultants were called upon to examine the problems. That method could in particular be

be applied in relation to the review of price and cost on living indices and would spread the work over a longer period. The remarks of the representative of the United States of America should in no way be interpreted as critical of the work of the Commission. The Commission deserved support since it was revealing in practical terms the interdependence of activities of all nations, and was thus illustrating one of the fundamental principles underlying the concept of the United Nations in developing an international system of statistics.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) felt that the proposal put forward by the United Kingdom delegation in Document E/AC.6/W.21 agreed to a large extent with the point of view of the Brazilian delegation. The ideas contained in the Brazilian proposal (Document E/AC.6/W.21) were perhaps presented more concisely and elegantly in the United Kingdom proposal, which, moreover, avoided the enumeration of regional commissions. He therefore withdrew the Brazilian draft resolution in favour of the United Kingdom proposal. He went on to say that he understood that the work connected with the statistical deficiencies of the countries mentioned would be undertaken by the Statistical Office of the United Nations in collaboration with the Economic Commission for Latin America. The Statistical Commission was, of course, primarily concerned with such questions and its collaboration with the Economic Commission for Latin America with regard to such matters would be helpful.

Mr. RIVET (France) fully approved of the Statistical Commission's work both in the field of the classification of industrial activities susceptible to statistical analysis and in the subjects chosen for priority treatment during the next year. The French delegation heartily agreed with the remarks made by the representatives of Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States of America in support of the Commission's report, especially the request made to the Secretary-General to encourage and facilitate such consultation among representatives of the statistical services of the various European Governments upon questions of statistics. The French delegate also supported the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom inviting the Commission, at its next Session, to consider how countries requiring assistance in remedying deficiencies of statistical data could be helped to improve their services.

The drawing up of an international programme for education and training in statistics was of special interest to the French delegation, because France had played a leading role in that field. A Statistical Institute connected with the University of Paris had been created at the end of the First World War. That Institute had gained a world-wide reputation owing to the high qualifications of its teaching staff and the soundness of its methods of teaching. It had trained the key statisticians of a large number of countries. To this there had been added a training programme, beginning in 1942 for official statisticians in France. By adapting its programmes to some extent, the Institute would be able to train statistical technicians for international work.

He emphasized that it would be desirable for the United Nations to make use of that body within the framework of the proposals submitted by the Statistical Commission.

Mr. D'ASCOLI (Venezuela) expressed his disappointment that the Brazilian representative had withdrawn his proposal. That proposal constituted a step forward in the promotion of better statistics in economically under-developed countries. The countries which fell within the scope of the Economic Commissions for Asia and the Far East and for Latin America needed the assistance of the Statistical Commission in improving their statistical services. He had hoped that such assistance would be forthcoming not only in order to bring about the co-ordination of the methods used in Latin America with international practice, but also in order to improve by the adoption of more advanced methods, actual systems of statistics used in the countries concerned. However, his comments did not mean that he wished to oppose the Statistical Commission's resolution on regional statistical activities (document E/795, page 32); but that resolution was somewhat incongruous, since it spoke in general terms of regional activities and ended with a recommendation which applied to Europe only. The Brazilian draft resolution had, therefore, filled a gap in the Commission's resolution. The United Kingdom representative had no doubt submitted his proposal in a constructive spirit. Logically, the United Kingdom draft resolution would answer the purpose both of the Commission's resolution and of the Brazilian draft resolution and could replace both. But for the sake of conciseness, it would be preferable to adopt the Commission's resolution, and to accept the Brazilian proposal as an addition thereto, or as an independent resolution.

He would abstain from voting on the United Kingdom resolution because he considered that resolution to be inadequate. If the representative of Brazil did not wish to re-introduce his proposal, he would reserve the right to re-introduce it himself.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation deemed it necessary to make a certain number of observations on the report of the Statistical Commission.

First, the Commission had recommended the adoption of the draft of an International Standard Industrial Classification of all Economic Activities (Document E/795/Add.1). The Soviet Union delegation considered that the Council could not approve that draft at that stage, since it would be found on close scrutiny that the proposed classification suffered from grave deficiencies of a scientific methodological order. The Soviet Union delegation thought it necessary that the Council should recommend to the Statistical Commission that it reconsider the International Standard Industrial Classification and take into consideration any remarks which various Members might make on the subject. Such classifications should be recommended only after very thorough study. The Soviet delegation would submit a draft resolution on the subject for discussion during the debate on specific resolutions.

Secondly, in a number of cases the Statistical Commission had recommended the setting up of groups of experts to study various problems. The Soviet Union delegation did not think that the Council could approve that method of work, as the tasks in question pertained to the work of the Commission and the Secretariat themselves. Experience had shown that groups of experts tended to substitute themselves for the Commission, as had happened during the consideration of the International Standard Industrial Classification of all Economic Activities. That classification had not been discussed in substance by the Commission, but the latter had accepted the report of the group of experts. Furthermore, the setting up of such groups of experts entailed unnecessary expenditure.

Thirdly, the Soviet Union delegation observed a tendency on the part of the Commission to enlarge the Secretariat machinery. The Soviet delegation considered that such increases of staff were not warranted, and that the tasks entrusted to the Secretariat by the Statistical Commission should be carried out by existing personnel.

Fourthly, the Statistical Commission was a consultative body answerable to the Council only. The Soviet Union delegation noted that several resolutions had been drafted in a manner which might lend substance to the view that the Commission was assuming the role of an administrative organ of the United Nations. For example, one resolution "instructed" the Secretary-General to take various measures and to report to the Commission. Such instructions could be issued by the Economic Council alone, and then only

after it had considered the Commission's report.

Finally, the Soviet delegation must abstain from any expression of approval of the results achieved at the World Statistical Congress called at the direction of the Council, because the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had not taken part in that Congress. He also reserved the right to comment on each resolution as it was considered by the Committee after the closure of the general debate.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) regretted that the representative of Venezuela should feel that he had sacrificed part of his proposal by withdrawing it. His proposal was intended to correct the relative lack of balance in the approach of the Commission to the problem of comparability of statistics. The Commission devoted more attention to technical refinements and less to the need for filling gaps where they existed. His own proposal and the United Kingdom draft resolution recognized that need, since the United Kingdom text invited the Commission at its next session to consider as a measure of urgency how countries requiring assistance in remedying statistical deficiencies could be helped to improve their basic statistical services. That wording was equivalent to the wording used in paragraph (b) of the Brazilian addendum to the draft resolution of the Statistical Commission on Regional Statistical Activities. The only difference between the two texts lay in the fact that the Brazilian draft mentioned the two regional Commissions of which the co-operation should be sought. He considered, however, that in this instance precision might be sacrificed to greater comprehensiveness. The Economic Commission for

the Middle East might be set up and might also welcome co-operation and assistance in remedying the deficiencies of the statistical data of that area. The Brazilian text might have been considered as exclusive. Therefore, he preferred the United Kingdom text. He wondered whether the attitude of the representative of Venezuela was not due to a misunderstanding of the basic purposes to be achieved.

The CHAIRMAN reminded members that individual resolutions would be discussed after the general debate.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) considered the report of the Statistical Commission excellent, and that it showed a clear understanding of the issues before the Council and of the problems which must be resolved to achieve comparability in international statistics and to improve standards in statistical fields.

The Canadian delegation would make only one observation on the list of priorities. It considered that indices of industrial production, the statistics of prices and the revision of the minimum list of commodities for international trade statistics, and statistics on national income should have top priority. With regard to the expense involved in the implementation of the proposed programmes, the Canadian delegation would support the view of the representative of the United Kingdom, since it considered that the expenditure was worth-while in terms of the results which might be achieved. It would therefore strongly support the necessary appropriations. Such unqualified endorsement was made,

however, on the understanding that the general requirements of economy which applied to the present phase of the activities of the United Nations would be strictly observed. The Secretariat should of course try to implement the programme with the minimum expenditure consistent with the efficient fulfilment of the aims.

Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands) stated that he was very pleased with the report, which showed that the members of the Commission possessed a highly developed esprit de corps and that they had defined their aims with a clarity and perception which were not often encountered in the United Nations organs. The Council should welcome the Commission's acute awareness of its tasks. He agreed with the list of priorities established by the Commission and with the recommendation on regional statistical activities, with particular reference to Europe. The way in which the Commission envisaged such regional consultations could serve as an example for other parts of the world, though the methods used should be adapted to suit conditions prevailing in each region. It was a comfort to know that at least one body of the United Nations would thus be able to register with punctiliousness the troubles of the nations represented in the Organization.

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) shared the opinions expressed by other representatives who had supported the Report of the Third Session of the Statistical Commission, and said he would vote for it. He agreed with the remarks of the Soviet Union representative to the effect that certain points regarding the International Standard Industrial

Classification of all Economic Activities should be examined in detail by the Committee.

Referring to paragraph 4 on page 3 of document E/795/Add.1, he pointed out that one type of company common to his country had been omitted in the description of units to be classified. The Chilean delegation did not agree with the opinion expressed in the third paragraph on page 4.

His delegation supported the Commission's suggestions regarding priorities of work and also agreed with the remarks of the representative of Venezuela in respect of the need for priority in the case of the statistical services of under-developed countries.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) said that as the Brazilian delegation had withdrawn its amendment he would submit it as an amendment emanating from his delegation.

The CHAIRMAN, replying to a point of order raised by Mr. MORCEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), said the amendment submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics delegation would be considered as soon as it had been received from the translation service. As that amendment referred to the resolution on statistical classification on page 32 of document E/795, the Committee would first consider the second resolution appearing on that page, namely the resolution on regional statistical activities.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) asked whether the representative of Brazil would support the original amendment he had submitted (document E/AC.6/W.22), but had later withdrawn in favour of the United Kingdom draft resolution (document E/AC.6/W.23).

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that it would be unnecessary to have a separate resolution referring to the under-developed countries if the word "European" were deleted in the second and third paragraphs of the resolution on regional statistical data submitted by the Statistical Commission. The resolution would then be of a more general character, and acceptable to all representatives.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) said that if the general consensus of opinion was that the USSR proposal would meet the situation, the Venezuelan delegation would not oppose it. He felt, however, that a formula might be found which would cover both the case of European countries and that of the under-developed countries, and pointed out that in the latter countries the problem concerned the technical development of statistics and not their co-ordination.

Mr. LORWIN (United States of America) considered that the USSR proposal nullified the purpose of the resolution on regional statistical activities, and failed to meet the points raised by the Brazilian and Venezuelan representatives. The resolution referred to a situation which was peculiar to Europe, where statistical problems were numerous and statistical technique was well advanced, and dealt with problems of statistical comparability and reporting. The Brazilian delegation's amendment was concerned with the development and encouragement of basic statistical services, which was a totally different problem. An addition might be made to the resolution to cover the proposal submitted by the Venezuelan delegation.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) agreed that there would be some difficulty if the resolution were amended as suggested by the USSR representative. The resolution in question referred to problems of standardization and comparability, which presupposed the existence of well-developed statistical services. The problem envisaged by the Brazilian and Venezuelan delegations was that of filling in gaps in international statistical information - one of promoting the national development of basic statistical services. He felt, therefore, that either a new resolution should be drafted, or the present resolution divided into two parts, one dealing with regional statistical activities in Europe, the other reproducing the original Brazilian proposal or the United Kingdom draft resolution.

He had withdrawn his own proposal and accepted the United Kingdom draft resolution in the hope that that action might simplify procedure. If the representative of Venezuela reintroduced the original Brazilian proposal, he would have to abstain from voting upon it.

Mr. HSAIO (China) supported the remarks of the United States representative and suggested that in order to expedite the Committee's work, the Venezuelan representative should submit his proposal separately, and not as an amendment to the draft resolution of the Statistical Commission.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) said his delegation would be willing to accept the suggestion of the representative of China.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the opinions expressed against his proposal that the word "European" should be deleted had not convinced him that his suggestion would not widen the scope of the

resolution. The questions referred to in the resolution obtained in all regions. If members of the Committee felt that particular attention should be paid to the under-developed areas, then a passage drawing attention to those areas should be inserted after the word "European". He felt the Committee should not adopt recommendations of purely regional scope.

Mr. LORWIN (United States of America) considered that the resolution should be read in conjunction with paragraphs 76-81 of the Report of the Statistical Commission, on which it was based. The United Kingdom representative had drawn attention to paragraph 80, which referred to the principle of avoiding the fragmentation of statistical standards, and the resolution was an attempt to meet certain problems peculiar to European countries without involving or leading to such fragmentation in promoting the work of the Statistical Commission and the Statistical Officer of the United Nations. That fact should be borne in mind, and the resolution treated in the spirit in which it had been drawn up.

Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom) supported the remarks of the United States representative, and considered that the USSR amendments to the draft resolution on regional statistical activities failed to meet the points raised by the Brazilian representative. It was for that reason that the United Kingdom delegation had introduced a separate resolution emphasizing the need for priority treatment of the particular requirements of countries whose statistical services were as yet in a relatively under-developed state. The United Kingdom delegation would be obliged to vote against any amendment to the existing draft resolution on regional statistical activities.

Mr. RIVET (France) supported the remarks of the United States and United Kingdom representatives. Statistical problems peculiar to Europe should be dealt with separately; the French delegation was ready to support the United Kingdom draft resolution.

Mr. SMOLIAR (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the USSR amendment proposing the deletion of the word "European", as it would widen the scope of the resolution of the Statistical Commission. That resolution would then be applicable to all regional commissions; it should not single out any one region for attention.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) pointed out that in the original Brazilian proposal (document E/AC.6/W.21) mention had been made of the Economic Commission for Latin America as well as of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. It was because his delegation had felt that there were areas where regional commissions did not yet exist, and areas which did not fall within the purview of any regional commission, that it had accepted the United Kingdom draft resolution, which invited the Statistical Commission to consider as a matter of urgency the statistical needs of all countries in which deficiencies in statistical data existed.

He felt that even if the word "European" were deleted, the resolution would not be applicable to under-developed countries. A separate resolution dealing specifically with the problem of the development of statistics in such countries should be drafted.

Mr. HSIAO (China), as a representative of one of the under-developed countries, expressed his gratitude for the concern shown by the USSR and Byelorussian SSR representatives regarding the development of statistical services in those countries. He could not, however, agree with those representatives that the deletion of the word "European" in the draft resolution of the Statistical Commission would meet the points raised by the representative of Venezuela. The draft resolution had a specific purpose, and was therefore limited in scope. In the opinion of his delegation, the resolution should be adopted as drafted and a separate resolution drawn up on the question of developing statistical services in the under-developed countries.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt there was a certain lack of understanding as to the scope of the resolution being considered by the Committee. If the amendments he suggested were adopted, the draft resolution would be a clear-cut document drawing particular attention to the economically under-developed countries.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment suggested by the USSR representative that the word "European" be deleted from the second and third paragraphs of the resolution of the Statistical Commission on regional statistical activities.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 9 votes to 4 with 4 abstentions.

The draft resolution of the Statistical Commission on regional statistical activities was then put to the vote, and adopted by 11 votes to 2 with 4 abstentions.

Mr. HSIAO (China) proposed that the other draft resolutions of the Statistical Commission should be dealt with before the United Kingdom and Venezuelan amendments, and suggested that the representatives of those two countries should meet and draft a joint resolution for consideration by the Committee.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela), supporting the suggestions of the representative of China, said he would accept the United Kingdom draft resolution as a basic document. Certain additions should be made to that resolution to cover the case of the under-developed countries.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should examine the resolution of the Statistical Commission on transport and communications statistics.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the Rapporteur had said that the subject referred to in the resolution before the Committee had been previously dealt with by the Economic Committee in discussing the Report of the Transport and Communications Commission. There was no need therefore for the resolution at present before the Committee.

Mr. DEMONTE (Secretary of the Committee) read the resolution of the Economic Committee appearing on page 4 of document E/AC.6/W.9.

Mr. LORWIN (United States of America) said that the resolution of the Statistical Commission contained more material than the resolution adopted by the Economic Committee in connection with the Report of the Transport and Communications Commission. He suggested, therefore, that the resolution before the Committee should be adopted with the

notation that it should be considered in conjunction with the resolution on the Report of the Transport and Communications Commission earlier adopted by the Economic Committee.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that the Transport and Communications Commission's resolution had been discussed both by the Statistical Commission and by the Economic Committee. There was no need to take up the same subject twice.

The CHAIRMAN said he would defer discussion of the resolution until the appropriate documents had been consulted. Meanwhile he would ask the Committee to consider the resolution on Statistical Education and Training. There was a Brazilian amendment to that resolution.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil), still seeking simplification, proposed to withdraw the first part of his amendment, as given in document E/AC.6/W.22, and to incorporate it in the second part, which would then read, "taking into account the survey now being undertaken under Resolution 132 (VI) on international facilities for training in public administration ...".

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) had no objection to the Brazilian amendment, but wondered whether it was necessary to remind the Secretary-General of a survey he was already undertaking. If the amendment were to be adopted, it might be simpler to make it an addition to sub-paragraph (ii) in the form, "and relevant sections of the survey now being undertaken ...".

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) could not agree that the Brazilian amendment was unnecessary. He would, however, accept the Canadian suggestion that the amendment should take the form of an addition to sub-paragraph (ii).

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) doubted whether the Statistical Commission had had sufficient information to justify its stating in the preamble that there was a "world-wide" shortage of statisticians and that that shortage was impeding development "throughout the world". He proposed that the word "world-wide" be deleted and that the words "in a majority of countries" should be substituted for the words "throughout the world". Such changes would make the resolution more explicit, and bring it into line with others of the Council's resolutions.

He also doubted whether, in sub-paragraph (ii), the Council should recommend the Secretary-General to "take into account the views expressed by the Statistical Commission and those contained in a communication on this subject addressed to the Statistical Commission by the President of the International Statistical Institute". The Secretary-General would already have noted the Commission's views and should not be asked to take account of the views of the President of the Institute unless the Committee had already discussed them. He would like to hear the Secretariat's views on the matter, and would move that the sub-paragraph be deleted.

Mr. BRUCE (Secretariat) replied that the USSR representative's view was correct. The Secretary-General would take into account the views of the Commission, which had heard the President of the International Statistical Institute, such discussions being embodied

in the records of the Commission.

The USSR amendment to the preamble was put to the vote and rejected by 4 votes to 3 with 10 abstentions.

The USSR proposal to delete sub-paragraph (ii) was put to the vote and rejected by 4 votes to 3 with 11 abstentions.

The Brazilian amendment was put to the vote and carried by 13 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions.

The resolution as amended was put to the vote and adopted by 15 votes to none with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to consider the USSR draft resolution on statistical classification which was presented as a substitute for the resolution on that subject proposed by the Commission.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that the system of industrial classification which the Statistical Commission had asked the Council to adopt was based on the recommendations of an expert committee of the League of Nations. In other words, it was not based on the vast experience of countries Members of the United Nations.

Industrial classification was a complex problem, bearing on many fields and demanding the greatest accuracy. It should be approached from the standpoint of real social and economic phenomena and not from that of abstractions. The system devised by the Commission had set up nine divisions, which resulted in the juxtaposition of subjects which had little in common. As an example, division 8 linked statistics of community and business services with those of recreation and

personal services. Division 7 did not separate freight and passenger transport statistics. Moreover, there was a lack of logic in the proposed system. Transport, for example, should have come immediately after industrial production. The Soviet Union delegation therefore proposed that the prepared draft should be circulated to Member States for observations, and that the Statistical Commission should review it in the light of replies returned.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) drew the attention of the Soviet Union representative to paragraph 43 of document E/795, which said that "the recommended classification takes into account the comments and suggestions of twenty-seven countries which responded to the request of the Secretary-General when the preliminary draft was circulated. The technical views of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, not having been previously received, were presented during the Commission's session by its representative and were referred to the group of expert consultants. The technical views of the Soviet representative and the comments thereon by the expert consultants will be found in Summary Records of the Committee on Statistical Classification".

Thus the third paragraph of the Soviet Union resolution asked the Commission to repeat work it had already carried out. The classification was a living document, which would require revision. But the Commission had foreseen that requirement in the paragraph following the one he had read. The USSR was represented on the Commission, and its views would be considered together with those of other Members.

The Commission had produced a useful document and, subject to revisions, it could be acted upon immediately.

Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom) agreed with the remarks of the Canadian representative, and added that the matter was urgent. Unless the Commission's Resolution was adopted, Member States would not know whether to follow the League of Nations report of 1938 or the United Nations proposal.

Mr. RIVET (France) agreed with some of the criticisms made by the Soviet Union representative. Classification was a difficult problem, however, and it was doubtful whether it would be possible to devise a system which would satisfy everyone.

Since 1947, France had been applying to census results a system of classification adopted only after several years work by authorities and users.

He was not opposed to revision of the Commission's system, but would meanwhile vote for its adoption.

Mr. LORWIN (U.S.A.) considered that some of the Soviet Union representative's criticisms were well founded, while others were debatable. It was not sufficient to confine observations to the major divisions recommended by the Commission. It was necessary to consider also the sub-classifications which permitted the refinements sought by the USSR representative. The Commission itself had already pointed out that "continual improvements in the Classification may be expected as a result of experience gained in its use by Member Governments".

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that, although the French and United States representatives

recognized the validity of some of his criticisms, they nevertheless intended to vote against his resolution.

Any system could be adopted in haste, but to act thus would not enhance the Council's prestige. The Commission's system could not and would not be applied, as statistical experts could not accept the faulty principles underlying it.

It had been said that the views of the interested countries had been taken into account. But there were 58 countries Members of the United Nations, of whom only 27, or less than half, had submitted their views; even the 27 had not given their views on the final draft.

The Soviet Union resolution to replace the Statistical Commission's resolution on statistical classification was put to the vote and rejected by 10 votes to 2 with 6 abstentions.

The Statistical Commission's resolution on statistical classification was put to the vote and adopted by 12 votes to 2 with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN announced that on comparison of the Statistical Commission's second resolution with that previously adopted in considering the Transport and Communications Commission resolution, to which the Soviet Union representative had referred, there appeared to be no substantial difference between them. Unless there were objections, therefore, he would suggest that no action be taken on the Statistical Commission's resolution relating to transport statistics.

It was so agreed.

Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom) announced that the

Brazilian, United Kingdom and Venezuelan delegations had agreed on a minor amendment to the United Kingdom draft resolution which would meet the requirements of the Venezuelan representative. The amendment consisted in the insertion of the words "statistically under-developed" before the word "countries" in the second line of the second paragraph of the United Kingdom resolution, (E/AC.6/W23).

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that there was no need for such a recommendation. Unless the Commission had concrete requests before it, it would be considering to no avail the problems of how to remedy deficiencies in statistical data.

The United Kingdom resolution as amended was put to the vote and adopted by 14 votes to 2 with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN proposed, and the Committee agreed, that the resolutions adopted should be prefaced by one in which the Council "takes note of the report of the third session of the Statistical Commission".

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. SMOLIAR (Byelorussian SSR) asked that their abstentions should be noted in the approval of the report.

There remained the question of the Provisional Questionnaire of the Trusteeship Council. The President of the Council had suggested that Committees should comment on that questionnaire in the course of their examination of Commissions's reports. As, however, the Statistical Commission had suggested that its recommendations in the matter be deferred until statistical reports of Trust Territories could be studied, he proposed that the

Committee should defer those comments to the general discussion of the Provisional Questionnaire.

The meeting rose at 1 -