

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL
E/CN.2/SR.41
11 April 1950
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Fourth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,
on Thursday, 30 March 1950, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

International Road Transport

- (a) Results of the United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport (including recommendations of the Conference contained in its Final Act relating to future action by the Commission, to be considered by the Economic and Social Council at its tenth session);
- (b) Uniform System of Road Signs and Signals;
- (c) Further Problems relating to International Road Transport (E/CN.2/76, E/CN.2/76/Add.1, E/CN.2/76/Add.2, E/1609, E/1559/Add.1, official summary record of the 347th meeting of the Economic and Social Council);

Application of certain non-governmental organizations for consultative status:

- (a) Inter-American Federation of Automobile Clubs (FIAC);
- (b) International Road Federation (IRF);
- (c) International Permanent Bureau of Motor Manufacturers (IPBMM) (E/CN.2/80, E/CN.2/80/Add.1, E/CN.2/80/Add.2).

Draft resolutions prepared by the Secretariat:

- (a) Passports and Frontier Formalities;
- (b) Pollution of Sea Water by Oil;
- (c) Unification of Maritime Tonnage Measurement;
- (d) Problems of Maritime Shipping affecting Latin America;
- (e) Barriers to the International Transport of Goods.

Chairman: Mr. OYEVAAR Netherlands

Members: Mr. PLAZA Chile
Mr. HSIAO China
ABAZA Bey Egypt
Mr. GOURSAT France
Mr. SUKTHANKAR India
Baron van HEEMSTRA Netherlands
Mr. FOLEN Norway
Mr. BAIG Pakistan
Sir Osborne MANCE United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
Mr. BAKER United States of America
Mr. JOVANOVIĆ Yugoslavia

Also present: Mr. CHARGUERAUD Economic Commission for Europe
Mr. CLARKE Economic Commission for Asia and the
Far East

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. EVANS International Labour Organisation (ILO)
Mr. CARNES United Nations Educational Scientific and
Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
Mr. MARLIN International Civil Aviation
Organization (ICAO)
Miss WERRING International Bank for Reconstruction and
Development (BANK)

Consultants from non-governmental organizations:

Category A:

Mr. TOMPKINS International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)

Category B:

Mr. WILKINSON International Union of Official Travel
Organizations

Secretariat:

Mr. LUKAC Director of the Division of Transport and
Communications, Secretary of the
Commission

INTERNATIONAL ROAD TRANSPORT:

- (a) RESULTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON ROAD AND MOTOR TRANSPORT (INCLUDING RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONFERENCE CONTAINED IN ITS FINAL ACT RELATING TO FUTURE ACTION BY THE COMMISSION, TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL AT ITS TENTH SESSION)
- (b) UNIFORM SYSTEM OF ROAD SIGNS AND SIGNALS
- (c) FURTHER PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL ROAD TRANSPORT
(E/CN.2/76, E/CN.2/76/Add.1, E/CN.2/76/Add.2, E/1609, E/1559/Add.1, Official summary record of the 347th meeting of the Economic and Council)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Commission to consider the agenda item on international road transport.

2. Mr. LUKAC (Secretariat) submitted the note by the Secretary-General on International Road Transport (E/CN.2/76) as well as the addenda to that note (E/CN.2/76/Add.1, E/CN.2/76/Add.2).

3. The first part of that note set out the results of the United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport held in Geneva in August and September 1949. That Conference had prepared a Convention on Road Traffic, a Protocol on Road Signs and Signals and a Protocol concerning Countries or Territories at present occupied. On 31 December 1949, those three instruments had been signed by 21, 16 and 17 countries respectively.

4. The Conference had expressed the wish that the Economic and Social Council should instruct the Transport and Communications Commission to consider the question of establishing a world-wide uniform system of road signs and signals. It had also recommended that the Commission should continue to deal with further problems relating to international road transport and advise the Economic and Social Council on what action should be taken to deal with those problems.

5. The second part of the note dealt with the question of a uniform system of road signs and signals; it explained and compared the "European" or "international" system and the "American" system. Mr. Lukac pointed out that the Protocol drawn up by the Geneva Conference was largely based on the "European" system. The difference between the two systems lay mainly in the use of different colours and the fact that the "European" system used symbols, while the American system generally used words.

/ 6. The Conference

6. The Conference had considered that the Commission could, with the assistance of the necessary experts, successfully establish a world-wide uniform system of road signs and signals. The Secretary-General had thought that the Commission was not a sufficiently technical body to deal with such a question and that it would undoubtedly wish to set up an ad hoc committee of experts. Accordingly the Secretary-General had submitted to the Economic and Social Council a statement of the financial implications of the work of a group of a number of experts not exceeding seven who should meet once in 1950 and, if necessary, once or twice in 1951. The Council had adopted the suggestion of the Secretary-General and had approved the statement of the financial implications.
7. The Commission should now decide whether it wished to set up an ad hoc committee of experts as suggested by the Secretary-General.
8. The CHAIRMAN expressed the view that the Commission could take pride in the fact that the Convention on Road Traffic had been drafted on its initiative. He called attention to a study prepared for the Commission by the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States Department of Commerce, entitled "A Comparison of the International Standard Road Signs with the United States Standard Road Signs."
9. The Chairman invited the members of the Commission to present their views on the question of the establishment of an ad hoc committee of experts to assist the Commission in the study of a world-wide uniform system of road signs and signals.
10. Mr. JOVANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) considered that the creation of a world-wide uniform system of road signs and signals was a question of the utmost importance. Its solution was a matter of urgency for certain countries which had not as yet a well-developed system of road signs and signals. Such countries had not so far incurred heavy expenditure in that field and they could very easily adopt any new system which might be proposed in the near future; on the other hand, if there were too great a delay in establishing a world-wide uniform system, those countries would in the meantime have to adopt one of the systems now in force and might perhaps hesitate to incur the expenses involved in a change of system.

11. In the interests of all countries, particularly of under-developed countries, the Commission was under obligation to undertake without delay the task which had been assigned it for the creation of a world-wide uniform system of road signs and signals.

12. Mr. SUKTHANKAR (India) agreed that a world-wide uniform system of road signs and signals should be set up, but wondered whether the proposed survey should be undertaken on a world-wide or a regional scale. The difficulties encountered in any country were usually also present in the neighbouring countries; it seemed, therefore, that it would be more advisable to begin with a review on the regional level. A uniform system would thus be set up in each area studied, and it would be easy to eliminate subsequently any differences there might be in order to achieve a common uniform system.

13. India would prefer a system using symbols, for they were more easily understood than words.

14. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it would be difficult to undertake a study on a regional basis now, as the Geneva Conference had decided that a world-wide uniform system should be adopted. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that uniform regional systems actually existed already.

15. The obstacles to the setting up of a world-wide uniform system encountered by the Geneva Conference had not seemed insurmountable. The Conference had been of the opinion that a study undertaken by the Transport and Communications Commission would certainly make it possible to eliminate the objections made till now to the establishment of a world-wide uniform system. It should also be borne in mind that the Economic and Social Council had entrusted the Commission with the task of establishing such a system. The only question before the Commission, therefore, was that of setting up an ad hoc committee of experts to assist it in carrying out a world-wide survey.

16. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) fully shared the Chairman's view. The Commission should be gratified at the results achieved by the Geneva Conference and set up an ad hoc committee of experts to assist the Commission in carrying out the task it had been assigned by the Economic and Social Council.

17. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the ad hoc committee of experts should be made up of representatives of the six principal areas of the world, namely: North America, South America, Africa, Asia and the Far East, Europe and the Middle East. It would be for the Secretary-General to appoint the experts, in consultation with the Chairman of the Commission. The number of experts should not exceed seven.

18. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) suggested that the principal consideration in the selection of the experts should be their competence.

19. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that each expert would represent an area; it was therefore impossible for a region to be represented by an expert not belonging to that area.

20. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) thought an objective solution should be aimed^{at} and that the experts should above all be competent and impartial; the question of the representation of a region would seem to be of secondary importance.

21. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) considered that the experts should be thoroughly acquainted with the area they would represent irrespective of whether they came from that region or not.

22. Mr. GOURSAT (France) thought that the regional economic commissions could appoint the experts to represent their respective regions.

23. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that that was a procedural matter which should be left to the discretion of the Secretary-General.

24. He read out a draft resolution on the establishment of an ad hoc committee of experts.

/25. Sir Osborne MANCE

25. Sir Osborne MANCE and Mr. SUKTHANKAR (India) proposed certain drafting amendments.

26. The CHAIRMAN noted those amendments; he would submit a fresh draft resolution later which the Commission would be asked to discuss.

27. Mr. GOURSAT (France) wondered whether it would not be advisable to include in the draft resolution a paragraph inviting Member States to ratify the Convention on Road Traffic.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that a provision of that nature would be included in the draft resolution he had prepared on "Further Problems Relating to International Road Transport".

29. He read out the draft resolution which he said he would submit for the Commission's consideration at a later date.

30. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) asked whether the Secretariat could include the following items in the documentation it was to prepare for the fifth session of the Commission: registration of vehicles; drivers' licenses; the question of driving on the left or right hand side of the road; development of a network of roads in under-developed countries.

31. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) thought it would also be wise to provide for a study of the transport of dangerous goods. He observed that the problem was already being dealt with in the United Kingdom in the case of the transport of such goods by sea. The matter was also being studied in connexion with air transport. It should not be studied separately in the case of road transport. The Secretariat should ensure that there was no lack of co-ordination in the carrying out of those studies.

/APPLICATION

APPLICATION OF CERTAIN NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR CONSULTATIVE STATUS

- (a) INTER-AMERICAN FEDERATION OF AUTOMOBILE CLUBS (FIAC)
 - (b) INTERNATIONAL ROAD FEDERATION (IRF)
 - (c) INTERNATIONAL PERMANENT BUREAU OF MOTOR MANUFACTURERS (IPBMM)
- (E/CN.2/80, E/CN.2/80/Add.1, E/CN.2/80/Add.2)

32. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider the applications for consultative status received from three non-governmental organizations.

33. Mr. LUKAC (Secretariat) submitted the Secretariat note on the applications concerned (E/CN.2/80), together with two addenda, (E/CN.2/80/Add.1 and E/CN.2/80/Add.2). He recalled that, following the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, the Economic and Social Council had requested the Commission to advise it on the applications submitted. The Secretary-General's note contained all the necessary information on the three organizations in question.

34. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in giving its advice in such cases, the Commission had always had regard to the following three factors: geographical distribution, the organization's ability to express freely the views of its members and the need to avoid any overlapping with the activities of organization already granted consultative status.

(a) Inter-American Federation of Automobile Clubs (FIAC)

35. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) was opposed to the granting of consultative status to the FIAC in view of its strictly regional character and of its close connexion with two organizations already granted consultative status -- the International Automobile Federation (FIA) and the International Touring Alliance (AIT).

36. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) considered that the FIAC could associate itself with the FIA and the AIT and thus enjoy the consultative status jointly granted to those two organizations.

37. The CHAIRMAN agreed with Mr. Baker and Sir Osborne Mance. He pointed out that the President of the FIAC was a member of the Committee of the FIA.

/38. Mr. BAKER

38. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) added that the countries which were members of the FIAC were also members of the FIA or the AIT. They were, therefore, already represented by those organizations.

39. The CHAIRMAN concluded that the Commission considered it could not give a favourable reply to the application of the Inter-American Federation of Automobile Clubs.

The Commission decided to advise against acceptance of the application from the Inter-American Federation of Automobile Clubs.

(b) International Road Federation (IRF)

40. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) thought that the Commission should advise acceptance of the application from the IRF in view of the fact that the organization operated on a world-wide basis and was interested in such important questions as ^{road} construction and maintenance and the expansion of roads in all parts of the world.

41. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) supported Sir Osborne Mance's proposal.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that he found it difficult to form an opinion on the IRF, since he was not clear as to the interests it represented. He wondered whether its activities did not overlap with those of the International Chamber of Commerce, the International Touring Alliance and the International Road Transport Union, which had already been granted consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.

43. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) pointed out that the IRF represented economic interests primarily concerned with road construction and maintenance. It had a world-wide character and there seemed to be no reason why it should not be granted consultative status.

44. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) did not consider that there was any overlapping between the IRF, which was concerned with road construction and maintenance, and organizations such as those concerned with touring, i.e. with the use of roads.

/ 45. Mr. BAKER

45. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) did not think there was any need to consider whether the grant of consultative status to the IRF might involve the risk of future disputes. That question might be considered when it arose, if it ever should arise. The application of the IRF appeared to be in order and the Commission should advise its acceptance.

The Commission decided to advise in favour of acceptance of the application from the International Road Federation.

(c) International Permanent Bureau of Motor Manufacturers (IPBMM)

46. Mr. COURSAT (France) had no objection in principle to the application from the IPBMM. The Commission would, however, run the risk of creating a dangerous precedent if it advised acceptance of the application. The Commission had hitherto dealt only with applications from touring organizations or organizations representing the interests of users. If it advised favourably on an application from an organization of manufacturers, it would have to give similar advice in the case of all applications submitted by similar organizations such as organizations of aircraft manufacturers and ship-builders.

47. He would repeat that he was not opposed to the application in principle but merely wished to warn the Commission against the danger of establishing a precedent.

48. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) wondered whether the question raised by Mr. Coursat was as important as he would seem to think. The activities of the IPBMM were quite different from those of the organizations which had already been granted consultative status; he therefore saw no good reason why its application for consultative status should not be accepted. The only possible objection he could see was that the organization tended to be regional in character, in view of the nature of its membership.

49. The CHAIRMAN agreed with Sir Osborne Mance. Once consultative status had been granted to organizations of road builders and road users, there was no reason why that status should be refused to the manufacturers of vehicles. Furthermore, the organization in question had made a valuable contribution to the work of the United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport. Finally, an organization need not be world-wide in character to be granted consultative status.

50. Mr. SUKTHANKAR

50. Mr. SUKTHANKAR (India) pointed out that the IPBMM was not of truly world-wide character. In fact it only represented the professional associations of motor manufacturers in seven countries. Consequently, he could see no real reason for supporting the application of the IPBMM.

51. ABAZA Bey (Egypt) proposed that consideration of the application from IPBMM should be postponed.

The Commission decided to postpone consideration of the application from the IPBMM until its fifth session.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS PREPARED BY THE SECRETARIAT

(a) Passports and frontier formalities.

52. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider the draft resolutions drawn up by the Secretariat after previous discussions, beginning with the draft resolution on passports and frontier formalities.

53. Mr. WILKINSON (International Union of Official Travel Organizations) thanked the Commission for having mentioned his organization in its draft resolution and thus recognizing the work it had carried out.

54. The principal aim of the International Union of Official Travel Organizations was to encourage foreign travel so that the various nations might become better acquainted, and to remove the obstacles in the way of such contacts. About 40 member countries were at present represented in the organization by their official tourist agencies and government services dealing with travel. He assured the Commission that his organization wished to aid the Transport and Communications Commission to the fullest possible extent in its work.

55. Mr. CARNES (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) drew attention to document E/CN.2/88 which showed the special aspects of the question in which UNESCO was interested. He asked that the word "material" should be deleted from the English text of that document.

56. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity given to UNESCO to study with it the various aspects of a question which interested both the United

Nations and UNESCO for the latter obviously wished to remove the barriers which prevented cultural and scientific workers and teachers from moving freely from one country to another. Document E/CN.2/88 gave UNESCO's point of view on the matter and contained, from page 5 onwards, some concrete proposals ranging from the issue of special passports to the simplification of visa formalities, and from the granting of a special identity card and transport facilities to the question of foreign currency. Perhaps the most serious barrier of all was that of the impossibility of obtaining sufficient foreign currency for travel purposes. In asking Member States which were short of "hard currencies" for such a concession, UNESCO realized that it was asking them to make a sacrifice, but it was convinced that such sacrifices were amply compensated by the advantages resulting from freer exchanges.

57. Any step which the Commission might take in that connexion would be a source of gratification to UNESCO.

58. The CHAIRMAN thought the Transport and Communications Commission should simplify passport and frontier formalities in general, but that it was not for the Commission to express an opinion as to which particular groups were to be given priority in the matter.

59. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) thought that that question could be considered jointly by the Secretariats of UNESCO and the United Nations. A more thorough study was needed than that which the Commission could undertake during the present session. The Secretariat could be asked to report at the next session of the Commission on the result of its consultations with the Secretariat of UNESCO, and the Commission could then take a decision.

60. Mr. EVANS (International Labour Organisation) said that the Advisory Correspondence Committee on Recreation of the ILO had also dealt with measures designed to encourage popular touring, more especially on an international basis, as indicated in the document on travel questions (E/CN.2/70, page 5).

61. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) asked whether it would not suffice, and satisfy both the ILO and UNESCO, if States complied with the recommendations of the Meeting of Experts on Passports and Frontier Formalities held in Geneva in 1947, which was mentioned in sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph (2) of the operative part of the draft resolution.

62. The CHAIRMAN agreed that that was indeed the case, but pointed out that it was difficult for the Secretariat to take into account the interests of the various categories of travellers who might wish to obtain special facilities.

63. Mr. EVANS (International Labour Organisation) explained that besides frontier formalities and passports, concessions such as reduced rates which might be granted to certain categories of travellers had also to be considered. The Commission of the League of Nations which had dealt with communications and transit had examined the question and that in practice several governments, or rather their railways, had granted reduced rates and other important concessions.

64. The CHAIRMAN considered that the question of special rates was another matter, which did not concern the Commission.

65. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) suggested that the Secretariat should ask, in connexion with its inquiry addressed to Governments concerning the action taken with respect to the recommendations of the Meeting of Experts on Passports and Frontier Formalities, what treatment those Governments would accord to special groups. In that way, the Commission would know what had been and what remained to be done.

66. Mr. SUKTHANKAR (India) agreed with the Chairman that the Commission should consider only the general question of passports and frontier formalities and should not consider particular groups. He supported the proposal made by Mr. Baker that the Secretariat should be asked to submit a study and to make recommendations. Action might be taken with greater advantage on the national plane than on the international plane as had been the case with the recommendations made by the International Chamber of Commerce.

/67. The CHAIRMAN

67. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the question might be solved by adding a third sub-paragraph to paragraph (2) of the operative part of the draft resolution, which would read: "(c) Whether special facilities have been granted^{or}/whether Governments are prepared to grant special facilities to particular groups of travellers".

68. Mr. CARNES (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that, during their discussions, the organs of UNESCO had always taken care to show which questions fell within the competence of the Transport and Communications Commission, such as, for example, the subjects dealt with in document E/CN.2/88. He would therefore be glad if the Commission were to show that it had considered those questions.

69. Mr. TOMPKINS (International Chamber of Commerce) pointed out that business men also constituted an important group as far as travel facilities were concerned.

70. The CHAIRMAN replied to the representative of UNESCO that it would be difficult to mention the groups in which UNESCO was interested without also mentioning those in which the ILO, ICC and perhaps other organizations were interested. He proposed that the Commission should take note of document E/CN.2/88, submitted by UNESCO, in the second paragraph of the draft resolution, mentioning it after the report submitted by the International Union of Official Travel Organizations.

71. Mr. JOVANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) explained that he had refrained from taking part in the discussion and would abstain from voting since his Government considered that the question of passports and frontier formalities came exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

The draft resolution concerning passports and frontier formalities, as amended was adopted unanimously with one abstention.

(b) Pollution of Sea Water by Oil

72. ABAZA Bey (Egypt) suggested that if the Commission deemed it necessary to retain the reference to pollution by atomic waste, the word "possible" should be inserted before the words "pollution of sea water" in sub-paragraph (e) of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

/73. Mr. BAKER

73. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) pointed out that it was not yet known in what form atomic energy might be used to propel ships, but it was certain that such a development might result in the pollution of sea water. Sub-paragraph (e) should therefore be retained in the text of the resolution.

74. The CHAIRMAN also thought it would be better to retain the existing text of the sub-paragraph.

It was so decided.

75. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) pointed out that the meaning of sub-paragraph (f) of paragraph 1 was not clear.

76. The CHAIRMAN agreed with Mr. Baker. In his opinion, the sub-paragraph referred to the preference which Governments might wish to accord to any particular aspect of the problem. Nevertheless, it should be understood that it was the consequences of pollution, together with the methods for eliminating it, which should be considered, and not pollution itself.

The Commission adopted two formal amendments proposed by Mr. BAKER (United States of America) and Mr. SUKTHANKAR (India) respectively.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

(c) Unification of maritime tonnage measurement

77. Mr. JOVANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) remarked that there was no logical connexion between the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the draft resolution; indeed, they were somewhat contradictory.

78. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the text of the fourth paragraph should be changed to read as follows:

"Noting moreover that the replies of the Governments indicate that the majority of countries are not prepared at this stage to contemplate the unification of maritime tonnage measurement on the basis of the Oslo Rules of 1947...."

79. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) wondered whether that was really true of the majority of countries. He proposed that the text should read simply "a certain number of countries".

The proposal was adopted.

The modification to the text of the fourth paragraph proposed by the Chairman was adopted.

80. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) proposed that the last sub-paragraph should be changed to read "...to leave the question of inter-governmental action to IMCO, when it comes into being, and urges individual Governments to continue their study of the problem".

81. Mr. GOURSAT (France) remarked that the matter was not one with which Governments could deal separately.

82. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) explained that one of the aspects to be considered was that of the possible consequences, in each country, of a change-over from one system of tonnage measurement to another. A study of that nature required time and money; Governments should therefore be reminded of the desirability of continuing consideration of the problems involved in order to be prepared for the eventual conference to consider the adoption of a truly uniform system.

83. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the original text of the sub-paragraph should be retained.

It was so decided.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

(d) Problems of maritime shipping affecting Latin America

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously with some drafting changes.

(e) Barriers to international transport of goods (draft resolution A)

84. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) proposed the deletion of the words appearing in brackets in the second paragraph.

85. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) thought it should be recognized that that question had already been studied to some extent. He therefore proposed that the words "to proceed to" in the fourth line of the second paragraph should be replaced by the words "to continue".

/86. Mr. GOURSAT

86. Mr. GOURSAT (France) did not agree with the United States representative. As regards the words appearing in brackets, he felt that the resolution would cover a greater number of States if it addressed itself to those which were parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades or to those which had signed the Havana Charter. Those states were not all Members of the United Nations.

87. Sir Osborne MANCE (United Kingdom) proposed the insertion of a new paragraph between the two existing paragraphs, reading as follows:

"Noting further that direct action such as the convening of a conference to deal with the matter cannot be initiated pending the coming into force of the ITO."

88. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) proposed that it should merely be mentioned in the draft resolution that it was undesirable to take further action on the international plane before the ITO came into being and that a more detailed explanation of the situation might be inserted in the Commission's report.

89. The CHAIRMAN expressed his approval of Mr. Baker's suggestion; he did not feel, however, that the Commission should immediately take a final decision on the draft resolution.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.