

a.1

E/PC/T/C.V/PV/13.

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL  
PREPARATORY COMMITTEE  
of the  
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND EMPLOYMENT.

Verbatim Report  
of the  
THIRTEENTH MEETING  
of  
COMMITTEE V  
held in  
Convocation Hall,  
Church House, Westminster  
on  
Wednesday, 13th November, 1946  
at  
3.00 pm.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynn K. EDWINSTER (USA).

.....

Corrigendum to Document E/PC/T/C.V/PV/8.

- Page 5, sixth line from top of page, correct spelling of name to MR.  
TAIT after words "this statement from".  
Page 7, first line from top of page, correct spelling of name to MR.  
TAIT before "(I.L.O.)".  
Page 7, fifth line from top of page, substitute word "Body" for  
"Board".  
Page 7, fifth line from bottom of page, insert words "certain aspects  
of" between words "on" and "the matter".

.....

(From the Shorthand notes of  
W.B. GURNEY, SONS & FUNNELL,  
56, Victoria Street,  
Westminster, S.W. 1.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The first subject on our agenda this afternoon will be a consideration of Articles 64, 65 and 66 dealing with the functions of the three Commissions. I want to make some preliminary suggestions with reference to the method of handling the obligations of Committee V with reference to those articles.

It is, I think, quite apparent that the main responsibility for the substance of those articles should rest with the other Committees of this Conference which have been concerned with the fields of activity under the Charter with respect to which these Commissions would be respectively set up. Hence it would seem to the Chair that our responsibility would be chiefly one of seeing to it that the recommendations made by the other Committees with regard to the functional and organisational implications of the work which they have done on the Charter, and the drafts which they have approved, are carried out in the organisational part of this document in the part with which Committee V is concerned.

In order to accomplish that, the Chairman of your Committee and the Secretary have already taken a great deal of initiative to secure from the other Committees any information or suggestions which they may wish to make, arising out of the work in their respective fields, to this Committee. Unfortunately, our efforts have not, as yet, met with complete response. We have some partial results, of which I shall speak in a moment. I think that what we would be well advised to do is to try to obtain all the information that we can from these other Committees, that they should take the initiative in furnishing their information and suggestions to us; and that then, in addition, we should discuss in a preliminary way -- and we could do that this afternoon -- these Articles from the point of view of any suggestions or points that might occur to anyone in the Committee as properly emanating from Committee V, if there is anything additional that any member of this Committee might wish to bring up. Then, after we have gone over these

Articles in this Committee, my suggestion would be that we appoint a small Sub-Committee, whose duty it would be to take the results of our discussion this afternoon on these Commissions, and to take in hand any information or suggestions which have already come in from the other Committees or from individual Delegations relative to these articles, or any information that we may yet obtain as a result of the initiative which your Chairman and Secretary have already taken to obtain information. That material should be given to this small Sub-Committee.

The Sub-Committee would examine it to see whether there are any problems growing out of it which should be referred back to this Committee.

It might well be that there would be nothing that would need to be brought up in this Committee. It might well be that the suggestions that come from the other Committees would be mere suggestions that the Interim Drafting Committee carry out certain suggested changes in these Articles. For example, we have already received from Committee IV a series of suggestions with regard to drafting changes which would carry out the functions which have been set up in the Chapter to which they have now, at least tentatively, reached agreement. It may be that all that would be necessary would be for these suggested changes with respect to the Commodity Commission, or with respect to other Articles that have been made by Committee IV to be simply turned over to the Interim Drafting Committee to be taken into account before we meet again in the Spring. That would be for this small Sub-Committee to scrutinise.

That is the way that I suggest we go about this matter of discussing and disposing of these Articles on the Commissions this afternoon. I would like to find out whether it meets with the approval of the Committee.

MR. BURY (Australia): I think your proposal, Mr. Chairman, is a very good one. I would like to make a further suggestion in view of the small amount of time available to us and the amount of work we have to do. It is that, as we have discussed the Commissions in general terms, the remaining duty is to fit the scheme of Commissions in general to each of these other Committees, and that is very difficult to do except in the context of the work of these other Committees. For instance, Articles 65 and 66 will have to be perhaps fundamentally recast as a result of the work of those Committees, and it seems to me very difficult for us at this point to go further than see what their propositions are, and then link them together, so that there is some logic about the system of Commissions as a whole. If we could do that, we could appoint a Sub-Committee to do this job, and then perhaps go on to other business.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see the point which the Delegate of Australia has raised, and I think there is a great deal of force in it. The difficulty is that if this Committee is to have any opportunity to comment upon the functions of these various Commissions as set forth in the Charter -- and I certainly understand that the main responsibility for the content of those articles does fall on the other Committees -- it seems to me that today is just about the last opportunity. If anybody has anything to say about these articles, if they have anything they want to bring out from the standpoint of this Committee, this is the day when it has to be done. If the Committee wants to do so, it can, of course, leave our discussions on Committees where it stood when we were discussing the general composition and procedure of Commissions, and simply take no more responsibility, and pass it over to the Sub-Committee to consider the problem of how the various suggestions coming from the other Committees shall be worked into this document in proper juxtaposition and relationship to the whole of Section E on Commissions, and let it go

E/PC/T/C.V/PV/13.

at that. If the Committee did that, I should think it would mean that our full Committee would practically have to give a parting salute to the subject today, because there will be no opportunity to go back and review it and reconsider it in this Committee. I think there would scarcely be any opportunity between now and the time the report has to go in.

Some of these Committees, Committee II, for example, are going to be very tardy in making their suggestions to us, and the same will be true possibly in one or two other Committees. We have had great difficulty in getting anything out of Committee III on cartels. I have been trying desperately to get something from that Committee. It is very vital that they give us their ideas on business practices, because as they have drafted the Charter, practically the whole meaning of that Section depends upon how it is administered by a Commission on business practices. We ought to have their best ideas as to whether the section on the Commission on business practices is satisfactory in the Charter as it stands, or whether they think there is some improvement needed. We do have some suggestions from the Delegate of the United Kingdom, but we ought to have something from the Committee.

I do not know whether the Committee wants just to drop this matter of Commissions today, to appoint a small sub-committee, and say that from this point on it is a mere drafting matter concerned with what has been handed to us from the other Committees or Delegations or what may henceforth be received. It is problematical how much more we are going to get, and how soon. That is the situation. I have talked a great deal, but I am myself somewhat perplexed about how to handle this situation.

B.1.

E/PC/T/C.V/PV/13

SEÑOR ALAMILLO (Cuba): The Cuban delegations has presented two amendments to Article 66, paragraphs 7 and 8. They are very easy to explain. We have been working very hard in Committee 4 in order to get the Commodity Council a certain liberty of action which we consider absolutely essential. If, as we hope, our point is accepted by Committee 4, then it will mean that these two paragraphs will have to be amended, because they state that the rules of procedure are to be given to each Commodity Council by the Commodity Commission and that the Chairman and Secretary are to be provided by the Commodity Commission to the Commodity Council. We think this should be so only if the Commodity Council demands it from the Commodity Commission because, if they wish to do so, they should have the right to establish their own rules and to designate their own secretary and provide their own chairman. We feel so strongly on this point that if Committee 4 does not approve of our suggestion (which will necessarily entail the modification of these two paragraphs) Cuba would make a special reservation in order to be able to propose those modifications in January.

I only call the attention of this Committee to those points so that the Drafting Committee may have them in mind when they draft the final report of this Committee in respect of Committee 4, and also so that I shall have an opportunity to make these reservations if the final draft does not meet our point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Two other members have asked for the floor, but before recognising them, I should say that the document which was transmitted to the Chairman of this Committee yesterday from the Chairman of Committee 4 seems to contain suggestions which cover the two matters to which the delegate of Cuba has referred. I should have indicated in my opening remarks a little more fully what had been transmitted to me by the

Chairman of Committee 4. Perhaps I had better say now, so that it may be put into the record, that I have this short communication from him. The communication reads:

"In redrafting Chapter 6 of the Charter, this Committee has, except in one instance, used the term 'organization' without specifying the part of the organization which should perform the particular administrative function to which reference is made. Although Committee 5 will doubtless consider this matter in relation to other sections of its work, it is felt that some guidance from Committee 4 may be helpful. The ideas of the Drafting Sub-Committee of Committee 4 as to the allocation of functions to various parts of the organization relating to commodity arrangements, is set out on the attached Schedule. A copy of the redrafted Chapter 6 is attached for reference."

Then we have a copy of redrafted Chapter 6 on Inter-governmental arrangements, and we have an indication in an appended document as to the suggested authority within the organization to which certain functions that are set forth in the commodity part of this document who should perform them - the functional follow-through into the organizational part of the Charter of the contents of the Commodity Chapter of the Charter.

That is a document, so far as the commodity policy is concerned, which would be turned over to the small Sub-Committee which I suggested earlier should be set up.

I am going to recognize the two members who have asked for the floor, but I believe that it is incumbent upon me to clarify that matter in the light of what the delegate of Cuba has just said.

SEÑOR ALAMILLO (Cuba): Mr. Chairman, you will have to excuse me, but the report to which you have just referred is only the report of the Sub-Committee, and the Committee will meet only next Monday. We do not know if this report will be approved by the Committee, or if some changes will be introduced into it. I have gone through this report - which, by the way, is an extraordinarily well-drafted document - and I hope, as practically all the Sub-Committee hopes, that it will be approved in its entirety by Committee 4. However, it may not be. Therefore, as you were talking with such finality, as though we would have to say goodbye to this Article and never see it again, I must point out that it is possible that Committee 4 may not approve of our modifications, and I would like to have even one minute to say that we reserve our opposition. I do not want to do it now because it is possible that our point will be accepted by Committee 4.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate of France.

M. PALTHEY (France) (Interpretation): I would like to come back to the question of procedure concerning our study of Article 64 and those following, because it is within our terms of reference that we should go into the matter of these functions. I think that we, here, should undertake to study these Articles and that we really ought to be responsible, because we see the substance of them. I think that we should not accept even your suggestion - that we should hand it over to a Drafting Sub-Committee - because in my opinion, and not only in my opinion because it is shared by the heads of delegations and other Committees, that is only a Drafting Sub-Committee which will arrange what is given to them. Therefore I propose that we proceed in the following way: As you suggested, Mr. Chairman, we appoint a Sub-Committee to take cognizance of the different texts of all the reports from the four Committees and compare

them with the text of the Charter, and then report back to Committee 5 so that we can, with the necessary knowledge, proceed to a real discussion, which I think is part of our functions.

THE SECRETARY (Mr. Tait): May I add a word from the point of view of the Secretariat? The question of a timetable seems to me rather important in connection with our future procedure. Most of the other Committees will not finalise their reports until next Monday, or Tuesday at the very earliest. The last possible time that this Committee can have a meeting is on Tuesday morning because the final Plenary Sessions are to commence, according to the present timetable, on Tuesday afternoon and are to conclude possibly by Wednesday. I do not see how it is physically possible for this Committee, as a Committee, to give serious and considered attention to these articles in the light of the final recommendations of the other three Committees. If a way could be suggested whereby that could be done, from the Secretariat's point of view we would, of course, co-operate wholeheartedly, but it seems to me to be physically impossible. I can see no other alternative to the kind of procedure suggested by the Chairman, namely, that the Committee, if they have views on these articles, should express those views now. Possibly we shall have one or two meetings during this week, but the substantive consideration of these articles will have to be left to the Interim Drafting Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or to the next session of the Preparatory Committee.

THE SECRETARY: Yes, to the next session of the Preparatory Committee itself, to be considered carefully and leisurely in the light of the work and reports finally presented by the other three Committees.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I add, and then it can be translated altogether,

that I think what the delegate of France suggested as to the proper order is thoroughly logical. I think that is the way to do it if we had the time. The question of time is all that is worrying me. The delegate of France.

M. PALTHEY (France) (Translation): I understand the reasons which have been put forward by the Secretary. I agree completely, - and if the Committee is agreeable, we might refer this question to the Drafting Committee or, better still, to the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee.

SEÑOR ALMILLILLA (Cuba): I also accept that solution because I see that it is the only practicable one. I would only say that if the amendment is not accepted, the reservation of Cuba will be considered as having been made in this meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me, then, that the net effect of the procedure that we seem to be agreeing upon is that these suggested changes in the Charter as affecting organisation - assuming that they are approved finally by Committee 4, or as revised and approved by Committee 4 - will simply go to the Interim Drafting Committee and will virtually bypass this Committee. The Interim Drafting Committee would not have substantive responsibilities, it would simply work them into the draft Charter. and, when the matter comes up again in the spring, there will be the draft which has been worked out by the Interim Committee in the light of suggestions arising out of this Conference, and if some member of the Conference is dissatisfied with the draft that has emanated from that process, he would have, of course, an opportunity then to declare it. That seems to me the way it would work out - this Committee will be virtually bypassed in respect of this report from Committee 4, which I hold in my hand.

MR. VAN TUYL (Netherlands): We have been discussing for an hour this question of procedure, and therefore I do not want to waste

B 6.

E/RC/T/C.V/PV/13

much more time on this question of Committee 5. With regard to your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, to appoint a Sub-Committee to go over all the suggestions of Committees 4, 3 and 2 in order to bring amendments to Articles 64, 65 and 66, it might perhaps be wise, in order to get quicker results, not to appoint one Sub-Committee, but three - one for each of the articles concerned. I make that suggestion for further consideration.

MR. DAS (China): I agree entirely with the suggestion of procedure from the Chair, but I wish to clear my mind on certain points. Is it correct to assume that the contents of functions will be decided by the other Committees, whether in a final or tentative form?

Our task if time permits will simply be to apportion the functions among the different Commissions. As we will not have time to discuss them, none of the members of the Committee will commit himself as to the number of Commissions to be set up, or the allocation of functions to various Commissions. The second point relates to the Sub-Committee which has been proposed. From the point of view of the report, will the findings or conclusions of the Sub-Committee form a separate part of the report of the Committee, or will they be in the form of an appendix to the Committee's report, and not be embodied in the report itself?

THE CHAIRMAN: I realise that I have talked a great deal, but I do not feel that any member of this Committee should be apologetic about the time we are spending on this matter. We are really deciding this afternoon how we are going to dispose of the assignment that has rested upon us with regard to these three major Commissions. We have to decide it under pressure. We cannot use quite the procedure we would probably have used if we had had plenty of time. This discussion of procedure may result in disposing of a very large segment of our part of the Charter in one fell swoop. I hope the Committee will not be uneasy that this discussion is somewhat sustained.

MR. HOUTMAN (Belgium/Luxembourg): (Interpretation): I wish that we could now pass to the discussion of the articles, and first article 63. Further, I wish it could be understood that those are only preliminary considerations, it being understood that we all reserve the right to come back to this question in the Drafting Committee or in the second session of the Preparatory Commission in the light of the work of the other Committees. Naturally, we want to avoid any lack of harmony between the results of our work and their work.

MR. COLBAN (Norway): Since you have invited us to speak about this, Mr. Chairman, I would like to put forward my view. We are here dealing with a number of articles setting forth the functions of the Commissions

the establishment of which we have already decided in Article 62. Article 64, 65 and 66 contain a list of functions; what these functions are does not depend upon us, but upon the different Committees of the Preparatory Commission. I think that it is a simple question of drafting to sum up these functions in the light of the decisions to which the other Committees of the Preparatory Committee may arrive. I do not think we are called upon to do anything more than simply say we approve of the scheme as set forth here, leaving it an open question what will be the exact wording of Articles 64, 65 and 66 when we know the results at which the other Committees arrive. That is a task that might quite well be entrusted to the Interim Drafting Committee. If the Drafting Committee comes up against any difficulty, it will certainly explain this difficulty to the second session of our Preparatory Committee. In that way we should not lose our time in any useless discussion about functions not yet decided upon by the proper organ of the Preparatory Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the Chilean Delegate, I want to say that I have great sympathy with the views expressed by the Delegate of Norway. I think the solution may be simply to drop further consideration of these three Articles and pass on to another part of the report, and simply leave the function of Committee V in this matter as one simply of transmitting to the Interim Drafting Committee the suggestions that are made by the various other Committees with regard to changes in the functions of these three Commissions as set forth in the Charter.

MR. MERINO (Chile) (Interpretation): I wish to ask you what will be the fate of the suggestion of the Chilean Delegation regarding the possible setting up of a Commission with a view to increasing the level of production, industrialisation and employment, which we put forward when we discussed Article 61. What will be the functions of that fourth Commission? The Chilean Delegate in the Joint Committee of Committees

I and II suggested that a new Chapter should be added to the Draft Charter in order to envisage the situation of under or insufficiently developed countries, and we wish to know what will be the fate of this proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not a matter which rests with Committee V.

That rests with the Joint Committee on Industrial Development. If the Joint Committee were to recommend the setting up of an industrial Commission, it would presumably be incumbent upon it to indicate what those functions would be, and so on. I cannot answer the question. It really does not rest with this Committee.

MR. QURESHI (India): While I quite agree that it is not the function of this Committee to decide on the industrial Commission, nevertheless while we are at a drafting stage and have to consider this point, I would like to support very strongly the views expressed by the Delegate of Chile. At a very early stage we pointed out in very strong words that one of the main functions of this Conference should be to concentrate on the development of industries in less developed areas. We feel you may succeed in increasing demand by eliminating certain restrictive business practices, to which so much importance has been attached - you may succeed in reducing tariff barriers to some extent - and you may succeed in having more employment by these methods - but those methods are only negative aspects of the problem.

One of the main functions of the ITO, and the entire structure of the Organisation should be based on this assumption, is that it is one of its principal and fundamental functions to bring about ways and means to see that industries are developed in areas which are less developed. If, for instance, we are able to increase the demand for various goods in India and China, we will be able to absorb the surplus of the entire world, and still there will be under-employment in various countries which you will not be able to cope with.

To give an example, at present the consumption of cloth in India is 16 yards, while in the United States it is over 60. If we could

increase the demand even to 32 yards, which is not very high, it would be of great importance to various countries. The sacred duty of all the member countries to try, in their own interests as well as in the interests of other countries, to see that demand is increased in those countries. I feel that it is the function of the Committee, when we are drafting a constitution, to see that that is one of the most important parts of the functions of the Organisation.

MR. PALTHEY (France) (Interpretation): I apologise for speaking once more, but I do not agree. I think it belongs to Committee V to take the necessary steps with a view to implementing the decisions taken by other Committees. In particular, Committee V has to decide whether the problem discussed by Committee I will justify the setting up of a further Commission. This we will be able to see only when we know the final results from Committee I.

MR. COLEMAN (Norway): I support the statement made by the French Delegate. If the Joint Committee wants to have a special Commission for industrial development set up, it ought to be necessary that the proposals should be sent automatically, by the authority of our Committee but without its having looked into it further, to the Interim Drafting Committee, to be dealt with in exactly the same way as the three Commissions already mentioned in the Draft Charter.

MR. KELLOGG (US): The Delegate of Norway, as so often, has expressed very much better than I could do the idea I have. Could we not, in that portion of our report which may refer to Articles 64, 65 and 66 to the drafting committee for its re-editing in the light of the reports of the other Committees, at the same time request the Interim Drafting Committee to draw up tentatively a corresponding Article to cover a possible Commission on industrialisation in the light of the report, or the decision, of the Joint Committee, and in the light, possibly, of any decisions which may be taken by the Economic and Social Council if the latter is referred to it in the meantime.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean if the Joint Committee recommends that such a Commission be set up?

MR. KELLOGG (US): Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You did not say that, and it is an important provision.

MR. PERINO (Chile) (Interpretation): I support wholeheartedly the remarks made by the Indian Delegate, but I accept the proposal made by the Norwegian Delegation regarding the question of procedure.

MR. QURESHI (India): The remarks made by the Delegate of Norway and the Delegate of the United States are acceptable to us. At this stage we would point out that there is a necessity to take that in view, but if you are waiting for the decision of Committee II, we will wait for that. There does not seem to be any hurry about it.

MR. BURY (Australia): I was going to remark that the French Delegate has a very appropriate view of the relative importance of this Committee, but I wonder whether it is practicable to allow the initiative for the setting up of the Commission to lie with this Committee rather than with the others.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to try to get this matter resolved and to proceed to the next item on the agenda as soon as possible, but meanwhile I call on the Delegate of China.

MR. DAO (China): It seems to me that there is general agreement on the procedure, but I have some doubt about the initiative -- whether this should come from this Committee or from the Committee on industrial development. As I understand it, the conclusions reached by the different Committees will be in the form that the Organisation should perform such functions, but it will be up to this Committee to decide to which Commission certain functions should be confined. If the Joint Committee on industrial development should simply mention that the Commission should perform such functions, will it be appropriate for this Committee to decide to set up a Commission specially to deal with the problems discussed by the Joint Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to express a view, if it is not out of order, in response to what the Delegate of China has said. I believe that it is not the proper function of Committee V to take upon itself a decision as to whether a Commission should be set up in response to something done somewhere else in the Charter. I think the initiative and responsibility rests with the Committee concerned with that particular field of activity and with the functions that are recommended by it. I want to add that Committee V would, in my opinion, have the task of carrying out the organisational implications of any decisions made in the other Committees, but only that.

MR. ALMILLAS (Cuba): I agreed with the necessity for the commission being appointed by the Commission itself. I also agree with the delegate of China that the functions of that commission should be fixed by Committee 5. I agree also that we have not the time to do it, so I would suggest that if this joint committee states that they believe a commission is necessary, then Committee 5, in New York in January, will decide on the drafting possibilities and also on the functions of that new commission to be set up, because we are not going to have the time to do it, and I believe it is the task of Committee 5 (or whatever number they have at that time).

THE CHAIRMAN: We have considered this matter now at great length and about all it comes to is a matter of practical procedure. From this point on we should go on to the next item on the agenda for it seems to me that there is no particular point in taking up these provisions on the commissions in Committee this afternoon. If there is serious dissent from that, then I have to stand corrected, but it seems to me that all this comes to is that we are confronted with a condition and not a theory, namely, that we have to go ahead and discuss something else, and to allow suggestions coming from the various Committees with regard to the commissions to be processed in a manner which we have all agreed to here. That is all we can do and now we should go on to the next item on the agenda. The delegate of Belgium.

MR. HOUTEMAN (Belgium) (Interpretation): I am sorry, but I do not understand what we are discussing, for the following reason. When we were discussing at the last meeting Article 50, I put a question to the delegate of the United States concerning paragraph 1, asking him if we should not provide for a committee like that which we are now discussing. The reply was that the Economic and Social Council, having considered

this very important question, had created a Sub-Committee on Economic Development and therefore it was not necessary to provide another here. I was satisfied with that reply, but now, for ten minutes, I have been trying to get the floor in order to say that I cannot understand why, as this question seems to me to have been settled last time, we have been discussing it for an hour.

THE SECRETARY: I wonder if I might be permitted to say a word in connection with the point made by the delegate of Belgium, subject to correction by the United States delegate? I intervened in yesterday's discussion on that point. I think the point was that in paragraph 1 of Article 50 the reference is only to the collection of information relating to employment, policy, etc. It does not refer to the establishment of a commission which, I gather, has been the subject of the debate this afternoon.

MR. HOUWINK (Belgium) (Translation): I think the problem is exactly the same, and I would go on to say that the Secretary, in a document which I hold in my hand, formulates the very important functions of this Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate of the United Kingdom.

MR. HOLMES (United Kingdom): I apologise very humbly for intervening at this stage, but I have just come from a small drafting group with the Acting Chairman in charge of it of Committee 3, and I thought I should let you know that I believe you will be approached by Committee 3 with a view to co-ordinating with them a discussion of what should appear in Article 65 on the Restrictive Business Practices Commission. For myself, I would have no strong views as to whether this should be dealt with by Committee 5, or relegated, as I think has been suggested, to the Interim Drafting Committee. The only other point I would like to make is that whichever way this subject is to be dealt

with, I should not like our paper 22 in Committee 5 Series to be lost sight of, we we attempted to make certain revisions in the draft of Article 65 as it appears in the United States draft Charter.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would say that under the procedure which has received the approval of the majority of the Committee, any suggestions coming from Committee 3, including the suggestions with regard to a Commission on Business Practices which have been made by the delegate of the United Kingdom, would go forward to the Interim Drafting Committee because, as was made clear before the delegate of the United Kingdom (Mr. Holmes) came in, this Committee unfortunately will not have time to go through the process of considering jointly with these other Committees matters arising out of their recommendations. It seems to me that it is simply a matter of pipelining any suggestions that may come from any of these other Committees or from individual delegations concerned with a particular field of activity of another Committee, right on through to the Interim Drafting Committee, without any further processing in this Committee. I believe that is what the situation requires now.

The Chair would like to call upon the delegate of Norway, if he would be so good as to do so, to state again his suggestion with regard to further procedure in this matter. Let us see whether we are entirely clear on the matter, and whether we can all agree now to go forward on that basis.

MR. COLBAK (Norway): My view was that, having approved in general, the plan for setting up the commissions of the Organization, ... and not having the necessary time to go into the reports of the other Committees of the Preparatory Committee, we cannot do better than approve the scheme as it evolves from the American draft Charter, without entering into consideration of the definite terms of Articles 64, 65 and 66 now. We cannot,

I think, enter into any discussion or consideration of a possible fourth commission for Industrial Development, but we can decide to send the reports from the three other Committees to the Preparatory Committee, and if something comes from the Joint Committee with regard to a fourth commission on Industrial Development, we can do the same with that, sending them all to the Interim Drafting Committee, being fully aware that the Interim Drafting Committee is not to take political decisions and, for that reason, may find it necessary to make a report to the Second Session of the Executive and of the Preparatory Committee, which can then define their general attitude toward the results of the work of the Drafting Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any dissent from the formulation of the matter which has just been made by the delegate of Norway?

No? The delegate of China.

MR. DAI (China): I would like to make one point of clarification. The delegate of Norway said, "having approved the general scheme of the setting up of commissions". Did he refer to Article 61?

MR. COLBAN (Norway): 62.

THE CHAIRMAN. Very well then. We are ready, I take it, to pass to the next item on the Agenda which I have before me - the consideration of Article 56 and the Interim Tariff Committee. I hope that we may be able to dispose finally this afternoon of any comments that members may have to make in this Committee on that Article. The delegate of New Zealand.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): Might I suggest that the delegate of the United States gives a brief outline of how it is intended that this Interim Committee should work, both in respect of time and function in relation to the Organization?

MR. KELLOGG (United States): In reply to the question of the delegate of New Zealand, the United States scheme was more or less as

follows: This spring we anticipated that the countries here represented would sit down together and negotiate on a multi-lateral basis tariff reductions which would be mutually satisfactory. We hope that these reductions will be substantial and will have a large measure of success in reducing tariff barriers. When the I.T.C. is eventually set up, those countries which will have made such reductions will automatically be members of the Interim Tariff Committee.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): Do I take it that we have to regard the Charter as being a post-negotiation document in relation to the negotiations that are envisaged in the spring? The point being that Article 56 envisages a general agreement on tariffs and trade which presumably is to be entered into after the negotiations are carried on but before the Charter is brought into effect

MR. KELLOGG (United States): The impression of the delegate of New Zealand is generally correct. Our thought was that this negotiating meeting would put into effect tariff reductions at whatever time they may agree among themselves. That time might, of course, be the time prior to the coming into effect of this Charter, although of course we cannot now be certain of that.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): Do we presume from that, then, that the United States envisage that in the general agreement on tariffs there and trade that/will be some committee or authority, maybe termed the Interim Tariff Committee, which will function prior to the entry into force of the Charter, and which will continue on under paragraph 1 of Article 56 after the Charter is brought into effect?

MR. KELLOGG (United States): Subject to possible correction, I would say that the answer to that is that we do not want to jeopardise the good work which we hope will be accomplished by the spring meeting in reducing tariff barriers as a result of a possible failure of the Charter to come into effect. Hence we hope

D. 6.

E/PC/T.C.V/PV/13

that the result of the spring meeting will be able to stand on its own feet. However, it is quite possible that the countries negotiating at this spring meeting may decide to set up among themselves some kind of an interim body to watch over the implementation of their agreement. I do not suppose any concrete suggestions have yet been developed on that, but the countries which do so negotiate might so decide.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the delegate of Australia wish to have the floor?

I do not know whether he wants to bring up a different point or throw some light on this one?

MR. BURY (Australia): It would be better, perhaps, to let the delegate of New Zealand continue his elucidation process.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): The explanation given by the delegate of the United States is very valuable and is generally in line with what I envisaged was intended to be the position. I see a possible difficulty, however, in the words of paragraph 1 of Article 56 - "pursuant to paragraph 3 of Article 18". The meaning we take from that is that the functions here envisaged to rest with the Interim Tariff Committee can only follow the entry into force of this Charter because paragraph 3 of Article 18 assumes a significance and attains a meaning only after the Charter is brought into effect; but it seems that in paragraph 2 of Article 56, some body of countries will have assumed certain responsibilities before the Charter actually comes into effect. The point that concerns us is whether or not the contents of what is referred to here as the general agreement on tariffs and trade is not of importance equal in strength with certain sections of the Charter. We have not given any detailed thought to this but it seems that the contents of the general agreement on tariffs and trade may be of very great importance, and that some attention should be given to working out a draft of appropriate contents very quickly, or before we meet in the spring, because responsibilities presumably are to be entered into and assumed before our Charter actually exists.

E follows.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Delegates of Australia and Cuba wish apparently to add some observations on this matter, and I leave it to the Delegate of the United States whether he wishes to hear their contributions first, or to reply now.

MR. KELLOGG (US): I would like to put in one or two more words in reply to the question of the New Zealand Delegate. In the United States plan, the countries meeting for negotiations in the spring can decide at what time they wish their tariff reductions to take effect. That will depend upon them. We hope that their decision will be such that if the Charter fails to go into effect for any reason, nevertheless the good work which they will accomplish may go forward. Assuming that they are successful and assuming that the Organisation is set up, then those countries which have actually reduced their tariffs will all, we hope, become members of the Organisation. When the Organisation begins to function, these countries will form the nucleus of the Interim Tariff Committee. As other countries come into the Organisation, it will be expected that they will also make corresponding reductions in their tariff. When they do so, they become members of the Interim Tariff Committee. If they do not do so, Article 16, paragraph 3, gives to the Interim Tariff Committee the right to say to such a country, "You either make reductions corresponding to those made by the other members or you get out of the Organisation. You cannot have the benefits of the reductions made by everyone else without yourself giving a corresponding benefit."

MR. BURY (Australia): I wish to record the provisional view of the Australian Delegation, which is that the tariff negotiations and the Charter are two interdependent factors, but if it should be necessary at a later stage and for special reasons to take special measures to prevent the results of the tariff negotiations being lost, then the United States draft does seem to us to be a satisfactory way of accomplishing that.

MR. LIU (China): I only want to add some information, because I formed part of the Sub-Committee which dealt with Article 18. I want to say two things. First, when we started our work we were told that it was envisaged that possibly not all the Charter, but certain parts of it, would be made as a partial agreement to be added to these tariff negotiations, as an essential part of them. Secondly, precisely this third paragraph of Article 18 has been redrafted, and is being redrafted at this moment, in such a way that it will not be a part of the Charter itself, but that reference will be made to a memorandum or an addition which will be considered maybe as an additional part of the Charter, or as a separate document that will comprise precisely these modes of operation in which the tariff negotiations are going to take place. So it would be easy just to detach it from the Charter and add it to the tariff negotiations.

MR. LE PAN (Canada): I would like to raise a comparatively minor point. It is the view of the Canadian Delegation that there should be an amendment in the second sentence of the second paragraph of Article 56, and that the sentence should be amended so that the words "shall be entitled" should be changed into "Shall be a member of the Committee". In other words, we believe it ought to be obligatory and not permissive for a member of the Organisation which has completed tariff negotiations to be a member of the Interim Tariff Committee. The third paragraph of Article 16 of the Draft Charter gives to the Organisation the power to consider questions and disputes arising out of tariff negotiations and tariff agreements. This Article lays it down for an interim period after the coming into force of the Charter that the forum in which such questions shall be considered will be the Interim Tariff Committee. It is our view that any member of the Organisation which has completed tariff negotiations should be obliged to be a member of the forum in which such questions will be considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of Canada has suggested an amendment to the second sentence of paragraph 2 of Article 56. We do not have provision at the moment for a Sub-Committee to consider that. I wonder whether we could have the views of the Committee now as to whether that is acceptable.

MR. KELLOGG (US): I take it that the proposed amendment would strike out the three words "be entitled to" in the first line of page 38. We would agree to that change.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): What is the position if that member does not desire to be on the Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not the obligation of the Chair to answer that question.

MR. QURESHI (India): I suggest that he could absent himself from the Committee.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): It is quite conceivable that some undesirable situation might arise with reference to the right to elect whether he wanted to be on the Committee or not.

MR. LE PAN (Canada): It seems to me that it should be an obligation. It is a minor obligation, but it is along with several others that are imposed in the Charter.

MR. KELLOGG (US): I would suggest that if a member serving on the Interim Tariff Committee found that a certain vote was particularly embarrassing to that member, he would probably abstain from voting.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): I still suggest there may be some point about it that may cause a member not to desire to be on the Tariff Committee. I will not press the point further. It can be thrashed out at a later stage. It is questionable whether that obligation should be imposed in this arbitrary way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could we agree that the Committee approves of this amendment, with the Delegate of New Zealand having some reservations on the question — see the stenographic record?.... As I hear no dissent, I take it that we agree to that. Is there any further

discussion on Article 56?

MR. LE PAN (Canada): It is now my turn to enter a reservation, and it refers to the third paragraph of Article 56. If, as we in the Canadian Delegation hope, it is decided that votes in the Conference should be according to a system of weighting, then I think as a consequence a similar system might be used in the Interim Tariff Committee. I only make this remark as a reservation. I certainly have no wish to reopen the whole of the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: A note will be made of the views of the Canadian Delegate.

MR. HOLMES (UK): And of the United Kingdom, please.

THE CHAIRMAN: The United Kingdom Delegation has expressed concurrence in the views of the Delegate of Canada.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): We would like to have a reservation recorded there, too, in view of the power which is vested in the Tariff Committee.

MR. NUDE (Union of South Africa): No, I am not going to enter a reservation.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no further discussion of Article 56, I should like to make a suggestion with regard to the handling of Article 1. This Article has to do with the objectives and purposes of the Organisation. From time to time we have had it on our agenda for discussion. We have deferred discussing it because we have usually had something that it seemed we could more profitably discuss at an earlier stage. Now I would like to suggest that we not discuss it at all, but that it be referred to the Plenary Session for consideration. The suggestions that may emanate from the various Committees of the Conference which would bear upon the question of any change in Article 1 as now drafted are suggestions which will hardly be, all of them, available before the very last stages of the Conference. They will concern matters on which the entire Conference would wish to pass in Plenary Session. It seems to me that it would be

unprofitable for this Committee in advance of those final recommendations from the other Committees bearing on Article 1 to enter into any discussion of it at all. My suggestion is that we simply leave the final formulation, so far as this Conference is concerned, of Article 1 to the Plenary Session.

MR. BURY (Australia): In agreeing with what you have just suggested, Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that the Australian Delegation did submit to Committee V an alternative draft, and when this matter is remitted to the Plenary Session, we would appreciate it if the attention of the Session were drawn to this draft, with a note that Committee V had not discussed it.

THE CHAIRMAN: With regard to the suggestion made by the Delegate of Australia, I should like to have the comment of the Secretary as to how that might be carried out.

THE SECRETARY: If it is agreeable to the Australian Delegate, I think arrangements could be made for that document to be re-issued under another symbol as a general Conference document and made available to all Delegations.

MR. BURY (Australia): That would be very satisfactory. The document is V/19 in this series.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it that that method of disposing of Article 1 is acceptable to the Committee. There are some odds and ends that we have not disposed of, of which the Secretary has kept a note, and this seems to be the time to dispose of them, and I am going to ask him to take up with the Committee one by one those matters, and see whether we cannot dispose of them as rapidly as possible.

THE SECRETARY: With your permission and the consent of the Committee, I would like to mention these one by one, and get some instructions or decision from the Committee as to what the situation should be. It would be helpful to do as much of this tidying up as possible in order that the joint Rapporteurs can proceed more easily with their

E/PC/T/C.V/PV/13

reports, which have got to be prepared and considered by this Committee between now and next Tuesday at the latest.

The first point, which concerns particularly the United States Delegate, relates to Article 69, paragraph 2, of the American text. The United States Delegate did reserve the right to raise the matter referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 69 after the general character of the Commissions had been discussed and considered. I am wondering whether that is a point which still needs to be considered by the Committee, or can we strike it off the suspense list?

MR. KELLOGG (US): The United States Delegation is content with the way in which the Charter has been redrafted at the present time.

THE SECRETARY: The second point also concerns the United States and I think other Delegates, and it deals with the reference to food and agriculture, which we struck out of paragraph 2 of Article 71, on the understanding that consideration would be given later to making some appropriate reference to the importance of food and agriculture in relation to commodity arrangements elsewhere in the Charter. May I add that it is my understanding that Committee IV, in redrafting Chapter VI of the Charter, have made a very specific reference to the Food and Agriculture Organisation, and have in fact included an Article on relationships with the F.A.O., and I wonder whether that would not meet the case satisfactorily.

MR. KELLOGG (US): In the light of the action taken by Committee IV, the United States Delegation withdraws its reservations in this respect.

THE SECRETARY: The third point I have is with reference to a request made by the New Zealand delegate for a legal opinion on the formulation we suggested in the matter of voting. He suggested, I think, that we should get a legal opinion as to whether the phrase "by a vote of two-thirds of its Members" was a proper and appropriate phrase. I have consulted the legal officer of the Conference and he agrees that it is not a very good phrase, it is ambiguous, and has suggested as a solution that it should read "by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members". I wonder if that clears up that point satisfactorily?

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): It is difficult offhand to say whether it would clear up the point, but the impression is that it would clear my difficulty. Just as a matter of interest, I have been extracting the phrases used in the Charter dealing with voting, and I think possibly there is room for tidying them up, but I will not worry this Committee about it, it can come up later as a drafting point. The phrase we have just had suggested, without the word "affirmative" is a definite improvement on the phrase as it previously stood.

THE SECRETARY: I think it was the sense of the meeting, Mr. Chairman, that our intention in the matter was quite clear and that it is a point which really ought to be settled by the Technical Drafting Committee.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand); Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the delegate of the United Kingdom wanted to say something?

MR. HOLMES (United Kingdom): I think a better phrase might be: "by the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the Members of the Organization." That is to say, the

word should be in the plural - "votes".

THE SECRETARY: I suggest that we adopt that in the meantime on the understanding that the Drafting Committee will look at this matter, and that we draw their attention to our discussion on it in our instructions to that Committee.

The next point refers to paragraph 2 of Article 55, where I think it was suggested by the French delegate that the words "Chapter 4 of" should be deleted. The United States delegate, as I recall, reserved the position of his delegation on that point, and it was agreed that the Committee would return to consider that particular paragraph. May I just add that it is recommended in the report of the Drafting Sub-Committee of Committee 4 that a reference to Chapter 6 should be added to paragraph 2 of Article 55.

MR. KELLOGG (United States): In view of the change suggested by Committee 4 in this respect, and in view of the suggestion of the French delegate, we would be happy to see the words "Chapter 4" dropped, which was I believe the suggestion of the French delegate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed to?

THE SECRETARY: The next point is one of rather greater substance which the Committee may or may not wish to take up now. At our 8th Meeting, the Canadian delegate gave notice of his intention to propose an additional new paragraph to Article 57. I do not think the Canadian delegate has had an opportunity since to raise this matter. I have here copies of the text of the new paragraph, as submitted at that time by the Canadian delegate, which I will

pass round, and members can decide whether or not they can deal with it quickly. It is quite brief. Copies were supposed to be available in French, but I am afraid they have gone astray. I must apologise for that most sincerely. Perhaps I should read out the suggested new paragraph? It is as follows:

"Any Member of the Organisation who is not a Member of the Executive Board shall be invited to send a representative to any meeting of the Board called to discuss a matter of particular and substantial concern to that Member. Such representative shall, for the purpose of such discussions, have all the rights of Board Members, except the right to vote."

THE CHAIRMAN: First, does the delegate of Canada wish to make any remarks on this?

MR. LE PAN (Canada): I think that there are a few things that I might profitably say about this suggestion. It is the view of the Canadian delegation, on the one hand that the membership of the Board should not be unduly increased and, on the other hand, that it is highly essential that any member of the Organization whose case is being considered by the Executive Board should have the right to appear before that Board. It will be remembered by the members of this Committee that Article 31 of the United Nations Charter gives the right to any one of the United Nations whose case is being considered by the Security Council to appear at the Security Council. In point of fact we feel that the interpretation of Article 31 in the United Nations Charter has been so restrictive that it has

F.4.

E/PC/T/C.V/PV/13

not had exactly the effects that we intended when we proposed it originally as an amendment to the United Nations Charter. Therefore this amendment has been drawn in rather more precise a form. I think that it would have the result of securing to any member of the I.T.O. the right to appear and to effectively present its case to the Executive Board, and I hope that the Committee will view it with favour.

MR. BURY (Australia): I would like to support the Canadian suggestion, and to express the hope that the Committee will adopt it.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): Could the Canadian delegate advise us whether his delegation envisages that this member should attend throughout the whole of the proceedings of that particular meeting of the Board, or whether it should be just that part of the proceedings affecting the member which are under discussion, or whether it is just that the Board shall hear a statement from that member irrespective of whether the member is in attendance during any other part of the proceedings? I think it would be very dangerous to impose the obligation on an Executive Board to have a member, who may be challenged and may be guilty of some offence, in attendance when members of the Board are discussing matters concerning the case before it. However, the reply to the questions I have put may throw some light on that.

MR. LE PAN (Canada): If I understand the position which has been put by the New Zealand representative, it falls into two parts. In the first place he would like to know for how long, according to this amendment, the member called to the Executive Board would have the right to be present. My answer to that would,

be that he would not have the right to be present during the whole of the session if that session considered other matters than the one which affected his country. On the other hand, he would have the right to attend for the whole of that part of the session during which the cause which affected his country was being discussed. The second half of the question put by the New Zealand representative, unless I am mistaken, was: should the member called to the Executive Board have the right only to submit a statement, or should he have the right to enter into the discussion as well? My answer there unequivocally is that he would have the right to enter into the discussion as well, not only to make a statement. In other words, as the final sentence of this amendment reads, he would have "all the rights of Board Members, except the right to vote". It seems to me that the experience of a considerable number of international organizations and conferences has shown that the right simply to make a statement, and not to enter into a discussion, is insufficient if a case is to be thoroughly ventilated, and if the member is to feel that he has had a chance to present his arguments with completeness and fullness.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before recognizing the delegate of South Africa, the Chair would like to suggest that while this is a drafting matter, the first point raised by the delegate of New Zealand with regard to whether such a representative should be in attendance throughout the whole of the session of the Executive Board might be met by some such change as the following:

"Any Member of the Organization who is not a Member of the Executive Board

"shall be invited to send a representative to any meeting of the Board to be in attendance whenever a matter of particular and substantial concern to that Member is under discussion."

The delegate of South Africa.

MR. NAUDE (South Africa): I merely wanted to support wholeheartedly the principle involved here. I am not entirely certain that the drafting will meet all the points that can be raised, and my immediate reaction to the words "in attendance" was that it did not mean the same as "participating". Another point struck me with regard to the words "except the right to vote". I agree that the representative who comes to participate but is not a member of the Board should not have the right to vote, but if we are to have weighted voting, and if we are to adopt the same principles as apply in the case of the Fund and the Bank - namely, the Executive or the directors casts the votes of himself and all those who voted for him - you might land yourself in a little difficulty of drafting.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would just call the attention of the delegate of South Africa that the matter of definition between attendance and discussion is taken care of by the last sentence in the draft. Even as the original sentence stood, there is nothing about participation.

MR. NAUDE (South Africa): No, I merely had in mind that there might have to be a drafting committee to draft this. One other point. Will the member himself decide when the matter is of particular and substantial concern to him? I notice that in the case of

Article 51 of the Charter, the Security Council decides whether the interests of the member are specially affected.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the delegate from Canada wanted to say another word a moment ago.

MR. LE PAN (Canada): It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that most of those are drafting points rather than points of substance, although I am extremely obliged to members of the Committee for raising them because I think they are of importance. If I might go back for a moment to your suggestion of the drafting change, I would like to suggest to the New Zealand representative that in almost every case that I can envisage, the question of how long a member called to the meeting of the Executive Board should be allowed to remain would be academic, because I think that any question which is of particular and substantial concern to any member of the Organization will ordinarily occupy one full meeting of the Executive Board. However, I would be very ready to accept some amendment of the sort that you have yourself suggested, which would make it clear that the member should be called to participate in the discussions of the Executive Board while the particular matter which is of concern to him was being discussed.

MR. DAO (China): To meet the last point raised by the delegate of South Africa, may I suggest that the word "shall" is changed to "may"? That would leave the discretion to the Executive Board.

MR. LE PAN (Canada): Although that is a way out of the difficulty, it might lead us from the frying pan into the fire and, in my view, it would emasculate this amendment considerably. I feel very strongly that the wording should remain "such representative shall

F.8.

E/PC/T/C.V/PV/13

have all the rights..." - in other words, his rights shall not be whittled down. There is the question outstanding, raised by the representative of South Africa, which I confess I find rather a ticklish one: who is to decide whether or not the matter is of particular and substantial concern to the member not belonging to the Executive Board? I feel certainly that the final power must reside in the Executive Board to decide as to whether or not the matter is of particular and substantial concern. The procedure in fact that I would envisage would be that the member who is not a member of the Executive Board would apply to the Executive Board and represent that such a subject was of substantial concern, and then it would be for the Board to decide whether or not that was the case. We ourselves would hope that the Executive Board would adopt a very liberal attitude to representations from members who are not members of the Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is now 6 o'clock, and we are sort of hung up, if I may use that expression, on this proposal of the Canadian Delegation. I think that all that it is essential for us to do at this time is to decide whether we agree that something approximately as suggested by the Delegate of Canada is acceptable to the Committee. If the Committee will agree to that now, I suggest that any drafting of the paragraph be left, in the first instance, to the Sub-Committee which I am about to suggest be set up to take care of certain other articles which we have discussed and which require certain other work on them by a Sub-Committee. I do not think it is incumbent on us now to agree upon the drafting. Therefore, I hope that, unless some member of the Committee is extremely anxious to add to the body of wisdom on this subject, at the moment we conclude our discussion, and transact one or two other items of business, and then go home.

M.R. LAURENCE (New Zealand): I apologise for speaking, but there are important points of principle in this. Taking the words "particular and substantial concern to a member", what is the position if the Executive Board are discussing something of general application? Does it mean that you have to convene a conference? Does it mean that the Executive Board cannot have a confidential discussion, as a Board, on any subject concerning a member? Then we have the point of administration. If the Board has to hold up consideration of matters until Members concerned have been invited and have communicated their views, I think that a provision in the Charter as rigid as that would hamper the proceedings of the Board.

I would say that we could be sympathetic to the general view that members who are concerned with the subject could have the right at some point to be heard, but I do not think that to write it into the Charter in this manner is the way in which to achieve it, and if the Committee were satisfied that the principles involved were acceptable, it would seem that the best thing to do would be to make the provision in Article 55 that the Conference could prescribe the procedures under which

E/PCGT/C.V/PV/13

members could have proper representation at meetings of the Executive Board. But from the point of view of practical operation, I think that to carry out all the things envisaged in the Article would impede and embarrass executive action.

MR. ALMILLIA (Cuba): I would like to express complete agreement with the proposal of the Canadian Delegation. We think it should be left to the Interim Committee for drafting, or to the Committee we are going to appoint here. Likewise, all the other points that may arise can be left to the Sub-Committee. I would like also to point out that an Article of this kind is in the Charter of the United Nations, and I do not think it has caused so much trouble as has been envisaged here.

THE CHAIRMAN: The various remarks that have been made on this proposal will be in the record which will be available in the first instance to the Sub-Committee I am about to appoint, and will be available, secondly, to the Interim Drafting Committee which will work on this subject between now and next spring.

Yesterday we discussed Articles 50, 51 and 61, and various suggestions for amendment were made. I would now suggest that it would be appropriate to appoint a Drafting Sub-Committee which would consider the suggested amendments to those Articles, and also would consider the suggestions that have just now been made with reference to the proposal of the Canadian Delegation for the addition of a new paragraph to Article 57. I would appoint as members of that Sub-Committee Canada, India, Cuba, United Kingdom, and the United States. If any other member wishes to be represented on the Sub-Committee, of course that would be acceptable.

With reference to future meetings, I would suggest that the next meeting of the full Committee not occur until Friday afternoon. I suggest that we meet on Friday afternoon at 3 o'clock, and that we take up at that time, first, the report of the Sub-Committee which I have

just now appointed, and secondly, the report of the joint Rapporteurs on voting and executive board membership, the matter which we had agreed yesterday should be particularly concentrated upon by the Rapporteurs, and lastly, any other business which any member of the Committee may wish to bring up at that time. That would then leave the situation about as follows. We would make every effort to have the draft report of this Committee to the Plenary meeting circulated Monday morning. Our joint Rapporteurs would have some time over the weekend to complete their draft, and the final meeting of the Committee to approve the report would be held on Tuesday morning. The present programme calls for the final plenary meetings of the Preparatory Committee to begin on Tuesday afternoon with a view to finishing on Wednesday, and it seems to the Chair that a meeting on Tuesday morning would be necessary to take care of the final report of the Committee.

That is the programme that is now envisaged. Are there any comments? If there are none, and there is no further business, I will adjourn the meeting.

THE SECRETARY: May I take it that it would be convenient to members of the Sub-Committee just appointed to meet tomorrow afternoon, say, at 3 o'clock?

(The meeting rose at 6.16 p.m.)