

Regional Commissions as a means of promoting the aims of the United Nations. The resolution as adopted mentions the decision of the Economic and Social Council to set up an *ad hoc* Committee to study the question of an Economic Commission for Latin America and records the favourable reception given to this proposal by the Second Committee. The U.S.S.R., Byelorussia and the Ukraine objected to the inclusion of this latter notice on the ground that the mention of the Economic Commission for Latin America in a resolution concerning a commission for the Near East was contrary to the rules of procedure and was intended to imply approval for the establishment of an Economic Commission for Latin America. For this reason these three countries refused to participate in the voting on the resolution. In plenary session of the General Assembly, however, this resolution¹ was adopted by a vote of 45 in favour with 4 abstentions. Canada voted for the proposal.

During the discussion of the question of Regional Commissions, the Soviet representative introduced a resolution that the Assembly should recommend that the Economic and Social Council supplement the original membership of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East by including all countries in this geographical area which were Members of the United Nations but did not participate in existing Regional Commissions. This resolution did not receive the support of the states which would have been affected. The Soviet resolution also proposed that the Economic and Social Council should revise the procedure for communication between the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and the non-self-governing territories in that area. The purpose of this latter provision was to allow direct communication between the Commission and a non-self-governing territory irrespective of the wishes of the metropolitan power concerned.

The metropolitan powers (the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and France) took exception to the means proposed by the U.S.S.R. for direct communication between the Commission and non-self-governing territories. It was pointed out that in international law the metropolitan government was responsible for non-self-govern-

¹The text of the resolution as adopted is given in Appendix II, D, p. 229.