

TENTH WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY



A10/AFL/Min/11
20 May 1957

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION, FINANCE AND LEGAL MATTERS
PROVISIONAL MINUTES OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING

Palais des Nations, Geneva
Monday, 20 May 1957, at 2.30 p.m.

CHAIRMAN: Mr A. SAITA (Japan)

CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Assembly procedures for examining the programme, budget and ancillary administrative, financial and personnel matters (continued) | 2 |
| 2. Celebration of the Tenth Anniversary of WHO (continued) . | 12 |

Note: Corrections to these provisional minutes should be submitted in writing to the Chief, Records Service, Room A.571, within 48 hours of their distribution.

1. ASSEMBLY PROCEDURES FOR EXAMINING THE PROGRAMME, BUDGET AND ANCILLARY ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND PERSONNEL MATTERS: Item 6.4 of the Agenda (Official Records No. 76; Resolution EB19.R54 and Annex 19; Documents A10/AFL/26, A10/AFL/29, A10/AFL/30) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN took to himself the blame for the misunderstanding that had arisen at the end of the previous meeting. His imperfect knowledge of the English language had led him to use the phrase "challenge the vote", when he had simply meant to suggest that if a delegate was not satisfied with the counting, a recount of the vote on the Lebanese draft resolution (document A10/AFL/30) might be taken.

To overcome the difficulty that had arisen, he suggested that the Committee might vote again on the three proposals that had been placed before it (documents A10/AFL/26, A10/AFL/29, A10/AFL/30), although he was fully aware that that procedure might be regarded as creating a bad precedent in the Health Assembly. In the circumstances, however, he would be fully prepared to take his responsibility as its instigator and asked the Committee to give the suggestion unanimous approval.

Dr JAFAR (Pakistan) drew attention to the proceedings at the seventh plenary meeting of the Third World Health Assembly (as reported in Official Records No. 28, pages 146-148) which might serve as a precedent for settling the present difficulty. On that occasion a question had been reopened for discussion because one of the delegates raised an objection to a draft amendment on the ground that he had not properly understood the amendment in question when it was put to the vote. In the resulting discussion the proposal before the Health Assembly had been amended and a second vote taken on it. He believed that precedent would fit the present situation - which was not covered by the Rules of Procedure - and would allow the Committee to proceed to a second vote on the Lebanese draft resolution.

Mr KHANACHET (Saudi Arabia) said he would gladly have abstained from speaking at the present stage of the debate had it not been for his impression that the situation that had arisen had aroused much regret in the Committee. He accordingly wished to express his delegation's full and entire confidence in the Director-General. He believed it was the first time that the Secretariat's vote-counting had been placed in doubt. He trusted the other delegations in the Committee would wish to join with him in expressing confidence in the Director-General and in asking him to reconsider his suggestion that in the future a polling officer be chosen by the Chairman for the task of vote-counting.

He regretted he was unable to support the suggestion of the delegate of Pakistan. In view of the voting at the morning meeting there seemed to be only two alternatives open to the Committee: to reopen the discussion or to reverse a resolution already voted on. He would like to know what procedure the Chairman proposed to follow, since the Committee would be called to reopen the debate on a matter on which it had already voted; furthermore, in the event of the debate being reopened, would not that be tantamount to reversing a properly drafted resolution?

The CHAIRMAN said that he was convinced that no member of the Committee or of the delegations to the Health Assembly would for one moment entertain any doubts as to the integrity and efficiency of the Secretariat. The whole situation had arisen from a misunderstanding, as he had already explained.

He would like to make it clear that he was not proposing to reopen discussion on the item. His suggestion was that the Committee should unanimously agree to vote once again on all the three proposals on the item.

Dr EVANG (Norway) remarked that he was very glad that the misunderstanding regarding the use of the word "challenge" had been removed.

So far as clearing up the position was concerned, he believed that the Committee should move with very great care. The rejection of a motion by one or two votes would obviously occur frequently in the Health Assembly. That might be very hard for the proposing delegations but, in his opinion, the only solution was to be found in a formal motion for the reopening of the debate on the item. If that were carried, it would open the way not to discussion alone but to amendment of the proposals. Should that course not be adopted, the decisions taken at the morning meeting would stand. Otherwise, to vote again on the three proposals would merely create two sets of decisions of the Committee on the same item.

Mr WERSHOF (Canada) spoke to clear the misunderstanding which had arisen as a result of his request for a recount of the vote on the Lebanese proposal at the previous meeting. He was distressed that the Director-General, and apparently one or two delegations as well, had made the mistake of interpreting that request as implying a lack of faith in the members of the Secretariat who had counted the vote. No such thought had entered his mind. His request had been based on the premise that it was possible for an error to be made in the counting of a vote by a show of hands in crowded conditions.

That was why he had asked whether there was not some method of checking again the vote that had been taken. He was sure that every delegation represented in the Health Assembly had every confidence in the integrity and good faith of the Secretariat.

Nevertheless, he reiterated his belief in the possibility of a mistake in counting. In other United Nations bodies, including the General Assembly, it was not unusual for some check to be made on a vote by show of hands especially when the result of the voting was very close. Sometimes the Chairman would ask the delegates to raise their cards a second time in order to check the count. He had hoped that similar action might have been taken in the present instance and he repeated his request to have the vote recounted by means of whatever procedure the Chairman should find appropriate.

Dr SIRI (Argentina) welcomed the statement just made by the delegate of Canada, as clearing up the two points he, Dr Siri, had made at the previous meeting, after the Canadian request for a recount of the last vote taken and the Director-General's announcement that in future the Secretariat would not take the responsibility for the counting of votes. Although there was no specific provision in the Health Assembly's Rules of Procedure to that effect, it had always been customary for the Secretariat to undertake the counting of votes and in the discharge of that duty the Secretariat merited the confidence of all delegations.

He, as representative of the Argentine Government, would express his absolute confidence in the Director-General and the staff of WHO, as well as his gratitude for the loyal way in which those officials had always fulfilled their duties.

He did not think the precedent cited by the delegate of Pakistan was appropriate to the present case. There had been no suggestion of misunderstanding in regard to the matter voted upon. The Committee was now discussing a matter that had been finally disposed of at the previous meeting and there were no grounds for reopening the debate upon it. He opposed any motion to that effect and proposed that the Committee pass to the next item of its agenda.

Mr WERSHOF (Canada) explained again that he had asked for a recount of the vote simply on the grounds of possibility of error. He was fully prepared to abide by the Chairman's decision as to how that should be done and his delegation was perfectly willing to accept the decision reflected in the voting.

The CHAIRMAN reiterated that he would hesitate to put into effect his procedural suggestion (for the vote on the three proposals to be taken again) without the unanimous approval of the Committee. Yet the delegation of Canada had asked for a recount of the vote on the Lebanese draft resolution as taken at the previous meeting. So far as he could see, the Committee had two alternatives:

- (1) to maintain the results of that vote as announced at the previous meeting;
- (2) to reopen discussion on the item with the approval of a two-third majority of the members present and voting, as required by the Rules of Procedure. The effect of such action would of course be to reopen the discussion on the item, as well as providing an opportunity for revoting.

Professor HURTADO (Cuba) maintained that it was not possible for the Committee to accept the Chairman's suggestion, well-intentioned though it was. In effect, the Rules of Procedure precluded going back on a decision that had already been taken. It was his view that, legally, the voting on the Lebanese draft resolution was closed once the Chairman had announced the result.

If, exceptionally, it was desired to vote a second time on the Lebanese draft resolution, it would be necessary first to vote on the reopening of the discussion - for which a two-third majority was needed. In his opinion that procedure, too, would be out of order since the Rules of Procedure governed the reopening of a discussion but made no mention of revoting.

He deplored the length of time that had already been devoted to discussion of and voting on the item and saw no point in what appeared to him to be efforts to revive the Canadian proposal which had already been categorically rejected in principle. Other opportunities were open for pressing the Canadian proposal elsewhere, including the Executive Board. In his opinion, it was somewhat absurd to refer the proposals, as had been agreed, to the Executive Board, since they would, if put into effect, impinge on its own field of competence.

He appealed to the Committee not to take any decision that was tantamount to going back on its earlier work and to revising a vote already taken.

In conclusion, he expressed his conviction that no member of the Committee entertained doubts as to the good faith of the Secretariat.

Committee asking for a recount of a vote. That was why he had put forward his compromise suggestion but on the clear understanding that he did not propose to put it into effect without the unanimous consent of the Committee.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL wished to express his gratitude to the Chairman for

the remarks he had made at the opening of the meeting.

There were two points which he would like to clear up. He hoped the

delegate of Canada realized that it was his (the Director-General's) duty

to protect the staff in the event of any remarks in the meeting being open to

misconstruction. He himself had not, in fact, believed that the Canadian

delegate intended to imply a doubt of the integrity of the Secretariat in asking

for the recount of the vote on the Lebanese draft resolution, but he had been

obliged to take a stand in case the remarks made were misunderstood by any

delegate in the Committee.

There appeared to be some misunderstanding regarding the question of the

Secretariat undertaking the counting of votes in the future. He had never on

any occasion refused to carry out the instructions of the Health Assembly and

what he had said at the previous meeting (as the verbatim records of it showed)

constituted a request that the Committee appoint polling officers in the future

to undertake the task but at no time had he refused to undertake it. It was

a human failing to make mistakes and each and all of them were liable to do so.

As this was recognized by all and since there were now no doubts about the

intentions behind the Canadian request, he would suggest that what was of

immediate importance was to find a way whereby the Committee could proceed with

its work.

The CHAIRMAN said that the members of the Committee would doubtless recall how some of the difficult situations that had arisen in the past had been cleared by the Chairman ignoring certain parts of the Rules of Procedure. With those precedents in mind, he would again ask the Committee whether it would be willing to give unanimous approval to the procedure he had proposed. The other alternative was for a member of the Committee to move the re-opening of the debate on the item. Failing that, he would have no course open but to proceed to the next item.

Dr EVANG (Norway) welcomed the Chairman's clear exposé of the situation which showed the way out of the difficulty. Being an international body, composed of government representatives, the Health Assembly had to follow an orderly procedure. There was no possible doubt on the procedure to be followed in regard to the present situation as governed by the Rules of Procedure. The only course of action was to proceed with the next item of business unless a motion for reopening the discussion was made and carried by a two-thirds majority.

Professor PESONEN (Finland) proposed that the discussion on the item be reopened.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with Rule 65 of the Rules of Procedure, he would accord permission to speak only to two speakers opposing the motion, after which he would put it immediately to the vote.

Professor HURTADO (Cuba) opposed the motion for reopening the debate on the grounds that it would merely lead to repetition of the series of arguments that had already been heard at length and would in no way change the views of any delegation as expressed in the votes taken at the previous meeting.

Mr GEERAERTS (Belgium) believed it quite a normal procedure for a delegation to ask for a recount of a vote and such a request ought not to give rise to mistrust and suspicion. However, as soon as it became evident that the request could not rally unanimous support and that its consideration was being rejected on fallacious procedural grounds, he thought the Committee should accept the situation. He accordingly opposed the somewhat roundabout procedure proposed of reopening the discussion, as likely to lead to the same result in the end, and proposed that the Committee pass to the next item of its agenda.

Decision: The motion to reopen the discussion was rejected by 34 votes to 20, with 8 abstentions.

Mr JOCKEL (Australia) observed that the point he was about to raise might be of formal significance only but he felt that he ought not to let it pass unnoticed.

The previous speakers had suggested that, if the proposal for reopening the debate were rejected, the item under consideration would be finally disposed of and the Committee would go on to the next item of business. He was not sure, however, that that was exactly the position. The Committee had had three resolutions before it; one had been rejected and one accepted, but to his mind there was a third draft resolution still before the Committee. The draft

resolution that had been accepted - that proposed by the delegation of the Lebanon - was not in his view an amendment, either formal or in substance, to the Canadian draft resolution. Indeed, the delegate of Israel had stated at the previous meeting that he regarded the Lebanese draft resolution as a new and separate proposal. He himself would regard the two draft resolutions of Canada and the Lebanon as quite compatible, one with the other. That, in his personal opinion, left the draft resolution submitted by Canada still before the Committee, but he would be prepared to be guided by the delegate of Canada in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that at an early stage of the previous meeting his interpretation of the Lebanese draft resolution as an amendment to the Canadian draft resolution had been confirmed by the delegate of the Lebanon. In those circumstances, he had ruled that the order of voting should be, first, on the joint draft resolution (document A10/AFL/29) as furthest removed from the original proposal of the Canadian delegation; second, the Lebanese draft resolution; and, lastly, the original proposal submitted by Canada. Any doubts on whether the Lebanese draft resolution was an amendment or a new proposal should have been raised at that time.

Mr BRADY (Ireland) said that, if the Committee had adopted an amendment to the Canadian draft resolution, perhaps the Chairman would, for his, Mr Brady's, clarification, read out the terms of the resolution as amended, since that was still to be considered by the Committee.

Dr HAYEK (Lebanon) said that, if he had understood aright, the Committee had just rejected the motion to ~~re~~open the debate. Yet it would seem that certain members were now engaged in a substantive discussion on it.

The CHAIRMAN said he did not regard the point raised by the delegate of Ireland as a matter of substance. He would accordingly be happy to read out the Lebanese resolution as adopted, which in his understanding replaced the Canadian draft resolution.

Professor HURTADO (Cuba), speaking on a point of order, considered it a waste of time for the Chairman to accede to the request to read out a draft resolution that had been submitted to the Committee in writing and already voted upon at an earlier meeting. Nothing could now be done to change the terms of that resolution.

The CHAIRMAN assured the delegate of Cuba that all he intended to do was to accede to the request to read the Lebanese resolution, as adopted, and he proceeded to do so.

He then proposed that the meeting be suspended for a short recess.

It was so agreed.

The meeting was suspended at 3.35 p.m. and resumed at 4.10 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN read, for the information of the Committee, the following extract from the verbatim record of his remarks made at its tenth meeting:

"We should proceed to the voting and, as I have already expressed my views on this the order of the voting would be first, that of India, the Philippines, Norway and Yugoslavia. Then comes, if that is not carried, the voting for the proposal of the Lebanon delegation; and, if it is necessary, lastly we come to the proposal of the Canadian delegation."

He added that, as he presumed that there would be a difference of opinion on that issue, he would leave his ruling to stand. Members of the Committee who dissented from it could easily bring the matter up in the plenary meeting.

2. CELEBRATION OF THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF WHO: Item 7.7 of the Agenda (Resolutions WHA9.28 and EB19.R32; Documents A10/AFL/17 and Add.1 and Add.2)

The CHAIRMAN requested the Rapporteur to read the resolutions drafted by him on the item.

Dr VANNUGLI (Italy), Rapporteur, read the draft resolution contained in document A10/AFL/17 Add.1. He added that, after discussion of that draft resolution, he had been asked to take into consideration all the suggestions raised by delegations in the Committee. As they had been rather too contradictory to combine in a single text, he had drafted an alternative paragraph 4 (document A10/AFL/17 Add.2) which read:

- "4. (a) REQUESTS the Director-General to arrange with Member States for the drawing-up of a list of speakers for the Tenth Anniversary Commemorative Session, such list to be completed by 1 January 1958;
- (b) EXPRESSES the desire that the list include at least one Member from each region;
- (c) DECIDES to allot not more than ... minutes each for addresses by Member States,"

The time allotted for addresses might, in accordance with the suggestions that had been made, be specified as five, six or seven minutes.

Dr HAYEK (Lebanon) understood that the reference in the original draft of paragraph 4 (document A10/AFL/17 Add.1) to the selection of speakers by regional committees had been deleted in the amended draft. His delegation considered that the regional committees ought to take an active part in that selection; they would save the Director-General the trouble of referring to all the eighty-eight Member States. He proposed to insert in the amended draft (document A10/AFL/17 Add.2), paragraph 4(a), instead of the words "with Member States", the words "after consultation with the regional committees".

Dr VANNUGLI (Italy), Rapporteur, explained that in drawing up the amended draft of paragraph 4 he had tried to take into account all that had been said by the delegations taking part in the discussion. The amendment suggested by the delegate of Lebanon might well, if the Committee agreed, be inserted in the draft resolution.

Dr SIRI (Argentina) said that the amended draft took no account of the proposal, already agreed to, that each region should appoint two speakers. He proposed that words to that effect should be incorporated. Moreover, it was difficult to limit beforehand the time which each speaker should be allowed to deal with the past, present and future problems of his region, its successes and its needs, its views on the Organization, and other matters to which attention should be drawn. He would not altogether rule out limitation; but the Director-General might agree with the regional directors and perhaps also with the speakers themselves on the time which they should occupy, in a manner which would not imply a hard and fast time-limit in a commemoration so important, the report of which would go out to all the peoples of the world. The Executive Board had recognized the need for the world to know of the Organization's achievements; a great propaganda effort might have most important results.

Dr CAYLA (France) thought that, before debating the substance or form of paragraph 4, the Committee should decide whether it preferred the scheme in document A10/AFL/17 Add.1 or that in Add.2. He preferred Add.1. He did not think that to increase the number of speakers, would enhance the value of their speeches. One or at most two speakers for each region would be likely to give more comprehensive and instructive addresses, more valuable for the commemoration of the tenth anniversary. All delegates well knew the difficulty of limiting the time taken by speakers. Even with a limit of five, six or seven minutes there was always a chance that speakers would take more, and it would be impossible to know how long the ceremony would last. If a time-limit were fixed for the whole occasion, some speakers might not be able to deliver their addresses because others had overrun their times.

Dr KHOMOUTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, while his delegation had no objection to the draft, a time-limit for speeches should be agreed upon at the outset, or speakers might be too prolix, the debate be prolonged unduly, and would-be speakers deprived of the floor. He also proposed the addition of words to paragraph 4 which would ensure that speakers were chosen with regard to equitable geographical distribution within the region.

Mr SIEGEL, (Assistant Director-General, Department of Administration and Finance), Secretary, pointed out that document A10/AFL/17 Add.2 contained an alternative paragraph 4. The delegate of Lebanon, in suggesting the insertion in its sub-paragraph (a) of a provision for consultation with regional committees, might have misunderstood the Rapporteur's intention. A better place for that provision would be in sub-paragraph (b) which read "Expresses the desire that the list include at least one Member from each region". Sub-paragraph (a) as originally drafted would oblige the Director-General to enquire directly of all the States Members of the Organization whether they wished to speak at the Commemorative Session. He suggested that the following words be added at the end of (b):

"and to this end requests that the Director-General consult with the regional committees".

Thus the Director-General would communicate directly with the Member States under sub-paragraph (a) and with the regional committees under sub-paragraph (b).

Dr HAYEK (Lebanon) agreed with the Secretary's explanation, and proposed to add to sub-paragraph (b) a phrase along the following lines:

"and that the regional committees be previously consulted".

Dr VANNUGLI (Italy), Rapporteur, in reply to the comments made, said that in the previous discussion two trends of thought had been manifested, both concerned with the time the ceremony would occupy. The one, expressed in the first draft resolution, would limit the speakers from each region to two and allow those unlimited time; the other would allow any number of speakers from each region but would limit their time. Naturally, either draft was open to amendment; his only aim had been to interpret the wishes of the delegates who had spoken.

Dr SIRI (Argentina) stated that the record of the previous discussion would show that the Committee had agreed that there should be two speakers from each region. A region comprised many countries, each with its own differing ways of life and social fabrics, its own problems and solutions. The speakers should be able to reflect the different outlooks to which those heterogeneous elements gave rise. He did not suggest that speakers should speak for as long as they liked, but that the Director-General should agree with them on how long they should speak.

Mr KHANACHET (Saudi Arabia) believed that the Committee was primarily concerned with two matters: the duration of the special commemorative session; and representation on a regional basis. The former involved limitation either of the number of

speakers or of the time which should be allowed to each. Limitation of time was bound to impair the quality of the speeches delivered on that exceptional and important occasion. As regards the second point, regional representation postulated the right of regional committees - in consultation, of course, with the Director-General - to appoint their own representatives. The Director-General would be well able, in agreement with the representatives of each region and having regard to the requirements for the success of the ceremony, to find a means of granting to each speaker the time necessary to represent his region adequately.

Dr KHOMOUTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) referring to sub-paragraph (b) in the amended paragraph contained in Addendum 2, said he would not wish to limit the number of speakers from each region to one. Europe, for example, contained many States with widely differing systems of public health and social structure. He therefore preferred the original draft in A10/AFL/17 Add.1, with its limitation to two speakers for each region. Perhaps one speaker would be sufficient for some regions, but the most just and fair scheme would be to allow the large regions two. A certain time-limit appeared necessary and he would suggest fixing a maximum and a minimum time, so that speakers might take such time as befitted the importance of their region.

The CHAIRMAN explained that according to sub-paragraph (b) of the draft resolution in Addendum 2, the list would include "at least one Member from each region", so that the number of speakers for a region would not necessarily be confined to one.

Mr LIVERAN (Israel) suggested that the Committee was losing sight of the Rapporteur's aim. Special sessions of the Health Assembly were governed by the same Rules of Procedure as were its ordinary sessions. The Rapporteur had remembered, in producing his draft, that no resolution might depart from the Constitution and the Rules of Procedure. The Committee was faced with the dilemma that it must save time and yet allow due freedom. The first question was, who should be given the authority to decide on the necessary compromise? Clearly the Director-General, who would be in charge of all the other arrangements. The second question was how the Director-General could be informed early enough of the situation with which he would have to deal. The answer was implied in the time limit laid down by sub-paragraph (c), and the provision, in sub-paragraph (a), that the list must be completed by 1 January 1958. The third problem was to make the list agreeable to all Member States. The regional committees should be consulted, but the result of the consultation must be referred to the Director-General. If a Member not listed wished its representative to speak, he was obviously entitled to do so. The Member, however, must inform the Director-General of its intention, and if there was a time limit the speaker would be bound by it. The Director-General would ensure that the time limit was reasonable. No delegate had made any objection of substance to the ideas embodied in Addendum 2, and none had proposed another text taking account of all the factors on which that document was based. The Committee now merely had to consider how the requests for speakers should be transmitted, and whether the precise time limit should be written into the resolution or left to agreement.

Mr KHANACHET (Saudi Arabia) formally proposed that, if the original draft (Addendum 1) were adopted, the following phrase should be added to paragraph 4: ". . . . taking into account the limited time allotted for the Tenth Anniversary Commemorative Session."

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should first vote on the draft in A10/AFL/10 Add.2, as amended by the addition at the end of sub-paragraph (b) of the words "and to this end requests the Director-General to consult with the regional committees".

Dr CAYLA (France) thought it would be more logical first to examine Addendum 1, and then, if it was not approved, Addendum 2, amendments to which would be relevant only if it came under consideration.

Dr KHOMOUTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested, in order to simplify procedure, that a vote first be taken on the draft in A10/AFL/10 Addendum 2, with the addition to paragraph 4 (b) of words providing for equitable geographical distribution within each region.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that no suggestion had yet been made in relation to the number of minutes to be allotted to each speaker under sub-paragraph (c).

Mr BRADY (Ireland) proposed to consider paragraph 4 of Addendum 2 as an amendment to Addendum 1, and to deal with it first, subject to the amendments put forward. A specific time limit might be unduly rigid, and the Director-General was undoubtedly highly competent to organize that matter sensibly and conveniently. As words which would be flexible but also allow the session to be completed within two days, he suggested:

"(c) DECIDES to authorize the Director-General to fix a limitation on the duration of speeches so far as may be necessary to ensure the completion of the session within the period of two days".

He would not press that motion against objection.

Mr GEERAERTS (Belgium) considered it unpleasant to load the Director-General with a burden which should be borne by the Assembly. The resolution should, he thought, provide that chosen speakers should submit their speeches to the Director-General in advance, so that he might know whether they would conform to a reasonable time limit.

The SECRETARY pointed out that the Director-General would have at his disposal a list of Members who wished to speak at the Commemorative Session. He suggested that the delegate of Ireland should amend his proposal to read somewhat as follows:

"DECIDES to authorize the Director-General, in agreement with the President of the Assembly, to fix a limitation"

Mr BRADY (Ireland) agreed.

The SECRETARY, at the request of the Chairman, read the text of sub-paragraph (b) as amended by the suggestions of the delegates of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of Lebanon:

"(b) EXPRESSES the desire that the list include at least one Member from each region, taking account of an equitable geographical distribution, and to this end requests the Director-General to consult with the regional committees".

Dr SIRI (Argentina) expressed doubt concerning the subject of the vote to be taken, and asked for clarification.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the Committee was being asked to pronounce on sub-paragraph (b) in the amended text read out by the Secretary. If it agreed, it would then be asked to vote on sub-paragraph (c) as amended by the delegate of Ireland, and then on Addendum 2 as a whole, as amended.

Dr SIRI (Argentina) asked whether, if the words read by the Secretary were approved, the remainder of Addendum 2 would be open to debate. That addendum could be discarded if a slight amendment were made to Addendum 1, paragraph 4: to add at the end the words:

"and to agree with them on the time to be taken by the addresses, so that the session shall be completed within the two days allotted".

That amendment, he thought, would meet the desires of the various speakers and include all the ideas accepted during the previous discussions.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the delegate of Argentina could move to reject Addendum 2 and, if he succeeded, move his amendment to Addendum 1, paragraph 4.

Dr SIRI (Argentina) signified his assent.

The CHAIRMAN, noting that there was no objection to the amendment proposed to Addendum 2, paragraph 4, sub-paragraph (b), asked the Secretary to read sub-paragraph (c) as amended.

The SECRETARY said that the delegate of Ireland proposed to substitute for sub-paragraph (c) as circulated the following words:

"DECIDES to authorize the Director-General, in agreement with the President of the Assembly, to fix a limitation on the duration of speeches so far as may be necessary to ensure completion of the session within the period of two days".

The CHAIRMAN said that, as he heard no objection, he assumed that the Committee approved sub-paragraph (c) as amended by the delegate of Ireland. The Committee could now vote on Addendum 2 as a whole. He added, to clarify the position, that Addendum 2 would if adopted replace Addendum 1, paragraph 4.

Mr KHANACHET (Saudi Arabia) said that he did not remember the Committee adopting sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), and was somewhat taken aback to hear that it had done so.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had just agreed to the amendments to sub-paragraphs (b) and (c), but had taken no decision on them as a whole, nor on sub-paragraph (a). He therefore proposed that it should consider Addendum 2, paragraph 4, sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) as amended. If that text were adopted, it would replace Addendum 1, paragraph 4.

Mr KHANACHET (Saudi Arabia) thanked the Chairman, and proposed to insert in sub-paragraph (a), after the word "drawing-up", the words:

"in consultation with the President of the Tenth Assembly",
as in sub-paragraph (c) according to the suggestion of the delegate of Ireland, amended by the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Secretary to read the new proposal.

The SECRETARY read sub-paragraph (a) as amended by the proposal of the delegate of Saudi Arabia:

"REQUESTS the Director-General to arrange with Member States for the drawing up, in consultation with the President of the Assembly, of a list of speakers for the Tenth Anniversary Commemorative Session, such list to be completed by 1 January 1958".

Dr VANNUGLI (Italy), Rapporteur, suggested that the proposed words should be inserted after the words "Director-General".

Mr KHANACHET (Saudi Arabia) signified his assent.

Dr EL WAKIL (Egypt) said that he could not appreciate the true meaning of amendments introduced in such quick succession, and asked whether the Rapporteur would prepare another text for the Committee to vote upon at its next meeting.

Dr VANNUGLI (Italy), Rapporteur, asked whether he should combine all the amendments into one proposal, or present a series of alternatives.

The CHAIRMAN considered that the Committee should be invited to choose between the conflicting approaches of Addendum 1 and Addendum 2.

Mr GEERAERTS (Belgium) felt that it was not fair to leave entirely to the Rapporteur the task of bringing order into such confusion. It had been agreed on a similar occasion in the past that the authors of various proposals should assist the Rapporteur to draft a resolution which they, having agreed it with him, would not later discuss in Committee.

Mr OLIVERO (Guatemala) agreed with the delegate of Belgium that the wisest course would be to appoint a working party consisting of the Rapporteur and the authors of amendments, to report on the next day.

Sir Arcot MUDALIAR (India) proposed that a working party be established immediately to consider the amendments to document A10/AFL/17 Add. 1 and Add. 2 and to place before the Committee for voting, without any further discussion, the proposal contained in Addendum 1, paragraph 4, and the revised proposals in Addendum 2 as amended by the working party.

Mr BRADY (Ireland) endorsed the suggestion of the delegate of India, and proposed that the working party should meet immediately after the present meeting rose.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the working party should consist of the Rapporteur, the delegate of India, and the delegate of Ireland.

Sir Arcot MUDALIAR (India) suggested that it should consist of the Rapporteur and the delegates of Saudi Arabia, Israel, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

After further discussion, it was agreed that the working party should consist of the Rapporteur and of all delegates who had moved amendments, and should meet immediately after the termination of the Committee's meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.33 p.m.