

PREPARATORY COMMITTEE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE  
ON TRADE AND EMPLOYMENT

HEADS OF DELEGATIONS

SUMMARY RECORDS OF MEETINGS

Sixth Meeting  
held on Monday, 18 November 1946  
at 4.30 p.m.

CHAIRMAN: A. SUTENS (Belgium)

(Discussion of Note by the Secretariat (E/PC/T/DEL/8 Rev.1))

The CHAIRMAN explained that the document now before his colleagues was a revised version of the original document and took account of all the views expressed at the last meeting on 15 November.

Dr. COOMES (Australia) apologized for re-opening a discussion that had taken place at the last meeting, but he had been unable to be present during the latter part of the meeting. He wished to suggest a minor change. He was fully in agreement on the publication of agreed texts, in so far as agreement had been achieved, but, for reasons which he had explained at previous meetings, he desired them to be appended to the Report as a working document, and not to be an integral part of the Report itself.

No objections having been raised, the CHAIRMAN agreed to the suggestion made by Dr. Coombs.

Mr. WYNDHAM-WHITE (Executive Secretary) explained that it might not be possible for this suggestion to be followed in respect of all the Reports prior to their submission to the Preparatory Committee. It was purely a question of editing, and the necessary alterations would be made before the final text was published.

Mr. KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia) wished to raise a point in connection with the Resolution relating to the Drafting Committee. The second part of the first sentence "except insofar as the Drafting Committee ...." appeared to be in contradiction with the first part of the sentence and was likely in his opinion to give rise to misunderstandings. He wished to know exactly what the terms of reference of the Drafting Committee would be. He was also not clear as to the difference, if any, between "differences of opinion" and "different view points".

Dr. COOMBS (Australia) suggested that the difficulty felt by Mr. Kunosi might be met by deleting the words "except insofar as....." to the end of the sentence. The explanatory notes and commentaries referred to later on in the paragraph would give the Drafting Committee latitude to submit alternative texts which might help the Preparatory Committee at its Second Session.

M. NATHAN (France) contended that the Drafting Committee would have two main tasks: its first task would be to make a synopsis of the views and opinions expressed in the Preparatory Committee; its second task would be to prepare for further work by the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee. There seemed to him to be no contradiction as both tasks clearly belonged to the Drafting Committee.

Mr. WYNDHAM-WHITE, in reply to M. Nathan, explained that the text had been drafted with great care and, for his part, he gravely doubted the wisdom of attempting to redraft it in a Committee of eighteen. In his opinion, the terms of the paragraph exactly correspond to the views expressed at previous meetings. After considerable discussion, Dr. Coombs (Australia) agreed that there was a genuine difference of opinion as to what the Drafting Committee was to do. It had been his intention to advise his government that it would be unnecessary for Australia to be represented on the Drafting Committee on the understanding that the Drafting Committee must do no more

than clarify the work done during the present Conference, i.e. would have largely editorial functions. It was for this reason that he attached importance to the deletion that he had suggested.

Mr. SPEEKENBRINK (Netherlands) and Mr. WILCOX (United States) supported the suggestion for deletion made by Dr. COOMBS.

M. NATHAN (France) argued that the members of the Drafting Committee were, so to say, delegates of the Preparatory Committee. Clearly they could not commit Governments any more than the Preparatory Committee could.

Mr. WYNDEHAM-WHITE pointed out that the first sentence of the paragraph had been drafted so as to cover the situation described by Dr. COOMBS. It must be remembered that the work at the present Conference had been done at great speed, and it would be for the Drafting Committee to complete such editorial tasks as had been impossible at the present Conference.

Mr. KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia) was still of opinion that the precise functions of the Drafting Committee had not been laid down sufficiently clearly. After further discussion, the CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee was unanimous in accepting the proposal made by Dr. COOMBS, on the understanding that the minutes of the meetings at which this question was discussed would also be forwarded.

M. van der KERCHOVE D'HALLEBAST (Belgium) hoped that an effort would be made to ensure that the French translations of the documents to be sent to the Drafting Committee were technically correct.

The CHAIRMAN agreed on the importance of this point.

Subject to the foregoing, the third resolution was approved.

The CHAIRMAN then drew the attention of the Committee to the fourth resolution on page 6 of the document.

H.E. Mr. WUNSZ KING understood that tariff negotiations would be on a multilateral basis. As, however, only eighteen nations would be represented in Geneva, he was anxious to know whether the agreement reached in Geneva would come into force before the remaining thirty nations obtained concessions and satisfaction from other countries.

Mr. SPEEKENBRINK (Netherlands) said that Mr. Wunsz King's assumption was correct. The point had been discussed in the Procedure Committee and was covered in the Draft Report, in course of preparation. As soon as the eighteen countries reached agreement, it would be recommended that tariff agreements come into force forthwith and that concessions be extended provisionally to all nations who were to be summoned to attend the World Conference. After the termination of the World Conference, every country would be called on to negotiate agreements within a specific period. These negotiations might, of course, have to be revised in the light of subsequent events.

Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom) thought that some reference to the procedural memorandum, which was being elaborated by the Sub-Committee of Committee II, should be made in the penultimate paragraph of the last Resolution. He suggested that the words "and that the procedural memorandum should constitute the rules by which such a meeting should be conducted" be added.

Mr. FRESQUET (Cuba) stated that when the memorandum on procedure had been discussed at the meeting held on that day, he had made a reservation on behalf of his Government. It raised a number of new questions on which members would have to consult their Governments before they could agree to the procedures suggested.

Mr. WILCOX (United States) suggested that the difficulty might be met by the use of the phrase "conducted according to the procedure recommended by Committee II of this Committee".

As there were no further amendments on the fourth Resolution, it was accepted, subject to the modifications made during the meeting.

PROPOSALS BY THE SECRETARIAT FOR  
THE AGENDA OF THE FINAL PLENARY MEETINGS (E/PC/T/DEL/7)

Mr. WYNDHAM-WHITE pointed out that the original paper had been redrafted on 12 November, and that the dates of the fifth and sixth plenary sessions would have to be changed. He drew the attention of the delegates to the two alternatives referred to in item 4. While some public discussion was essential, it was desirable if possible for the business to be concluded in two sessions, and the second alternative would therefore have to be adopted. With reference to item 3 on the Agenda of the sixth plenary session, the interim Report to the Economic and Social Council might also provide an opportunity of seeking advice from the Council on various points, such as industrial development, on which the Committee required guidance.

Mr. WILCOX (United States) preferred the second alternative. He assumed this to mean that the Reports would all be released to the Press simultaneously, and not one by one. He ventured to hope that Committee II would be able to finish its work within the next three and a half days. For his part, he would not be prepared to participate in a plenary session which was to consider only certain Committee Reports. These Reports were part of one document, and must be discussed as a whole.

Mr. SPEEKENBRINK (Netherlands) explained that the Sub-Committee on procedure had still a considerable amount of work to do. He did not think it possible that Committee II would be able to finish its Report before Friday or Saturday.

The CHAIRMAN felt sure that they could place complete confidence in Committee II to finish its work at the earliest possible date.

Mr. KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia) suggested that the delegations not hitherto represented on the Procedures Sub-Committee should now be invited to participate in its work. This would expedite the ultimate consideration of the Sub-Committee's Report in Committee II.

Mr. SPEEKENERINK (Netherlands), with whom Mr. FRESQUET (Cuba) agreed, suggested that delegates should assist as observers, in order to obtain an insight into the working of the Committee, but should not actively participate in the discussions as this might considerably delay progress. This question was left open for further discussion.

Before the meeting adjourned, H.E. Mr. WUNSZ KING (China) begged to state that Committee I, of which he was Chairman, had adopted a draft resolution on international action relating to employment. It had originally been drafted as emanating from the International Conference on Trade and Employment, but it was subsequently suggested that it might go forward to the Economic and Social Council in the name of the Preparatory Committee. It had been decided to submit the question to the Heads of Delegations Committee for their opinion.

The CHAIRMAN, in view of the importance of the question raised, suggested that the consideration of the many points involved be deferred to a later meeting.

The meeting rose at 7.40.

-----