

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIALE/AC.6/SR.30
5 August 1948

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH

Dual Distribution for Council Members

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTIETH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
Thursday, 5 August 1948, at 3 p.m.Present:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile)
Australia	Mr. EVATT Mr. SWAN
Brazil	Mr. MUNIZ Mr. CAMPOS Mr. CORREA
Byelorussian S.S.R.	Mr. SMOLIAR
Canada	Mr. POLLOCK
Chile	Mr. VALENZUELA
China	Mr. HSIAO
Denmark	Mr. IVERSEN
France	Mr. CLERMONT-TONNERRE Mr. KAYSER
Lebanon	Mr. MIKAOUI
Netherlands	Mr. PATYN
New Zealand	Miss HAMPTON
Peru	Mr. MONGE
Poland	Mr. RUDZINSKI
Turkey	Mr. SARPER
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. MOROZÓV
United Kingdom	Mr. PHILLIPS Mr. HUGH-JONES

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

17 AUG 1948

UNITED NATIONS
ARCHIVES

P 28 P.

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE ECONOMIC AND EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION: (Item 5 of the Council Agenda.) (Documents E/AC.6/W.14, E/AC.6/W.16)

The CHAIRMAN proposed to proceed with the vote on the draft resolution presented by the New Zealand delegation ~~It was identical with the Canadian draft resolution~~ (Document E/AC.6/W.16) except for the deletion of paragraph 3. There were two amendments before the Committee: one put forward by the Canadian delegation to reinsert paragraph 3, and the other put forward by the Chinese delegation, to substitute for the whole of paragraph 3 the words: "Approves the general principles of development set forth by the Commission in this draft resolution."

The representative of China had asked that the vote be taken by roll call.

Mr. HSIAO (China) wished to comment on his amendment. The question before the Committee was that of a choice of procedure to be followed with regard to the recommendations made by the Economic and Employment Commission in Draft Resolution B. The proposals could be accepted or rejected; they could also be partially accepted or rejected. But if the Draft Resolution were rejected, the Committee should send it back to the Commission with directives concerning the principles enunciated in that Resolution. If the Committee did not make its attitude clear, the Commission would have no basis on which to carry on its work. If the Committee refrained from taking a definite stand on principles, its position would be similar to that of a man

who having asked for plans for a house to be drawn up, then refused to pass judgment upon them.

He would recommend that the Committee endorse the general principles as a whole, since there had not been many criticisms of them except those made by the delegations of Chile and Venezuela. The representatives of Canada and the United Kingdom had expressed readiness to accept Draft Resolution B, the latter suggesting the addition of the word "under-developed" in paragraph (d) under (3). The representative of the United States of America had only objected on the grounds of lack of precision. His objection was fully met by the two final paragraphs of the New Zealand proposal, according to which the Commission was asked to reconsider details of implementation with reference to Draft Resolution B.

The general principles expressed in that resolution constituted the highest common factor generally acceptable. A great effort had been made to reach that point of agreement, and the Committee should recognise it as being the best that was attainable.

Finally, if the Committee did not commit itself to the acceptance of the general principles, the absence of a decision would cause the Economic and Social Council to take up a doubtful attitude towards the recommendations of the Commission. That element of doubt would lead to differences and disagreement within the Commission, and to eliminate it the Committee should express its general approval. The commitment was not irrevocable, and the Council would have further opportunity of examining Draft Resolution B.

The Chinese delegation had asked to have the vote taken by roll call because it attached great importance to the statement of general principles, and wished to know the opinion of different delegations.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that Draft Resolution B had already been fully discussed at several meetings. It was essential for the Committee to proceed as quickly as possible with its work.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) said that he proposed to vote against the Chinese amendment since it was unable to agree with the wording. The remarks which the representative of China had just made served to reinforce the doubts of the United States delegation; he had said, for instance, that the Committee might express approval of the principles in a general way. The amendment said however: "approves the general principles....." and not "approves the principles in a general way." An approval of Draft Resolution B "in a general way" would serve little purpose since the Commission would still not know what was the attitude of the Committee. He preferred the text of the Canadian amendment: "a useful interim formulation of certain of the principles." A vote taken by roll call would not show the attitude of representatives towards the principles enunciated in Draft Resolution B, but only towards the Chinese amendment as it was here formulated.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) emphasized that if the Canadian delegation had had no objection to Draft Resolution B, as the representative of China had seemed to assume, it would not have put forward an amendment. Although agreeing with some of the principles, his delegation did not feel that the resolution would be useful as it stood.

The debate had shown that there was considerable disapproval of the resolution; he would vote against the Chinese amendment.

Mr. SMAY (Australia) had hoped that the Council would have before it a more concrete proposal with regard to the problem of industrial development than that presented by the Commission. As it was, he did not believe that the cause of economic development would be greatly advanced; the resolution was not satisfactorily worded, nor did it contain all the principles. Nevertheless, since the Australian delegation felt that voting against the Chinese amendment would give the appearance of voting against the principles set out in the draft resolution, he would vote for the amendment.

Mr. HSIAO (China) said that what he had had in mind was perhaps somewhat loosely expressed in the document before the Committee (E/AC.6/W.15). He gathered that the representatives of Canada and the United States objected not to any of the principles set out in the draft resolution, but to the omission of certain principles which might have been included. He did not believe that it was a desirable position to object to a resolution because some principles were not embodied in it. One might have to wait a very long time for a perfect resolution. He hoped that the representatives of Canada and the United States would change their minds on the subject, and that any specific objection to the principles set out would be clearly indicated.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) pointed out that the essence of the matter was the desire to give help to under-developed countries, since these and the more developed countries were the two parties in the matter, it would be an

advantage if a unanimous resolution could be adopted; that unfortunately now seemed unlikely. He had every sympathy with the aims of the representative of China, but the purpose of his amendment was to encourage the Commission to ~~continue~~ its work on the lines set out in the Draft Resolution, and it was unlikely that the Commission would be able to solve problems if it continued to talk in generalities. He would be obliged to abstain from voting on the amendment.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) ~~could not support the Chinese delegation's amendment, since the draft resolution to which it referred contained certain points that his delegation could not accept.~~ He was all the more sorry because China was a country with which his own was often in agreement. His delegation's opinion was quite definite: the Economic and Employment Commission should not confine itself to the field of generalities and the time had come for it to do something concrete. He would accordingly vote against the amendment.

Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) emphasized that her delegation neither approved nor disapproved the substance of the Chinese amendment. The amendment introduced by the representative of Canada presented the highest common factor of agreement; the Chinese amendment introduced into the text a phraseology which would lead to a split vote on the resolution as a whole. She would therefore oppose it.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the USSR delegation had already expressed its desire that the Committee define its attitude towards the principles adopted by the Economic and Employment Commission, and had submitted an amendment, which had unfortunately been rejected, although not not by constructive arguments. Consequently, his delegation would abstain from voting on the

Chinese amendment.

Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark) stated that he would vote against the amendment for the same reasons as those given by the representatives of Canada, New Zealand and the United States. A vote was then taken by roll-call. The Chinese amendment (Document E/AC.6/W.18) was rejected by 9 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

The result of the voting was as follows:

In favour: Australia, Brazil, China, Lebanon, Poland.

Against: Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, United States, Venezuela.

Abstained: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Turkey United Kingdom, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to put to the vote the Canadian amendment (to the New Zealand proposal) that the original paragraph 3 of document E/AC.6/W.16 be reinserted into the text.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) emphasized that previous withdrawal by Canada of its draft resolution had made it impossible to discuss the paragraph in detail, and to point out its drawbacks, which in his opinion were the same as those of the Chinese amendment.

By adopting this paragraph the Committee would, in fact, approve what it had refused by rejecting the Chinese delegation's amendment. He hesitated to propose that the discussion should be continued on this point, but he wished to explain why he would vote against the Canadian amendment.

Mr. HSIAO (China) speaking on a point of order, requested that before a vote were taken on the Canadian amendment, the Committee discuss the first paragraph of Draft Resolution B of the Report of the Economic and

Employment Commission. That point took precedence of the Canadian amendment in that it entailed an examination of principles. A vote had been taken earlier on Draft Resolution B, and he had at that time expressed the wish that the text be reconsidered.

The CHAIRMAN referred to his previous ruling that the amendment would be voted upon in the following order: The Soviet amendment, the Chinese amendment, the Canadian amendment. The Soviet and Chinese amendments had already been put to the vote and rejected. There, therefore, remained the Canadian amendment, (that is, the reintroduction of paragraph 3 as set out in Document E/AC.6/W.16), to be put to the vote.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) said that his amendment had been introduced in the hope of avoiding a detailed discussion. Since this purpose seemed impossible to attain, he begged leave to withdraw his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN having ruled that the withdrawal of the amendment was out of order, the Canadian representative agreed to maintain it provided a vote were taken immediately.

Mr. HSIAO (China) said that there had been no opportunity for discussion and no motion for the closure of the debate. He would like to see a general discussion on the Canadian amendment before it was put to the vote. The problem now before the Committee, that of the under-developed countries, was very important.

The CHAIRMAN stated that since there were no other speakers, and since paragraph 3, being part of a draft resolution previously introduced had already been discussed, he proposed to put the amendment to the vote.

Mr. HSIAO (China) having ascertained that the representative of Canada was unwilling to change the words "certain of the principles which should guide the Commission" to "the general principles which should guide the Commission", moved an amendment to the Canadian text to substitute the following: "ENDORSES the Draft Resolution as a formulation of general principles which could guide the Commission" for the words "CONSIDERS that this represents a useful interim formulation of certain of the principles which shall guide the Commission" in paragraph 3.

He was against several expressions in the Canadian amendment. Then, he objected to the word "represents" and to the word "useful". The Canadian text of the paragraph gave no indication of an acceptance or refusal. There were many things which were "useful" but out of date. He interpreted the word "interim" as signifying "temporarily". A more definite formulation was necessary. He also objected to the words "certain of".

The Chinese amendment was put to the vote, and rejected by 11 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

The Canadian amendment, (that is, the third paragraph in document E/AC.6/W.16) was put to the vote and adopted by 7 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

Mr. HSIAO (China) withdrew his amendments (document E/AC.6/W.18) with reference to paragraph 4 of the New Zealand proposal.

Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was put to the vote, and adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) urged the Committee to approve the principles set out in paragraph 3, sub-paragraphs (b)

and (c) of the Chilean delegation's draft resolution (E/AC.6/W.14). Certain drafting changes might perhaps make the text clearer, and he proposed that sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 3 of the Chilean delegation's resolution should be inserted in the Committee's draft resolution before the paragraph 5. A small drafting committee should be set up to ensure that no repetition occurred in the final text. Being informed by the CHAIRMAN that in accordance with a previous decision, the amendment presented by the representative of Chile would not be put to the vote if the version of paragraph 5 in the New Zealand proposal (originally presented by Canada) were adopted, Mr. d'ASCOLI said that he had attempted to save as much as possible of the Chilean delegation's draft resolution.

Mr. VALÉNZUELA (Chile) thanked the Venezuelan representative for his proposal. He wondered whether paragraphs 3(b) and (c) of his delegation's amendment could be considered as an amendment to paragraph 5 of the New Zealand (originally Canadian) draft resolution or take the place of that paragraph. Sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 3 of the Chilean draft resolution should be inserted before paragraph 5, since they contained concrete ideas which did not appear in the Canadian resolution.

The CHAIRMAN said that the procedure was that the delegate of Venezuela had requested that paragraph 3(b) and (c) of the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Chile (E/AC.6/W.14) be considered

as an amendment or an addition to the text of the New Zealand (originally Canadian) draft resolution before the Committee (E/AC.6/W.16). He wished the Committee first to conclude its consideration of paragraph 5 of the latter. Replying to Mr. HSIAO (China), who thought that it was more logical to consider the Venezuelan proposal before paragraph 5, he pointed out that the mandatory words of the two resolutions had little connection with each other. The Venezuelan text would have to be given after paragraph 5, in which case the text of the resolution would read: "The Economic and Social Council, etc. REQUESTS, SUGGESTS, RECOMMENDS"

Mr. CORREA (Brazil) thought that the content of paragraph 5 of the Canadian draft resolution referred to types of work which were a matter of routine for the Commission and the Secretariat of the United Nations. He consequently did not see the need for its inclusion.

Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution was put to the vote, and adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. CORREA (Brazil) said that the words, "Stabilization of prices," in (c) of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Chile were not perhaps quite adequate. He preferred the formula "stabilization of a fair level of prices." This wording was perhaps not quite precise, but previous discussion had shown that it was very difficult to achieve precise terminology in that subject.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) accepted the Brazilian representative's proposal, which tallied with an observation previously made by his delegation.

The CHAIRMAN read sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 3 of the Chilean draft resolution, as amended by the Brazilian delegation: "(c) Member countries producing goods which play a vital part in world trade should endeavour to study measures likely to produce international agreement leading as far as possible to a stabilization of a fair level of prices."

Mr. PATYN (Netherlands) felt that the Chilean proposals had no place in the resolution, since it already stated that the Council had considered Draft Resolution B as a useful interim formulation of certain principles, by which the Commission should be guided, and the Chilean text reproduced in slightly different wording a certain number of these principles.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom), agreeing with the Netherlands representative, pointed out that in adopting the third paragraph of the New Zealand draft resolution, the Committee had implicitly decided not to discuss the principles of Draft Resolution B in all their details, and the Venezuelan and Chilean delegations had now pressed for inclusion a certain number of those principles which were of particular interest to themselves. Other delegations could then also, if they so wished, advance similar preferences.

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) recalled that his delegation had submitted in document E/AC.6/W.14 a draft resolution designed to replace Draft Resolution B of the Economic and Employment Commission. However, because of the procedure followed, the Committee had not been able to discuss the ideas contained in the draft, and representatives had not been able

to define their attitude towards it. If paragraph B, sub-paragraph (b) of the Chilean draft resolution was merely a re-draft of the initial draft resolution, sub-paragraph (c) contained new ideas. It recommended the conclusion of international agreements likely to lead to a stabilization of prices, which the Economic and Employment Commission had not taken into account in its draft. Prices played an important part in the economic development of under-developed countries; that was why his delegation wished the Committee to take a very definite stand on the matter.

It was not a question of stabilizing prices at the present level, but of taking advantage of the experience of such organization as the International Wheat Conference, from which importing countries in particular had derived great benefit.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) asked the Committee not to lose sight of the fact that sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of the Chilean proposal contained concrete ideas - first of all, the supplying of raw materials, machinery or industrial equipment generally to under-developed countries or countries whose economies had been dislocated as a result of the war; secondly, the stabilization of prices at a fair level for goods which played a vital part in world trade and as regards the economic development of under-developed areas.

There was a difference between the vague and confused terms of Resolution B and the clarity of the Chilean proposal. In his opinion, it was worth while to repeat in the resolution the requests mentioned in the Chilean resolution, since on them depended the raising of the standard of living in under-developed areas and the economic recovery of

countries whose national economy had been dislocated by the war. Hence his delegation urged that these passages be included in the resolution.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America), remarked that the Committee had implicitly taken a decision not to consider specific proposals for the economic development of less developed areas for inclusion in the present Resolution, when it had adopted the third paragraph of the Resolution.

Paragraph 3(b) of the Chilean proposal was a repetition in substance of Draft Resolution B, paragraphs (b) and (c), although in some respects the Chilean formulation was an improvement over Draft Resolution B. However, the Committee had in paragraph (3) of the Resolution already decided that some of the principles enumerated in Draft Resolution B were useful to provide guidance to the Commission, and therefore the addition of the Chilean paragraph 3(b) was not necessary.

With regard to the subject matter of that paragraph, the United States Government, besides expanding its production and exports to the limit, had complied faithfully with the words "should study practical means to increase such production and exports".

Paragraph 3(c) of the Chilean proposal was not a repetition of Draft Resolution B. Representatives should, however, note that the Council had already taken action along the lines indicated. It had established the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements.

The Council also had on its agenda the report on the Havana Conference, and therefore there would be an opportunity to discuss that matter at a later stage. The ITO Charter contained more detailed formulation of the problem referred to by the Venezuelan representative which was a result of lengthy and careful consideration of the problem, and the two or three lines on this subject in this Resolution would not be particularly helpful.

The CHAIRMAN said that, bearing in mind the fact that the Committee had already adopted paragraph 3 of the New Zealand Draft Resolution, sub-paragraph 3(c) of the Chilean draft contained new ideas, but the same could not be said about sub-paragraph 3(b). However, since the Rules of Procedure contained no clear directive to which he could refer, he would put to the vote both sub-paragraphs: sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 3 of the Chilean draft resolution. (Document E/AC.6/W.14), the latter as amended by the Brazilian representative (Document E/AC.6/W.17), and if there was no objection he would take a separate vote on each paragraph.

On a vote being taken, paragraph 3(b) was rejected by eight votes to four, with six abstentions.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) said that since he had originally moved the inclusion of the two paragraphs from the Chilean draft, he would withdraw his amendment proposing the addition to the resolution of paragraph (c) of the Chilean proposal, since the vote just taken on paragraph (b) indicated the attitude of the Committee. Moreover, he agreed that there was something to be said for the arguments of the United States representative concerning the action already taken by the Council.

The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to vote on Document E/AC.6/W.16, the New Zealand draft resolution, as a whole.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) proposed that the words "this Resolution" in paragraph 4, line 2, be deleted, and replaced by "Draft Resolution B".

This was agreed.

Following an enquiry by Mr. RODZINSKI (Poland), Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) suggested that the heading "Draft Resolution Substituting for Resolution B" (appearing in Document E/AC.6/W.16) would be dropped, which would then be submitted to the plenary meeting as one of the three resolutions adopted by the Committee in regard to the Report of the Economic and Employment Commission.

Mr. HSIAO (China) explained that he would vote against the draft resolution, although he opposed only paragraph 3, so as to make it clear that there had been a difference of opinion upon the fundamental questions involved in paragraph 3.

Mr. MORCOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the New Zealand draft resolution was vague and indecisive. Although many members had criticized the ambiguity of Draft Resolution B, the Committee had now before it a resolution which was even less clear and contained such meaningless expressions as "interim", "formulation" and "useful". Some representatives already had expressed doubts as to the purport of those terms, and in all probability the Employment and Economic Commission would be equally mystified.

The Committee had also rejected the guiding principles suggested by the Soviet Union delegation for the Commission,

and in particular the suggestion that the Commission should ensure that assistance given to less developed countries should not be accompanied by demands for political or economic advantages, or by attempts to interfere in their domestic affairs. That was a extremely important safeguard, but it had been rejected by the Committee. At the same time the Committee agreed on a wordless suggestion to the Commission, namely, that in making recommendations, the Commission should base them on studies and analyses, as if the Commission could make recommendations without bringing the problem before it.

In consequence, the Soviet Union delegation would abstain at that time from the vote on the resolution.

Mr. RUDZINSKI (Poland) also proposed to abstain from the vote, since the Committee should have agreed on a resolution adopting, in a more definite form, the general principles included in Draft Resolution B. He was not satisfied with the present version of paragraph 1.

The United States representative had expressed surprise at the fact that the under-developed countries most directly affected by the Draft Resolution would have voted in favour of it; a representative of an under-developed country, he would explain that whilst not being entirely satisfied with Draft Resolution B, he entertained no hopes that the Commission would produce a more useful document in the future. At least Draft Resolution B contained several good points.

Mr. SMOLLAR (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) stated that whilst Draft Resolution B was not entirely acceptable, some items laid down useful principles upon which more practical measures for the development of backward countries could be based. The New Zealand draft resolution

would place the Commission in an ambiguous position, since it was still more unsatisfactory than the Draft Resolution B. Representatives had, however, expressed themselves in favour of the faulty New Zealand draft resolution, and against those few principles of Draft Resolution B which could be considered appropriate. This reflected a general desire to divert the Commission from the fruitful paths it had so far explored. There had been a notion to revise its functions, thus excluding a possible repetition of its few useful achievements so far, and to convert it into a mere assembly of technical experts.

On a vote being taken, the New Zealand draft resolution (Document E/AC.6/W.16), with a minor drafting change proposed by the Brazilian representative and accepted by the Committee, was adopted by fourteen votes to one, with three abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee adopt the following resolution on the Report on the Third Session of the Economic and Employment Commission, as a whole:

"The Economic and Social Council

Takes NOTE of the Report on the Third Session of the Economic and Employment Commission."

This was agreed

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), and Mr. SMOLIAR (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), requested that their abstention be recorded.

" TRUSTEESHIP QUESTIONNAIRE.

The CHAIRMAN stated that Part VI of the Report of the Economic and Employment Commission dealt with the Provisional Questionnaire of the Trusteeship Council. A question of procedure had arisen in that connection:

should that part of the Report be discussed by the Committee, or should it wait until the Council had discussed it?

Several Commission Reports contained observations on the Trusteeship Questionnaire and, as had been noted in the Report of the Agenda Committee (Document E/855), "the Council would no doubt, in addition to its consideration of the Commission reports, wish to take appropriate action regarding the transmission to the Trusteeship Council of these comments, with or without further comments of its own." The Chairman informed the Committee that he had consulted the President of the Council and the Chairman of the Social Committee on this matter. As a result of these consultations he was prepared to suggest that the arrangements made by the Economic and Employment Commission regarding the study of the Provisional Questionnaire of the Trusteeship Council (Part VI of the Commission's Report) should be forwarded to the plenary with no additional comments by the Committee.

This was agreed.

REPORT OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE STATISTICAL COMMISSION
(Documents E/795, E/795/Add.1 and E/795/Add.2/Rev.1).

Mr. RICE (Rapporteur of the Statistical Commission), drew attention to the continuity of the membership and work of the Commission, which had been possible because the Statistical Commission had been given a clearly defined objective, namely, to build up a statistical system which would supply the data essential for international co-operation. Three prerequisites for the establishment of that system had been recognised: (1) uniform standards; (2) co-ordination of different branches of the statistical system; and (3) the promotion of studies which would fill

in the gaps and lead to improvements in present-day statistical information. The Report now before the Committee detailed the efforts made towards the satisfaction of one or other of those elements of the programme. The Commission had sought to build up the system by gradual stages, and had limited its efforts to those which it considered tangible and attainable within the limits of United Nations resources. Its labours were technical and non-political, with the result that its sessions had been harmonious and the action it had taken almost always unanimous.

The explanatory note appearing on the inside of the cover-page of the Report reflected the Commission's assumption that the Economic and Social Council expected a full report on the assignments it had made to the Commission, but that the Council would not consider it necessary or desirable to act on all the conclusions the Commission might reach. Accordingly, the various subjects suitable for formal action by the Council had been restated in the Annex, in the form of draft resolutions of the Council.

Having outlined the contents of the various chapters of the report, he pointed to the "opportunist" spirit reflected in Chapter VIII of the work programme, in which a number of projects given top priority by the Statistical Commission had been segregated. It should be borne in mind that not all those projects would necessarily be undertaken simultaneously. The Secretariat, knowing its own resources, would tackle these projects in the most convenient order. As the number of competent statisticians available in the world was extremely limited, the Commission

had decided that the services of those experts might be used most economically and efficiently as consultants attached on a temporary basis to the Secretariat. The work programme provided first of all for a study of indices of industrial production in order to be able to recommend standard concepts and modern methodology. Such a study was important now in order to make possible a comparison between the industrial development of the various countries. Second, standards of price indices were to be examined, and there the services of expert consultants would be of great value in studying the various kinds and methods of index numbers. Third, the Commission considered that an immediate revision of the League of Nations Minimum List of Commodities for International Trade Statistics was necessary. Fourth, the work programme included a further study of statistics on national income and related subjects. Proposed standard practices in this field are to be submitted for expert comment and later circulated to member countries. Fifth, the Commission had considered plans for the 1950 population censuses and recommended that the Secretariat should equip itself to render expert assistance to Governments intending to take a census in 1950. It was known that the countries of the American continent in particular were contemplating such a census, and similar assistance were given to interested countries at this stage, comparable population data might eventually be obtained. Housing statistics, which figured sixth in the Commission's work programme, were intimately related to those of population and the census programme, and in the opinion of the Commission the recommendations made on the subject by international organizations should

be brought to the attention of Governments by the Secretary-General. In regard to statistical sampling, the seventh item of the work programme, the Commission recommended that its proposals be brought to the attention of the Governments and Specialized Agencies, so that full advantage be taken of that economical and accurate method of obtaining statistical information. The eighth item entailed suggestions for collaboration with the statistical work of other Commissions. As its ninth priority item the Commission considered that a survey and report on a programme of statistical education and training was needed, and that the Council should recommend to the Secretary-General a study of the needs of and facilities for such a programme.

Of the recommendations referred to in the Annex, that in regard to transport and communication statistics had already been acted upon by the Council.

The CHAIRMAN, having thanked Mr. Rice for his summary of the Report, stated that four draft resolutions on which the Committee must vote were contained in the Annex to the Commission's Report. He asked for general discussion on the Report.

Mr. EVATT (Australia), observing that the Australian delegation had studied the Commission's Report with great care and recognised its especial value, thought this item of the Commission's agenda was likely to provide more satisfaction than any other. The Commission had evidently gone about its task in a workmanlike fashion, and it was to be hoped that discussion on the Report would be conducted with that absence of controversy which had signalized the work of the Commission itself. The Australian delegation believed,

as did no doubt all other delegations, in the extreme importance of the Commission's work; it was perhaps more important than that of any other functional Commission. It was basic to the activities of the other functional Commissions, the Specialized Agencies, the regional Commissions, and the Economic and Social Council itself. Progress in solving problems in the economic and social fields depends upon accurate and available statistics. However, the successful continuance of the Commission's studies rests on an improvement in national statistics, on the central collection and comparison of those statistics, and on the co-ordination of the work of the various statistical bodies of the United Nations. The latter requirements had so far been satisfactorily met by the Commission, and in the view of the Australian delegation, the Report contained businesslike proposals which might well be adopted by the Committee. It was significant that the most valuable part of the Commission's work did not figure in its Report; the Statistical Commission was one of the few organs of the Council which could pursue its duties without submitting a series of high-sounding resolutions to its parent body. In particular the Australian delegation associated itself with the sentiments expressed in paragraphs 26 and 109 of the Report of the Statistical Commission.

The programme of work outlined in Chapter VIII showed a wise and sensible choice on the part of the Commission; there should, however, be no misconception as to the expenditure which it would involve. Document E/795/Add.2/Rev.1 estimated these additional costs at about \$87,000. Whilst appreciating the need for economy in all branches of

United Nations activities, the Australian delegation could not regard any reduction in any aspect of the Commission's work as suitable for financial reasons. It was evident that so-called economies would result in increased expenditure for the Member Nations. A reservoir of sound and comparable statistical information would be of considerable administrative and financial help to most Governments; similarly, the results of the Commission's researches in such spheres as national income statistics and sampling would contribute to a saving by Member Governments by enabling them to avoid special and costly experiment.

The Commission's work as presented in its Report should be regarded as a model for the activities of the functional Commissions. Its work, consisting of a non-partisan quest for objective information, was of advantage to all Governments.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) warmly welcomed the straightforward account of the efforts reflected in the Commission's Report and approved of that body's wise selection of its major technical problems. He endorsed in particular the Commission's work in regard to indices of production, price indices and national income statistics.

The Brazilian delegation warmly endorses the emphasis given by the Commission to the work on the revision and modernization of the League of Nations Minimum List of Commodities for International Trade Statistics, and calls to the attention of the Commission the work in this field carried out by the Inter-American Statistical Institute. It was to be hoped that the Commission was familiar with those studies and would be guided by them. In regard to the co-ordination of United Nations' and Specialized

Agencies' statistical services, his delegation noted with approval the report that great progress had been made through the Consultative Committee on Statistical Matters. The balanced view shown by the Commission in discussing regional statistical activities (paragraphs 19, 20 and 21) was not always evident at other points in the Report, notably in paragraphs 76-80, which stated that special attention had been given to the study of statistical problems peculiar to European countries. Vital problems also affected other regional Commissions, and the Statistical Commission would be well advised to give the same attention to these problems. In particular it might have taken into account the statistical needs of the Economic Commission for Latin America, and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Special interest and priority might have been devoted to the development of statistics in those regions with the object of filling the existing gaps in such information. European statistical needs referred mainly to standards and comparability, whilst the requirements of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East were of a more fundamental order in that the statistical services of the areas entrusted to those bodies were still incomplete. The Brazilian delegation would at a later stage submit a draft resolution intended to supplement the resolution on Regional Statistical Activities of the Statistical Commission, as reproduced on page 32 of the Report. This draft resolution would be suitable either as a separate resolution or an addition to the text proposed.

The Statistical Commission had determined priorities for its future work with which the Brazilian delegation was in full accord on technical and organizational grounds.

~~Nevertheless it was disappointing~~ to note that a fundamental problem, that of the absence of statistics in many basic magnitudes in many countries, had not been sufficiently emphasized. Such deficiencies in existing statistical data should be given close attention. In this connection the Brazilian delegation, in the draft resolution it would submit, would in effect be directing the Commission to cooperate with the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, in analysing the existing gaps in statistical information and in studying measures to foster the development of the statistical services in those regions.

It would be unfair to state that the Commission had neglected this problem altogether, since it had included in its recommendations the subject of statistical education and training. The Brazilian delegation strongly supported that recommendation, but thought there was a danger of duplication of work unless due regard were paid to Resolution 132(VI) adopted by the Council. That Resolution instructed the Secretary-General to study the establishment of facilities for training in public administration. Plans for statistical education and training might therefore be coordinated with that project; and the Brazilian delegation proposed the following amendment:

Add after paragraph 3 in the introductory part of the Resolution (Document E/795, page 34): "Taking note of Resolution 132(VI) concerning the establishment of

facilities for training in public administration".

Add to the operative part of the Resolution, paragraph (3), sub-paragraph (a): "account being taken of the study being made pursuant to Resolution 132(VI)."

The Statistical Commission should realise that the comments offered by the Brazilian delegation reflected its intense interest and admiration for the Commission's work.

The CHAIRMAN said that the general discussion would continue at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.