

PREPARATORY COMMITTEE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE  
ON TRADE AND EMPLOYMENT

HEADS OF DELEGATIONS

Third Meeting  
held on Friday 1 November 1946  
at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. SUTENS (Belgium)

CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Mr. HELMORE (United Kingdom) said that one of the London newspapers of the previous day had printed a document which the United Kingdom delegation had submitted to the Conference, and which had received "restricted" circulation and was therefore confidential. His Government might be seriously embarrassed by this leakage, as statements of policy of the United Kingdom Government should be made in Parliament and not in the Press. The cause had probably been a somewhat too ready access to Committee rooms, where papers were sometimes left on the tables. He requested that steps might be taken to collect papers when Committees rose, and to exclude unauthorized persons from meetings. If a further leakage took place, his Government might be obliged to refrain from submitting further documents.

Mr. WYNDHAM-WHITE, Secretary-General, expressed regret on behalf of the Secretariat. A rigid policy had been laid down by which public relations officers and members of the Secretariat were forbidden, in conversation with the Press, to attribute statements to any delegate or view to any delegation, or to make any restricted document available for the Press except with leave of the delegation concerned. He asked delegations giving consent to the release of documents to do so only in writing and not over the telephone. He re-affirmed this policy

and undertook that it should be made known to and observed by every member of the Secretariat. Similarly, the already strict instructions given to messengers at the doors to keep careful check of all passes before admitting persons to meetings should be repeated. Delegates might, however, greatly help by showing passes whenever they entered a committee room, even if the messenger did not ask them to do so.

Delegates having asked for more copies of restricted documents, these had been provided, but secrecy had become correspondingly more difficult to maintain, and depended upon the personal care of delegates

Mr. HELMORE (United Kingdom) having expressed his satisfaction with this explanation, the CHAIRMAN declared the incident closed.

#### REPORT OF PREPARATORY COMMITTEE

The meeting considered the first part of E/FC/T/Del.3 summarizing earlier discussions as to the form of the Preparatory Committee's Report

Mr. NEHRU (India) observed that it was suggested that the report be drafted under the headings of the Draft Charter. He hoped, nevertheless, that new headings would be added as might be required as result of the Committee's discussion. Part 2 of the report would take the form of "instructions" to a drafting Committee. He presumed that these would merely be suggestions and that the Drafting Committee would be left free to prepare a draft in the light of all the conclusions of the Preparatory Committee. He hoped that in cases where no agreement was reached, the report would specify alternative suggestions made by delegations and by the Preparatory Committee itself.

Mr. WILCOX (United States) said that the report should be set in the frame-work of the agenda suggested by the Economic and Social Council, with the additions and amendments made by the Committee. In suggesting that Part 2 of the report "would specify the points on which agreement had been reached", the document implied that the Preparatory Committee would be in some way committed to that agreement.

He suggested that the wording should rather be "the points on which similar views had been expressed". Part 2 should contain also a third category, of controversial matters upon which "similar points of view had been expressed"

Mr. HELMORE (United Kingdom), supporting the Delegates of India and United States of America, suggested further that the distinction between "controversial" and "routine" matters was not particularly happily worded; better categories would be "comparatively formal" and "important" matters.

Dr. COOMES (Australia). He asked who would prepare the Report for the Drafting Committee. Preliminary work on it should already have started, or should start without delay.

Mr. WYNDEAM-WHITE, Executive Secretary, said that the answer depended on the duration and arrangement of the present session of the Preparatory Committee. He had expected that by the end of the present week the working committees would have reached the sub-committee and drafting stage; this might occupy the following week, and then the working committees would meet again to prepare their reports to the Preparatory Committee. He suggested that the working committees should now appoint rapporteurs who, with the assistance of the Secretariat, should progressively compile the reports of their committees during the sub-committee and drafting stage. The committee reports would then be considered as the reports of the Preparatory Committee.

Mr. MCKINNON (Canada) pressed for a termination date, and suggested 15 November.

The CHAIRMAN said that a fixed date would help delegates to use the remaining time to the best advantage. The sub-committees would occupy two weeks and the plenary sessions presumably one week afterwards. As a Saturday was a convenient day for termination he

suggested 23 November as an appropriate date. Some committees, however, were further advanced than others; the Second Committee had only just commenced its long and arduous work.

Dr. COOMBS (Australia) doubted whether the Second Committee could finish its work in time for the Conference to close on 15 November. It might itself finish by that date. The plenary sessions might not require a whole week, nor need the Conference necessarily close on a Saturday. 20 November appeared to be a reasonable compromise.

Dr. SPEERINGS-INK (Netherlands) doubted whether a definite date should be fixed. If the Drafting Committees did not properly clear up the matters allotted to them, the work might have to be done all over again at Geneva. Unless committees could meet in the evenings, they could not finish their work in ten days.

H.E. Mr. COLBAN (Norway) agreed with the Head of the Netherlands delegation that in fulfilling a colossal task the delegations must not be harassed by fixed termination dates but should rather aim at clearing up as many issues as possible. If these were left unsettled, governments would have to dispatch to the Drafting Committee many representatives now attending the Preparatory Committee, who would have only a few weeks to deal with other urgent work in their own countries.

Mr. HELMRE (United Kingdom) supported the fixing of a date, for this would encourage delegates to hasten their work and shorten their speeches. The Economic and Social Council had not instructed the Preparatory Committee to finish the work at one session. It might be profitable for delegates to consider controversial matters at length in the light of the discussions as a whole. The Drafting Committee would not reconcile controversial points but define them in clear and unambiguous language. If it was to duplicate the work of the Preparatory Committee, he would oppose its formation. Some controversial points could not be settled until the reduction of tariffs and preferences was

discussed at Geneva. His Government's work on this subject was still in an early stage. If prolongation of the present session hindered work on tariffs, it would not help the work at Geneva, for delegates would not have had time to study the subject matter of the Conference.

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) suggested that the committees should work for longer hours; that the Second Committee should meet every day and perhaps also at night and that the plenary sessions should discuss the work of the other committees before the Second Committee had finished. The work could thus be finished in two or three weeks.

Mr. AUGENTHALER (Czechoslovakia) proposed that delegations should draft short summaries of their observations on principles. Their views at present were contained in numberless documents.

H.E. Mr. WUNSZ KING (China) supported the suggestion to finish on the 20th and to start plenary sessions before all the committees had finished their work.

Dr. COOMBS (Australia) suggested a provisional closing date on the 15th, with reconsideration if by that day the Second Committee had not been able to finish.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the 20th should be fixed provisionally, and that if by Saturday the 16th it appeared impossible to finish, the session should be prolonged until the 23rd.

Mr. WYNDHAM-WHITE, Executive Secretary, added that the committees should aim at finishing by the 15th, so that the Secretariat could have two or three days to prepare the Report; the plenary sessions might then be limited to two days.

Mr. WILCOX (United States) suggested target dates for the committees whose work was advanced: 9 November for Committee I, III and IV, and the 15th for Committee II.

H.E. Mr. WUNSZ KING (China) said that the First Committee would probably finish before the 9th.

Mr. DIETERLIN (France) said that the Third Committee would make every effort to finish by the 9th or 10th though it might mean two or three days more.

Mr. HELMORE (United Kingdom) said that the Fourth Committee was in the same position.

It was agreed in principle that the First, Third and Fourth Committees should end their work by 9 November, and that the Second and Fifth Committees and the Joint Committee on Industrial Development should end a few days later.

Mr. JOHNSEN (New Zealand) asked whether the viewpoints which were to be set out in detail would be attributed to particular countries or outlined generally; and whether delegations could assume that the Report would be confidential.

Mr. WYNDHAM-WHITE, Executive Secretary, said that the Drafting Committee would be helped if it had a full report attributing views to the delegations which had expressed them in the Preparatory Committee. If this was agreed, the Secretariat would then prepare for publication an edited version containing no attributions but a general description of points of view.

Mr. HELMORE (United Kingdom) suggested that Parts 1 and 2 of the Report should be published without attributions, and that the Appendix, being long, detailed and technical, could reasonably be maintained confidential.

Agreed.

#### DRAFTING COMMITTEE

Mr. NEHRU (India) asked whether a government could appoint to the Drafting Committee any number of representatives or only a fixed number; also whether it could suggest that other countries should be invited to send representatives to the Drafting Committee. His Government would like to see certain countries of the Middle East, particularly Egypt, represented there.

Mr. WYNDHAM-WHITE, Executive Secretary, said that the Preparatory Committee had no authority to increase its size by co-optation. It had power to advise the Council as to which other governments should be invited to send delegations to the World Conference. The size of the delegations to the Drafting Committee would be left to the discretion of governments.

Mr. HELMORE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had assumed that the Drafting Committee would be appointed by the Preparatory Committee and consist of delegates who had taken part in the previous discussions. He could not see how its work could be assisted by the presence of others, except of observers dealing with specific points on which it required their assistance. It was generally understood that delegations to the Drafting Committee should be limited to two or three members.

H.E. Mr. WUNSZ KING (China) asked for guidance concerning the qualifications required of representatives attending the Drafting Committee.

Mr. WILCOX (United States) said that his Government would send two or three technically qualified junior officials who were at present acting as advisors to the United States delegation.

Mr. NEHRU (India) reserved the right of his Government to make further suggestions. A general feeling, he said, existed in India that countries with a certain economic position were over-represented, and others in a different position under-represented. For example, he felt the Middle East was under-represented and that Egypt might well be added to the Preparatory Committee. If the World Conference was to succeed, every point of view should be fully represented at the preparatory stage and in the Report of the Preparatory Committee.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the delegate of India that the Economic and Social Council had restricted the membership of the Preparatory Committee to eighteen specified countries. The Committee could do no more than make suggestions to the Council concerning the membership of the

Conference. Delegations which had not taken part in the work of the Preparatory Committee could not hope to contribute anything useful to that of the Drafting Committee.

H.E. Mr. COLBAN (Norway) asked why the Report suggested that the Drafting Committee should meet in New York, and why such importance was attached to its contact with the specialized agencies and the commissions of the Council. This appeared to suggest that it was to be a continuation of the Preparatory Committee rather than a true Drafting Committee, charged only with preparing texts for the next meeting of the Preparatory Committee. It was agreed to resume discussion of this and other points arising out of E/PC/T/DEL/3 at the next meeting of Heads of Delegations on Wednesday, 5 November.

The Committee rose at 1.5 p.m.

-----