

UNITED NATIONS

NATIONS UNIES

RESTRICTED.

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

E/EC/T/EC/PV.2/3

20 May 1967

SECOND SESSION OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE
OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND EMPLOYMENT
VERBATIM REPORT

FIFTH MEETING IN EXECUTIVE SESSION (1967)
HELD ON TUESDAY, 20 MAY, 1967 AT
3 P.M. IN THE PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

M. MAX SUTENS (Chairman) (Belgium)

Delegates wishing to make corrections in their speeches should address their communications to the Documents Clearance Office, Room 220 (Tel. 2247).

CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The meeting is called to order. I ask Mr. Nash the first delegate of New Zealand to start the discussion.

THE RT. HON. WALTER NASH (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, I again wish to thank you in particular and the Heads of the delegations for their courtesy in giving me the opportunity to state the case that we have to submit to the Committee for consideration. It fits in very well, Mr. Chairman, with the discussion that we had this morning because the emphasis that I desire to give this afternoon is on the objective and purpose of the Charter. That is, as I see it, to bring improved living standards throughout the world, and more particularly in those countries that are called under-developed and in particular some of the Eastern countries.

In looking at that standard, or rather that objective and purpose, I come next to the fact that the only way that we can satisfy or reach that objective is through the material and human resources that there are in the world. There is nothing else to work on except human and material resources. I think that is the first thing that we have to take account of when we are going towards our objective. Following that there comes the demand for something that is available from those resources, and then there comes employment. You cannot, as I see it (and that is the way I had it down this morning, and the way I would like to emphasise this afternoon), have production until there has been

employment. It is resources to work on, it is then employment, it is then production. Then again you exercise a little of your judgment in determining your employment by the effective demand. Following on production you come to exchange and trade, but even when you have the exchange and trade factor covered, you have to go, as I see it, along a much wiser way than we have previously travelled, and that is not only production. Everyone who has thought the matter out knows that if we want to raise the standard in the present day world, we must increase production, because living standards mean access to and availability of the things desirable to build the living standard. Then you have to have wise distribution. If you do not have wise distribution, you tend to destroy your effective demand, - and of the production that you had in '89, '91 and '92, does not avail - some of it has to be destroyed for the purpose of getting the world economy back again to something like normal.

Even though I started with an improved standard, I go from resources to employment to production to trade and exchange - which again is demand - and then to wise distribution, and that inevitably leads to improved living standards. It is not enough to produce the commodity. It is much more imperative that we should see that the people that need it get the commodity. If the effective demand is in the wrong place, your production will cause you trouble rather than be of help and that covers

the basis on which I want to make a case that I think is valuable and helpful. We had originally thought, Mr. Chairman, to amend Articles three and four, but we have ignored that altogether.

We now come to a simple cycle/^{again}line unto the one that I have mentioned; we want maximum use of resources, maximum employment, maximum production, effective demand, equitable distribution and maximum living standards everywhere. Now this is the sequence that I think must inevitably be worked out with the object of getting the decent living standard which is the purpose of this Charter. The important need, therefore, is to see that the Charter enables the objective to be brought right to the head, and is not restricted in any way by preoccupation with barriers to trade. But there are points that are not provided for here and that was what I wanted to emphasise for the moment.

The objective is agreed upon, but the roads may be different. This Charter, with some qualification, appears to me to provide for the free enterprise road and only with qualifications for any other road. It has one or two chapters or articles relative to State trading, but mainly it is a matter of free enterprise, mainly one of free play of ordinary market forces. Then there are some qualifying factors about State trading, but there is not anything worth while in the Charter with regard to something in between those two. That lets free enterprise have its play to the maximum inside a country. Each country is responsible for maximum trade and maximum/

production and maximum export (not the persons in it - the country or the Government) and the responsibility concerns all the people in their own country to use these resources in the best way. As I see it, each country by decent planning and regulations, can, I think, make an effective contribution towards maximising production and lifting living standards. That is not provided for in the Charter at present - not actually provided for - but there are some qualifications about State trading.

I think there is a state in which private enterprise in the main takes the resources and brings them into desirable products and in which the State, knowing better than private enterprise, and not entirely leaving it to market forces or ordinary demand, and knowing what is most required, determines what is to come in and go out. I will qualify that in a few moments because I know the cruel dangers and hardships that came to the world because of what is called quantitative restriction.

The test of merit, as I see it, is whether in every country available resources needed anywhere in the world are being as rapidly and fully developed and used as possible, and the production not domestically required and consumed, exported; and all the proceeds from the exports spent in creating a demand in other countries, or in loans to other countries. That means that there is no production factor lying idle that could be used to expand production and make the production available to the

people who need it.

If the Charter does not enable all these three systems to operate then it is not effective. Firstly, there is free play of enterprise and market forces; secondly, there is the State doing the job entirely (there is some qualifying provision in the Charter for that); thirdly, there is the State accepting the responsibility and then private enterprise getting on to the job in its own country. If it does not the State must get on to the job, and the State's responsibility is to see that the job is really done. My contention is a simple one. I think that whilst we have what is called sovereignty over a little area of land in the Southern Pacific of 104,000 sq. miles, and there are other representatives here of governments exercising sovereignty over certain areas of the world, we hold that sovereignty in trust. I do not want to be too much in the air with regard to this, but the land belongs to all the people of the world and we exercise sovereignty over given areas and with the responsibility for utilising the resources of those areas so that all can have a decent world standard of living. If we do not do that, then we have got war coming, as certain as anything, inside a decade, or a generation, or perhaps half a century. I therefore affirm that the land or resources of a given area over which we as a government (and other governments) exercise sovereignty are a possession not entirely of their own people. They have a responsibility to use these resources for the benefit of the whole of the people. No one, I think, even in this audience would argue that if one given

ingredient of an essential to life happened to be in the sovereign area of one country, that country has the right to hold the rest of the world to ransom. That cannot last in equity, whether it is internationally condoned or otherwise. The position cannot last where certain areas of the world are confined under the sovereignties of a few people, who imagine that, because they happen to have confined in those areas resources in the ground, in the water and in the air, they, and they alone, are to be entitled to all the good things that come out of their particular area.

It could not be sustained, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the area that I happen to represent here. We have 1½ million people; we have 104,000 square miles. It is a larger area than Great Britain. Outside the mineral and iron and coal resources of Britain, it is more productive than Britain, and to imagine that 1½ million people could say "this is ours to do with as we will" is all wrong. We have, I repeat, a responsibility without interfering with our own living standards, to use those resources to give some of the benefits from them to other countries.

I use sometimes in political addresses (and this is not political, Mr. Chairman) one illustration that comes from the United Nations figures published a short time ago. That is, that we in our little country live on the average for 68 years. In one other country they live for 27 years only. There is not another country where people on the average live as long as we live. That again puts a responsibility on us to help to lift that 27 years - otherwise our 68 is menaced.

- 21 -

I do not think the Charter does deal adequately with quantitative regulations. There is a difference between quantitative regulation and quantitative restriction. There may be a restriction of commodities coming in, with actual expansion in the volume admitted. It is doubtful whether the Charter does cater adequately in its G.R. provisions for all those three approaches which I mentioned earlier; that is, free enterprise, state enterprise, and regulation. The first one is fully covered, the second partly, but the third, no! It caters adequately for free enterprise; it gives equal access to markets in Chapter I, and MFN treatment in 14. Then Article 15 says that you must have MFN treatment extended into your own country. It may be right or it may be wrong; but then there is the general effect of Chapters V and VI. The Charter caters approximately adequately for the country with a complete monopoly of trade. I heard of a suggestion to take Article 33 out, but unless it is put somewhere else I think it would be entirely wrong, because my reading of 33 was that it was for the purpose of enabling the Soviet Union or other countries that had a State monopoly to come in whether they actually decide to come or not.

I think we ought to give in this Charter the opportunity and the right to come into the International Trade Organisation. We felt that there should be this right for everyone, but I believe that it does not cater adequately for a Government-regulated economy like our own, because it forces us into the free market framework subject to non-enforceable conditions.

On 3 and 4 we had an enjoyable and enlightening discussion this morning. I think that full employment and effective demand should be tremendously helpful, but we are in a difficult situation. I cannot determine whether a country is giving all

the help that it can to a full employment policy. You cannot actually determine it, it is something that has to be conjectured.

We would be willing to accept the decision of any outside Organisation that we have to follow a full employment policy because we have an undertaking that means everybody in our country must be employed, we are happy to say. If they are not employed it is worth our while, all the time, to make sure they are employed, and I am not talking about the U.S. approach to it - i.e., that work for work's sake is not the objective. It must be to produce commodities that are desirable. It is, however, not only a case of producing goods. You have also to know where to put goods, so that they can be effectively used to lengthen life. That is not completely provided for in this Charter.

There are inadequate examples in Article 26, and also from the general quantitative restriction rule in 25; Art. 13 is also inadequate. And that is why I ask for the right to link that Article to Article 2 - i.e. to emphasise that our objective is living standards. We cannot achieve full employment unless we have a State regulated economy, with such elements of private enterprise left complete inside our countries as are justified. An economy not totally State owned and operated cannot satisfactorily be covered by the American approach to the Charter. American forces almost killed us in 1929 - 1933. When fear enters into the mind of a person and then spreads to a company that they are not going to get their money back from overseas investments, there is nothing that can stop harmful effects other than a Government. That Government has to carry out the purpose of productive employment, and to do that it has to regulate its economy.

Our work is closely regulated, and I do not want a rule to apply to our own country only. I will give the text of what I propose to move at a later date, and have arranged for it to be distributed, so that I can explain it better. In general this Charter cannot be effective if you write in chapters for every individual country. You have got to write Chapters or Articles that under like conditions can apply to all the countries that we ought to provide for. We affirm, however, that our economic regulation leads to more expanded trade, and more expansion of production, than does the play of free markets.

There is private enterprise when effectively allowed to operate; and there is the national assumption of public responsibility for employment and the utilisation of resources. I know something about the political ambitions of workers, and others, and I tell them the same as some others tell them: You cannot have real full employment unless you produce, and you have to produce what is necessary, or else nothing can be done to improve your living standards.

Utilisation of productive resources in New Zealand is wisely planned. It is planned and regulated by a system of price control, with all sorts of mistakes, all sorts of complaints and difficulties, but despite these our price level has only gone up 14 per cent. since 1939; and there is not a country in the world that can claim anything even approximate to that. The Americans cannot control an economy for 150 million people, like we can for 1½ millions; and then we have a tremendous advantage in that ours are an homogeneous free people. They are, of course, not unique in that, there are others like them.

- 24/30 -

I do not want to go too far into detail, but we do produce more butter for export than any other country in the world. We have a greater per capita trade outside our own country than any country in the world; nearly twice as much as the next. Ours, in figures, I think, is 10.6 and the next is 6.3. We ensure that our primary producers get the cost of their producing commodities they sell. That has lifted our production to its maximum rate, and has kept it at this limit.

We now have in hand for the meat producers, I think, about £12,000,000 - whatever it means in Francs or Dollars - and about £8,000,000 or £9,000,000 in hand for the dairy producers. We have sold the products at a higher price than is paid the producers for producing them, and we set the money aside in farm stabilisation accounts. They belong to the industries - the Government sells the product in Britain or another country - and having sold the product, the money goes to the industry. The scheme therefore, is really under the control of the producers in that particular field.

Thus we have a complete and beneficial control of foreign trade, and that is why we consider we ought to have the right to continue what we are doing, and why other countries in like conditions ought to have that right also.

Perhaps we are slightly different in that the percentage of exports to production amounts to about 80% in certain fields of our production: in the case of one particular commodity, 98% is sent overseas; in others 60% or 70% and others 50%. In the main New Zealand farming is only a four product industry, and world prices of these commodities fluctuate violently. Therefore the proceeds from these exports are necessary for planned development, and this is where the regulation in the main comes in. There are only two elements in it:

1. Everything exported that is sold overseas results in the proceeds going into the Reserve Bank of the Government.

2. Nothing comes into the country except under licence, and we have not at any time, up to the limit of the money that we have, restricted the issue of licences. We are satisfied that we can only succeed in providing full employment, full production and full exports and full imports in the circumstances of a hyper demand (I do not know whether I like that word "hyper" - "super" if you like) while this system endures. What we mean by that is that the monies that are in the hands of the people who can demand goods are generally in excess of the production - no matter how minute is this excess. That enables an effective demand to be continually maintained, and we are under the spur to produce all the time, not only for our own use inside but also for sending overseas.

The Charter does not provide for what we want to do, and we do not want to see inside a Charter that we think is valuable (and I think it is imperative that it should be) into being if we are going to avoid the difficulties (of the past), that our economy is anathema and ought not to be practised.

There are certain elements making for maximisation of production in both the free market and State monopoly systems. You find that in our State regulatory also that there is a major contribution that can be made if the Charter is amended as I suggest. It cannot, however, be made unless the Charter is amended. There are several Articles we could work it under. We think Article 25 is too sweeping in its condemnation of quantitative restrictions. Article 26, we think, is inadequate. We do however say to some of the people who have been working on this Charter that we appreciate the thought they have given to countries like ours in drafting the Charter, particularly from the wide aspect of balance-of-payments; but nevertheless we think it is still inadequate. Also, we think Article 13, which provides for the economic development of smaller countries, is inadequate.

I have sometimes thought of it in another way. The Charter provides for two barriers or two methods in general, for achieving the production or assistance that is required: tariffs and subsidies. I do not think they are enough. I think we have got to find a further leg, that is, regulation. Tariffs are neither effective nor helpful in the undeveloped or under-developed or partially developed countries. They cannot afford a tariff high enough to stop the commodity coming in, because their people could not afford to pay the prices. They have not the revenue in some of the countries that I know - their people have not the income to enable it to be taken away from them by taxation - so that they can subsidise one single or two or three different products. I cannot see that it can be effectively done by either subsidies or tariffs. I can see

them both being partial agencies to the desired end but not complete agencies, and I therefore think that wider provision along the lines I mentioned should be made.

If it is with your will, Mr. Chairman, it would be helpful, if I have the privilege of referring to the copy of the Amendment to Article 33 which I have circulated independently and which we will later formally lodge with the Secretariat. It would help, I think, if all the Delegates would look at the clause which I plan to discuss briefly. The Article as ^{originally/} drawn gave every scope to a State monopoly. What we propose is a system very close to a State monopoly but possibly much more in line with the world objective and therefore likely to give good results. By buying imports to the limit of our powers, we offer to do the most important thing that any country can do towards world plenty and maximum trade, and incidentally more than the Charter directs Members to do. We make provision to consult the Organisation, and we submit to the procedure of Article 33 if a Member thinks that any action of ours is not in the spirit of the Charter and according to the agreement that we have made. Paragraph 1 of Article 33 provides for a State trading monopoly or substantial monopoly to have certain facilities inside the Organisation. We have made one amendment. If the Delegates will look at our amended Article 33, they will see that the words "foreign trade" are used in place of "import trade". We think it should be "foreign trade", because it covers both imports and exports. Then the new paragraph is what we desire to be written additionally into the Charter, and what we will submit by way of amendment. This new paragraph provides for what I have been talking about, that is, the state regulation of foreign trade and persons trade, and puts a lot of responsibilities on the country that decides to follow that road. Here is the wording:

"Any member who though not establishing or maintaining a

complete or substantially complete monopoly of its foreign trade, nevertheless establishes or maintains an effective system of complete control of its foreign trade, shall promote the expansion of its foreign trade with other Members in consonance with the purposes of this Charter."

That impels them all the more to keep to the purposes of the Charter right through, and to this end the Member, whichever country is concerned, undertakes to make available, in any given period, for expenditure on imports after providing for debt repayment and service charges, and for other external charges or outlay, the whole of the proceeds from its visible and invisible exports in excess of the amount of its monetary reserve (determined to be reasonable. Mr. Chairman, we, at the moment, are not Members of the International Monetary Fund. Were we members, I, as the Minister of Finance, would be willing to let the International Monetary Fund fix the reserve that we ought to have, having regard to the amount of trade that we do.

Shall we assume that we have an export trade of 100,000,000 a year, and we have some debt commitments. We might require to have 20,000,000 in reserve, but we would be willing to determine, in consultation with the Organisation, what is a reasonable sum for reserve. And that means every one of us does this - it does not mean New Zealand only. I am trying to make it a general rule. Then, having fixed our reserves, having fixed the period, we accept the obligation to discuss them with the Organisation. Somebody to whom we mentioned this matter said: "Oh, you are bound to do it in ten or twenty or forty years. What is the use of a period?" The period

that I had in mind was one year. It may be better to have two or three years as a period. But the period I had in mind was one year. Now, how could that be done? I can only say by the way we do it ourselves. We have the estimates of export income up to 1949, because we have sold a lot of our products in advance already. At the beginning of the year we estimate our total exports and the realisation. From that sum we draw all amounts that are due for debt repayments or debt services and all the other charges, remittances, dividends and everything else in other countries. Assuming that accounts for £40 millions of our £100 millions exports, we then take the balance of £60 millions. We set aside roughly £10 millions of that £60 millions and then issue licences - say import licences to ordinary merchants - for £50 millions; and the £10 millions is then kept in reserve for extraordinary imports that might be required in greater quantities at any time. Up to the present, when we have been doing that we have discriminated against certain countries, that is, we have discriminated in favour of certain countries. Some of the countries ^{have} felt that they were not being fairly treated, because we often said that if you can get it from this country you must, you cannot get a licence to get it from any other country. Now we would be willing to undertake that there should be no discrimination in the issue of the licences. That means to say that, presuming we issue licences up to sixty million pounds worth of goods and one million pounds worth of those goods are textiles, then the merchants obtaining the licences for the one million pounds would have the right to import from India, Belgium, the United States or the United Kingdom, or any other source as envisaged by this Charter.

Next, when we accept the general obligation that everyone, Mr. Chairman, must accept, I think, if they join this Organization, that is to have due regard to the interests of other members (we already agreed that we would do that). Then we come in with the other safeguards for everyone who may be injured by our system and we say that any member feeling that it is in any way being ill treated or ill affected by the practice of a country following this road, can complain to the Organization. The Organization then asks the country concerned to explain why it is doing it, and determines whether it is right or wrong. I do not know that there is anything so easy as that. It is inside the Charter principles. I have read about them for some time now, and they have only gradually come up to the standards of the Charter as we have it today. I do not know that there is anything ^{the} inside/Charter principles that could not be fitted into that. What would happen to this if it is agreed to? A lot of debate on, I should say, half a dozen Articles would go overboard and not be necessary. There is Article 4; there is Article 16 dealing with development, Articles 23 and 26. They can readily be left where and how they are, because then they will "be properly dealing with situations arising in the main from weakness in free market or substantially free-market economies and trading relations". They could all be left out as far as a country of this type is concerned because it must live up to its undertakings, that is, to go to the Organization and say "We have such and such a surplus from our exports over and above our invisible commitments, and we guarantee to give licences for the goods to be imported to our country to this value".

There are a number of other points I could have raised, but I feel, Mr. Chairman, I trespass on the Delegates and I do thank you and them for the courtesy shown to me in allowing me to make this speech because I have to leave tomorrow night for my country. I do hope that careful consideration will be given to this proposal and that I will have some opportunity before I leave of hearing what the other Delegates have to say with regard to it.

As mentioned before, the formal amendment will now be submitted to the Secretariat for consideration at the appropriate time. In the meantime, on the basis of what was said this morning concerning the basic objective of the Organisation and what I have said today, New Zealand would ask that Articles 4, 13, 25 and 26 be considered in the light of our amendment to Article 33.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I want to thank Mr. Nash for his very good speech and I believe that the fact that you approved of it so loudly is a sign that the whole meeting has been very much interested in it.

It seems difficult, however, to open a discussion now on the amendments suggested by Mr. Nash. The questions he raises in his text are delicate questions and, furthermore, they have not yet been translated into French. It seems, therefore, that, although I would like to give him satisfaction, it is impossible to start a discussion now, whilst he is here, of his rather elaborate text. However, if certain Delegations would like to get into touch directly with Mr. Nash, and submit to certain observations on his text, I believe it would be an excellent idea: it would certainly facilitate the discussions on Article 33 when we come to them at a later stage.

(After a pause).

We will now continue the discussion on Article 3. We had arrived at the second part of this Article, the first sentence of which reads as follows: "Members agree that, while the achievement and maintenance of effective demand and employment must depend primarily on domestic measures," and so forth. The first part of this sentence is the one we are now going to discuss.

We have three amendments on this text. The first amendment is one by Cuba, which says - it is on page 5 of the document you have before you - "Members agree that while the achievement and maintenance of effective demand high and stable production and useful employment opportunities based upon a large and growing demand must depend primarily on domestic measures. .".

We have then another amendment, by the New Zealand Delegation -- it is on the following page: "Members agree that, while the achievement and maintenance of high and steadily rising levels of effective demand, " and so forth; and then a third amendment, by the Delegation of the United States, which is more or less similar to the Cuban suggestion. It says: "Members agree that, while the achievement and maintenance of high and stable production, useful employment opportunities, and large and growing demand must depend primarily on domestic resources. . . "

I now open the discussion on these various amendments to the first part of Paragraph 2 of Article 3. If any Delegation, other than the authors of the amendments, wishes to express its views, I shall be glad to authorise them to speak. If the Delegations so desire, they can also submit to the Sub-Committee any text they wish to have examined by it.

The observations will in principle be submitted to the Sub-Committee. However, if a Delegation specifically insists now that the one or the other point be discussed, I will be very happy to allow them to express their views.

CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The three Amendments will therefore be transmitted to this Sub-Committee.

A little further in the text there is the mention of international action. In this respect we have a couple of Amendments. Cuba has sent in an Amendment which specifies what kind of international action is meant, and defines this action by saying that the international action should be the one as stipulated in the Charter. It therefore introduces a new idea - a complement to the international action. On the other hand there is a suggestion by the delegation of the Netherlands, which tends rather to limit international actions to Members whose substantial interests are affected. I wonder if this is perhaps the best way to express this idea, and if it would not be better to say Members whose essential interests are affected but the general idea of the Dutch Amendment is to limit the scope of the international action.

And then we have a United States Amendment which is rather formal and has not a very heavy bearing.

I would suggest, as everybody agrees, to send these Amendments to the Sub-Committee for their examination.

MR. CHENANG (China): I support the Amendment of the Netherlands Delegation.

M. ROYER (France): Mr. Chairman, you said a while ago that

the Amendment submitted by the United States Delegate was purely an amendment regarding wording. We did not understand that exactly, as you seem to have understood it, and we would like to know what is exactly meant by the international action to be agreed upon. Is this to be agreed by the General Assembly, for instance, or by the Member States, or which is the exact meaning of these words?

I would appreciate if the representative of the United States would specify this point a little further.

Then, as regards the suggestion of the Delegate of Holland, we do not understand that his suggestion really wants to limit international action. As we can understand it, it wants to prevent all countries, even those that have no particular interest in the question, from taking action. I think this limitation has to be taken care of, but we do not think that international action as such would be limited in any way by this Amendment; but we would like to have some precision on that point.

Mr. WILCOX (United States): In our discussion of the text of the Charter the question was raised whether it might be the intention or the effect of the present wording of this paragraph, by indirection, at least, to amend or change the powers or authority of the United Nations or the Economic and Social Council.

Clearly that was not our intention, and it was the purpose of this wording to clarify that point. I think perhaps some other wording might accomplish that purpose equally well, but certainly it was not the intention of the Drafters of the Charter to attempt in any way to alter the basic instrument of the United Nations with respect to the authority of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom): While agreeing that this should go to the Sub-Committee for further consideration, we hope that nothing will be done in any way to limit the procedure which is now set out in Article 32.

I think the Netherlands amendment as it is at present drafted does appear to limit that action, and I am not quite happy about the United States amendment. I can well understand that point which Mr. Wilcox has in mind when he has just said that they might wish to consider some other words of getting the same result; but if the words were left in as he has them, I think one might read into it even such a thing as a power of veto.

It says, international action to be agreed upon, and it may at the same time be open to someone to say they do not agree. I know Mr. Wilcox has not that in mind, and I should hope we can give effect to whatever was intended with perhaps a simpler form of words. I do not see myself there is this danger of attempting to dictate the powers of the Economic and Social Council, even as they stand in the text at present; but perhaps the Sub-Committee could bear in mind Mr. Wilcox's point and at the same time ensure there is no attempt made to limit the powers that we want to put into this clause.

Mr. John J. DEUTSCH (Canada): Mr. Chairman, we are also worried about the possible effect of Mr. Wilcox's amendment upon the authority of the Economic and Social Council. We should not like to see the authority and responsibility of that Council reduced in any way by an amendment brought in here. We would not like to see the authority of the Economic and Social Council in his employment field limited by amendments brought in here. We likewise would like to have the Subcommittee keep that in mind when they come to consider this amendment.

Dr. P.S. LOKANATHAN (India): Mr. Chairman, I should like to make just one observation upon the amendment proposed by Cuba. I do not think that the amendment really translates the idea behind this paragraph. It will be recalled that in the London Report there is a definite paragraph in the Report on Page 5. You will see a sort of action which is contemplated by international agencies, and certainly such methods of action go outside the Charter. Therefore, if you limit it to action as stipulated in the Charter, you are narrowing the scope. You will see, if you turn to Page 5 of the London Report, paragraph 2 of section G, that the sort of action contemplated here is: "In addition to a consideration of the effects on employment and production of a lowering of barriers to trade, such studies might well cover such measures as the synchronization of credit policies so as to ease terms of borrowing over a wide area in times of general deflationary pressure, arrangements to promote stability in the incomes, and so in the buying power, of producers of primary products, the timing of expenditure on

international capital projects and the encouragement of a flow of capital in periods of world deflationary pressure to those countries whose balance of payments needs temporary support in order to enable them to maintain their domestic policies for full and productive employment". Therefore, it is obvious that what was contemplated under this paragraph was action which is certainly a little outside the Charter, and therefore to say that it should be as stipulated in the Charter is not getting the idea properly. I also have another observation to make on another amendment. I do not believe that the language itself is very happy, because the words "substantial interests" are affected. I think the point of this paragraph is to carry international action forward, ^{and} promote employment in all countries. There is no limitation here. That is to say, the idea is to have recourse to action which would promote employment in all countries, and if you narrow the scope to include action only for members whose substantial interests are affected, I do not think we are translating the idea properly. Apart from that, if the object, on the other hand, of this amendment is to provide for action among the countries which are especially interested in particular things, there is nothing to prevent such a course of action being adopted under paragraph 2 as it stands. For instance, nothing prevents Belgium, Holland, France and other countries which are neighbours taking certain courses of action: that is quite possible and allowable under paragraph 2 as it stands. If, on the other hand, the object is to limit it to action of members whose substantial interests are affected, I would submit with all respect that that is not the spirit of this paragraph. The spirit is to allow all countries to resort to action with a view to maintaining employment in all countries and not merely particular countries.

M. L. COTZEM (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with some remarks made by the Delegate of India but I think that the course of some remarks which are made now lies in the translation which has been made for our amendment. We made it this time in French and we have said "Une action concertée entre les membres substantiellement intéressés". This has been translated by "Concerted action among members whose substantial interests are affected", but that, as far as I can see, is quite another thing.

CHAIRMAN: May I ask the delegate for the Netherlands what he exactly means by "substantially interested countries"? Does he mean countries who have large interests in the problem?

M. L. COTZEM (Netherlands): Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I think that, after all these observations, the question can be sent on to the Sub-Committee.

We have now a last amendment submitted by the delegate of Cuba which consists of extracting a number of sentences on information and making special paragraph out of them. The paragraph would read as follows: "Members furthermore agree that the regular interchange of information and views among members with respect to possible cooperation is indispensable and should be facilitated by the organization". I believe there is no observation on this amendment and we can accept this right away. Agreed. There are several amendments on Article 4. I am now going to ask you the same question that I asked when we discussed Article 2.

- 103 -

Does anyone wish to speak on one or the other point, it being understood, however, that it should only deal with the question of substance if we take up the question here.

Mr. L.D. MARTINS (Brazil) (Interpretation): I have a general remark to make about this paragraph. I think it is desirable to use in English the complete expression already used in French where we speak of demand; demand for products, goods and services the same as we did in paragraph 3 of Article 1. I think that if we express this precision we might create some lack of exactitude in our text, therefore I would suggest that the English text be completed to be entirely in accordance with the French text.

CHAIRMAN: I suppose everyone agrees with the declaration just made by the representative of Brazil?

Mr. CHAIR WILCOX (United States): I would suggest that wherever the phrases concerning production, employment and demand recur they involve the same points that we were discussing earlier in the day. That matter will be referred to the Drafting Committee. There is however in the amendment which we have suggested for paragraph 3 of Article 4 one other point, the purpose of which I should like to explain. As the paragraph now reads it says: "Each member shall seek to avoid creating balance-of-payments difficulties for other members." Our amendment proposes: "Members shall seek to avoid measures which would have the effect of creating balance-of-payments difficulties for other members." The

point of that suggestion is this: there is here and elsewhere in the Chapter the implication that the balance-of-payments difficulties is something that one country does to another country, and that might even be the possible inference that drafters of these paragraphs had intended to impute malice to the countries responsible for the creation of such difficulties. One gets a mental picture of a group of officials in a capital, let us say Washington, sitting round the table and conferring and asking themselves, "How, how can we harm somebody?" And somebody says, "I know, we will create balance-of-payments difficulties." I am sure that is not what is intended, and it is the purpose of our proposed amendment here and one which we are suggesting for a later Article, to make the wording entirely neutral as to this matter about motivation without in any way changing the substance of the commitments that are involved.

CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The Delegate for Australia.

Mr. A. H. TANGE (Australia): Mr. Chairman, the Australian Delegation would support the United States re-drafting of this second part of the second paragraph. We think it is a much better expression of the idea.

There is also a proposal by the Delegation of Cuba on the same paragraph, proposing that the words "seek to" before "avoid" should be deleted. We would feel some difficulty in supporting that amendment, because we think it would be very difficult to accept a binding commitment that in no circumstances would you use measures which would have the effect of creating balance-of-payments difficulties for other Members. It seems to us that the present text is designed to call upon Members to choose a method which has the least possible effect on the balance-of-payments of other Members, and if there were one method which has no effect and one which has, they will be expected to choose the one which has no effect. But it seems to us impossible to foresee that in no circumstances will you take measures which would have a harmful effect on the balance-of-payments of other Members. There may be circumstances in which a country desiring to maintain employment and demand is obliged to use quantitative restrictions. It may use these quantitative restrictions under the strict terms of Article 26, but there is no certainty that at times the use of quantitative restrictions under Article 26 might cause difficulties of balance-of-payments for others. We think the present text should be retained.

There is a second question, Mr. Chairman; the United States' suggestion that the word "Production" should be introduced into Paragraph 2 of Article 4. Earlier on we raised no objection to the introduction of the word "Production" into Paragraph 1 of Article 3. We have some doubts about it being put into Paragraph 2 of Article 4 and we had intended to submit our views on that direct to the Drafting Committee. We thought it might be useful to raise in this full committee the question whether or not the word "Production" should go into Article 4 too. It seems to us that the implications there are somewhat wider.

It will be noted that the first paragraph of Article 4 contains a pledge by Members that they shall "take action designed to achieve and maintain full and productive employment and high and stable levels of effective demand. . .".

It seems to us somewhat illogical to introduce into Paragraph 2 suddenly the word "Production", which appears to come from nowhere, and it seems to us it does raise a good many wider implications, implications wider than employment policy as such, to have an obligation that any measure to sustain production shall be consistent with the other purposes and provisions of the Charter, and for that reason we are inclined to support the existing text.

CHAIRMAN (interpretation): We have thus the parts of the amendment suggested by the United States. We have first the idea of obligation for the member states to take no measures to hamper the balance of payments of other countries.

We have also heard the observations of the Australian delegate, and we have a Cuban amendment. The Cuban amendment is more or less the same as the United States amendment, although it appears to be slightly less precise.

Can I take it that the Commission agrees with the principle of these changes in the drafting of the text being reserved for the sub-committee.

DR. P.S. MORGENTHAU (India): Mr. Chairman, we of the Indian delegation cannot accept the deletion of the words "shall seek". We consider that as vital. We cannot therefore accept the amendment to the Cuban delegation which said "delete the words 'shall seek'", because we do not want the imposition of their task more general than that, and the words "shall seek" are very important and operative words.

The second point I would like to make is we are quite agreeable to the suggestion from the U.S. delegate that the implication that a country is creating balance-of-payment difficulties must be avoided, but in so doing we have to safeguard ourselves against the effect of the amendment proposed by the U.S. delegation that is we do not want the obligation to be made more specific than at present exists, and I am not sure whether the words of the amendment

"Members shall seek to avoid measures which would have the effect of creating balance-of-payments difficulties" do not make the obligation more specific than it stands at present. I am not sure with my ignorance of English, and I would like to know from the English delegation for instance whether the two things are identical or whether the amendment which is now made by the U.S. delegation makes the obligation more specific than it is at present. The present obligation is just simply this "shall seek to avoid measures which would have the effect of creating balance-of-payments difficulties". Therefore, if the obligation is made more specific, we shall object.

MR. H. WILSON (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I do not know why our Indian friend should apply to my delegation - least of all to the delegation headed by a Yorkshireman - for authority on the English language, but as it happens, I was going to raise that same point myself.

First, on the United States amendment all I was going to say was that if any one can read the imputation in it which Mr. Wilcox has mentioned, then I think it should certainly be amended in the way Mr. Wilcox suggests.

Secondly, I do think it is important to retain those words "seek to". I think if those words were deleted it might place a bigger burden, a tighter obligation, and it would place on the country the obligation of considering not only the direct but also possibly an indirect and unforeseeable course of action that might be taken, and I would strongly support the maintenance in the text of these words "seek to".

CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): May I ask the delegate for Cuba if he maintains his amendment to the American amendment?

Mr. R.L. FREQUENT (Cuba): I am sorry, I am not authorised to change the position of our delegation in that respect.

CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Then we send the question back to the sub-committee.

CHAIRMAN (interpretation): We have now still another point on Article 4. This is relative to the words "full and productive employment". We have two suggestions for the substitution of these words by others. One is by the Delegation of New Zealand and consists in saying "high and steadily rising levels". The other is a suggestion made by the United States of America, to say "large and growing demand". Are there any observations on these suggestions?

Mr. HOLLOWAY (South Africa): We have three expressions now in two articles, three suggestions - "high and steadily rising" - "high and stable" - and "large and growing". There is one word which includes each of them - optimum. It cuts out all unnecessary questions. I suggest we cut them all out and substitute 'optimum'. It is perfectly good English.

Mr. JUSSIANT (Belgium): Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the word 'optimum' in this connection would be the most adequate. In fact it does not give the idea of growing, which we are trying to introduce in this text.

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom): I do not want to inject a lot of controversy in this important subject, but my impression of 'optimum', like many other expressions used by Cambridge economists, is that it is a word they use when they cannot think of a better word clearly to define what they are trying to say. If we must have such a word, I would say 'maximum', which has a very different meaning, more in accord with what I want to say - but I am quite sure this can be left to the Sub-Committee to reconcile in accordance with their discussions of Article 3.

Mr. NASH (New Zealand): I hope there will be some thought given to the import of "high and steadily rising". It is obviously looking forward to something better. Some things grow smaller instead of larger, and I do hope that those words that were originally used, and that everyone in the Economic and Social Council complimented the Drafting Committee on finding, would continue to be used.

I do not think we could possibly have "high and stable". "Stable" suggests you stop at some time. It is always level and even. "High and steadily rising" means it is going to be better, if they get the production the United States Delegate talks about, which is better for everyone.

I hope when you refer it to the Commission they will take into account the real implication of those words "steadily rising", because that is entirely in accord with the purpose of the Charter.

Mr. MARTINS (Brazil) (Interpretation): The Brazilian Delegation wants to second entirely the explanations given by the representative of New Zealand.

CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I believe the question can now be sent on to the Sub-Committee.

We come now to Article 5. Here we have a first Amendment by Cuba. The original text, as you can see in the document, started by saying, "each Member recognising that all countries have a common interest in the form etc.", and Cuba suggests the insertion of a new word, so that the text would read: "Each Member recognising that all countries have a common interest in

the achievement and maintenance" instead of only "maintenance of fair labour standards".

I believe there will be no objection to this addition.

CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Do you all agree?

The Cuban Amendment is therefore accepted.

We have two more Amendments, one has been submitted by the United Kingdom, the other by the United States. They seem to me to have more or less the same scope, and deal with the measures to be taken. The amendment submitted by the United Kingdom suggests that the Members shall take severally and in collaboration with the appropriate inter-Governmental organisations whatever action may be desirable, feasible, and so forth. The United States Amendment, which tends to more or less the same thing as the British Amendment, consists of an addition to the Article, the addition being as follows:-

"In pursuance of this objective Members shall give sympathetic consideration to recommendations made by the appropriate inter-Governmental Organisations".

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom): As you say, both these alternative Drafts are made with the same purpose, and we do not feel very strongly about either of them. I have a slight prejudice in favour of our own - perhaps that is only natural - I mean there are one or two points about the fact that perhaps not all Members of the ITO, when finally established and when everyone joins who we hope will join, may be at the same time Members of the ILO. That may involve one or two difficulties

if the United States Amendment is accepted.

What I would suggest is that if this is referred to the Sub-Committee, perhaps the views of the ILO Representative here might be sought on this matter, as to the best form of words to give effect to what we both have in mind .

Mr. GOFFIN (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with what was said by Mr. Wilson that both Amendments have the purport of the same thing; but the main question for me is what are the powers of the ILO. If the ILO have the same powers, that means executive powers, as the ITO, then I prefer for myself the Amendment made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. If not, I certainly prefer the Amendment made by the United States; so I should like to have some explanation on that point first.

Mr. NASH (New Zealand): There is one Amendment mentioned there that I think it is worth while taking a certain word out of the Cuban, British and U.S. Resolutions for. That is "export and generally", the inference behind that, Mr. Chairman, is that there can be different conditions for export production. But there is no need to mention it. Why not say, "for production throughout its jurisdiction". It infers two types of production and two standards, and I think those words could still be left out without in any way reducing its meaning or import, and rather making it more beneficial.

CHAIRMAN: I had intended to examine the New Zealand amendment after the amendments of the United Kingdom and the United States had been disposed of. However, as I have been asked what is the status of the International Labour Organisation, may I ask the representative of this Organisation to tell us what his opinion on this point is?

Mr. C.W.H. WEAVER (International Labour Organisation):
Mr. Chairman, it is not, of course, for the representative of the International Labour Organisation to express an opinion on the amendments before you. What I have to remind the Commission of is this, that the International Labour Organisation has existed since 1919, and has passed a whole series of conventions and recommendations relating to labour conditions throughout the world, which is called the International Labour Code. Now, you cannot neglect the International Labour Code in your consideration of fair labour conditions for the future international Trade Organisation, and my only suggestion is simply that you should have at all levels coordination of activities between the International Labour Organisation and the International Trade Organisation.

I do not wish to suggest anything more. I do not wish to attempt to suggest any better wording or to express a preference for any wording of the amendment before you. The United States amendment has one slight inconvenience from our point of view in that it uses the word "recommendation", which we have used in a very technical sense, and therefore I would suggest something rather more general than the words of the United States amendment. But what I want to point out is that at all stages, the International Trade Organisation should have complete and constant collaboration with the International Labour Organisation.

M. Max Suctens has been President of our Conference--he knows perfectly well what we have been doing, and the whole thing is, if I may say so, a complete system which can be, of course, elaborated by the International Labour Organisation, but which in respect of labour conditions must be left to us.

Mr. CLAIR WIECOM (United States): I think the purpose of the amendment suggested by the United Kingdom and the one suggested by the United States is the same. I should like to indicate why I prefer our wording. It seems to me that the wording suggested by the United Kingdom would impose upon members an obligation to adopt measures recommended by the International Labour Organization. There may be members of the Trade Organization that are not members of the Labour Organization, and if I am correctly informed, members of the Labour Organization are not obligated to accept recommendations, so that I think that, in that respect, the wording suggested by the United Kingdom is not so good. On the other hand, the wording suggested, substituting the word "desirable" for the word "appropriate", is not good either. It seems to me that "desirable" is a weaker word, and "appropriate" a stronger word in this context and that it is the existing wording which should be maintained. With respect to the point made by the representative of the ILO concerning the word "recommendation", I should be happy to adopt other wording that would avoid the technical difficulties involved there.

Dr. HOLLOWAY (South Africa): I would like to support the amendment proposed by the United States of America. It seems to me to meet the intention fully. I would just comment on one word which occurs in that - in the British amendment and the original text as well. I think perhaps the Sub-Committee might

devote their attention to finding something better than a question-begging phrase like "sub-standard" - an ugly word too, in any case. There is no recognised international standard, and I think all that it means is the best labour conditions, and rather than admit standards which do not exist, standards by which we cannot measure, the Sub-Committee might try to find a better word.

M. J. JUSTIART (Belgium) (Interpretation): It seems to us that this question of sub-standard conditions is of special interest if we think of export industries and that, in certain cases, it would be good to have an initiative coming from the ITO itself in this field. We therefore would suggest, to complete and to add something to the United States suggestion so that, spontaneously or on the initiative of the ITO, something could be done in this field without expecting initiative exclusively from other international organizations. This would of course not impair any relations with the ILO but I believe that we should make it possible, when the conditions are such that the initiative from the ITO is desirable, that this initiative should be taken.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone else want to speak on this amendment?

Mr. R.L. PRESQUET (Cuba): Only to support the proposal already made by the delegate of Belgium.

Mr. C.W.H. WEAVER (ILO): I do not know whether I should say anymore about the ILO. You all know, of course, that the ILO is

an association of member states which are a part of the Organization. At our Conferences we have represented the governments and the workers. Therefore all initiative, from whatever side, can be put forward. The conclusion and decisions of the International Labour Organization take the form of international conventions which come into force when they are ratified by the states, members of the Organization. That is a reply, I think, a little collated to the remark of the delegate of the Netherlands. These are the principle decisions of the ILO. In addition to that there are recommendations which I referred to a little while ago, but the main point I want to bring out is that the ILO, which has already existed thirty-seven years, is an association of states in which are represented governments, workers and employers, and in which there is every possible facility for free expression of opinion, and the results of the ILO discussions take the form of international conventions which, when they are ratified, become international law just the same as the decisions of any other international organization.

CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I believe that we can send the question to the Sub-Committee.

We still have the amendment of New Zealand which has been explained by Mr. Nash recently and which consists in suppression of the words "for export and generally" towards the end of the paragraph.

M.J. JUSSIANT (Belgium) (Interpretation): I would say that I cannot agree with the suppression of the words "for export" which is suggested. I know that the conditions in the export industries, industries working specially for export, are allied to those in the other industries, those that work mainly for the domestic market, but here we do not set up a Labour Charter but a Trade Charter, an International Trade Charter, and I believe that we must maintain the words here "for export" if we want to follow the principle that we are setting up a Charter on International Trade.

M. R.L. PRESQUET (Cuba): Mr. Chairman, we identify ourselves with the statement of the gentleman from Belgium.

M. L.D. MARTINS (Brazil) (Interpretation): We also want to second the point of view expressed by the representative of Belgium on the necessity of mentioning export trade in relation with this Article. We believe indeed that here the problem is a problem of trade and not a problem of labour.

Dr. P.S. LOKANATHAN (India): It may be of some use to this meeting if we recall the reason why the words "export and

general" are retained in this Article. As a matter of fact when this Article was discussed in London several delegations, including India, opposed the introduction of an Article like this because most of us felt that this was properly treated by the I.L.O. The reason that persuaded us to accept this article as it stood, later on, was that in the main the products which were likely to be exported and were produced under sub-standard conditions were creating disturbances in the market, and we were especially impressed by the point of view presented by the Cuban Delegation in particular, that such sub-standard conditions pertaining especially in foreign industries were matters which should be taken up by I.T.O. And it was only because of that that the Indian delegation which had made their reservation in this Article subsequently withdrew that reservation.

Secondly, and I think most of the Indians - would not like to have a double standard, one for local production and another for export.

Thirdly, the reason why "export and generally" may be retained has been stated like this: that is, as has been pointed out, that we are dealing with an International Trade Charter and therefore it is proper that "export and generally" should be retained.

I have complete sympathy with the point of view presented by Mr. Nash, that there is no necessity to distinguish substandard conditions that are provided for local products from those provided for export products.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wilcox.

Mr. CLAIR WILCOX (United States): The Article already provides that a Member shall maintain fair labour standards within or throughout its jurisdiction. If it does so, it will maintain fair labour standards in production for export, because it does not produce for export outside of its jurisdiction. Consequently the phrase which Mr. Nash proposes to delete is superfluous and unnecessary. I have no objection, however, to its retention.

There is one point, however, which has been raised and that has to do with its connection with the rest of the Chapter. We are concerned in this Chapter with the question of effective demand, and demand depends in part upon the maintenance of labour standards; that is true both in production for export and in production for domestic consumption. So, whilst I am in complete agreement with the amendment suggested by the representative of New Zealand, I do not think it is a matter to which we should attach very great importance.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nash.

The Rt. Hon. WALTER NASH (New Zealand): The point I would like to stress here at the moment is the non-understandability of the United States position. First of all, he says it is unnecessary, it is redundant, but "Oh, let it stay there." Well, if we have words like that, which have no meaning and are unnecessary, right through the Charter, I think it will take much longer than this year to get through.

I submit the whole of the Chapter refers to national activity and not international trade. It is the responsibility to find national employment, not for the purpose of international trade but national employment has its effect on international trade. Then I submit too, in connection with the wording of the actual Article itself, it reaches a point of absurdity when it says "Each Member, recognising that all countries have a common interest in the maintenance of fair labour standards" - and you must put in there 'for export' - "related to national productivity . . . for export and generally. . .".

I submit the words are unnecessary; they give a wrong connotation to the whole of the Article, because they infer that there may be two standards: one, that this Organisation has something to do with international trade; the other, that it has nothing to do with it. I cannot see a case for this wording unless we agreed to two standards, and then it would say it is not applicable - if you will allow me to use a word which has been used here once before. You cannot determine in a factory that produces commodities what its standards are, related to its export sales and its national sales. Who is to determine? If you do not want to determine that, why put in the words "for export".

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate for Cuba.

Mr. R. L. FRISCHOFF (Cuba): Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me to go back to Article 4, I am happy to say that I can now, on behalf of the Cuban Delegation, withdraw our amendment to Article 4.

CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I thank the Cuban Delegate very much for his declaration. I think that now we can adopt the United States amendment. Is everybody agreed?

(Agreed).

CHAIRMAN: We are unfortunately not agreed as far as the New Zealand amendment is concerned.

Mr. L.D. MARTINS (Brazil) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I think I owe an explanation for the approval we have given to the Belgian proposal when the question came up to maintain or suppress the word "for export" in Article 5. It is true that if Articles 3 and 4 are nearer to the domestic possibilities in the matter of trade, Articles 5, 6, 7 and 8 really deal more with the consequences of international trade and therefore I do not think that we would use the word "for export." I do not think that there would be a disagreement with the whole of the Chapter maintaining this word "for export." As for the creation of a true standard of life, which is the question which turned up just now, one for export industries and the other for domestic industries, I do not think that there is a problem here. We can, of course, ^{between} not distinguish ^{and that} this industry, but we can choose the products which are normally in a certain country destined for export; for instance in Cuba sugar is normally an export product, in Brazil coffee is normally an export product, so therefore, I do not think that it is necessary to suppress the words "for export" in the text. On the contrary, these words have their utility and have a certain reason to be there and their suppression could really lead to different interpretations of the text than the meaning we really want to give to it.

CHAIRMAN: I wonder if it is really necessary to continue the discussion on this point. The text as it is, I believe, gives satisfaction to Mr. Nash. What Mr. Nash wants is that there be no two sectors with different conditions, the one working for export, the other generally, and if I read the text as it is, at least in strength it seems to give complete satisfaction to Mr. Nash. I mean to say that there the sub-standard conditions must disappear both in the production for export and generally. Therefore, I do not see any contradiction with the desires expressed by the representative of New Zealand. Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It appears to me that now we have finished with the discussion of Article 5. It is too late now to start the discussion of Article 6, which as you know is an important Article, and on which we have many Amendments.

Before we depart, however, I would like to make a suggestion concerning the Sub-Committee which is going to study the Amendments.

Could we suggest having a small Committee of five Members, as you know a small number works much better than a large Committee. However, it would be understood that for each Amendment this Committee should work in collaboration with the representative of the Delegations which are most interested in the Amendment. It would, therefore, not preclude the participation of other Delegations than the five I am going to indicate. I would suggest the following Delegations as Members of the Sub-Committee:-

Cuba, Belgium, United States of America, Australia and India.

Do you all agree with this suggestion?

I suggest this Sub-Committee meets first to-morrow afternoon.

We will start discussion on Article 5 on Friday.

To-morrow we will discuss the Chilean Amendment on Article 14.

The Meeting is closed.

The Meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.