

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

FIFTH SESSION

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, Wednesday, 30 July 1947, at 11:00 a.m.

Present:

Chairman:	Mr. Papanek	
	Mr. Martin	(Canada)
	Mr. Santa Cruz	(Chile)
	Mr. Chang	(China)
	Mr. Perez-Cisneros	(Cuba)
	Mr. Radimsky	(Czechoslovakia)
	Mr. Clermont-Tonnerre	(France)
	Mr. Nehru	(India)
	Mr. Hakim	(Lebanon)
	Mr. Beyen	(Netherlands)
	Mr. Thorn	(New Zealand)
	Mr. Lunde	(Norway)
	Mr. de Laval	(Peru)
	Mr. Tarhan	(Turkey)
	Mr. Chernyshev	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
	Mr. Holmes	(United Kingdom)
	Mr. Stinebower	(United States of America)
	Mr. d'Ascoli	(Venezuela)

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

Mr. McDougall	(FAO)
Mr. Riches	(ILO)

Observer: Mr. Herrarte (Bank)

Consultants of Non-Governmental Organizations:

Mr. Garvan (AFL)

Secretariat:	Mr. A. D. K. Owen	(Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Affairs)
	Mr. G. Yates	(Secretary to the Economic and Social Council)

Interim Report of the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment (Documents E/469 and E/AC.6/W.5)

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there were two problems before the Committee: (1) what invitations would be sent for the Conference on Trade and Employment and (2) whether the right to vote would be extended to recipients of the invitations.

Mr. NEHRU (India) stated that India supported the recommendation of the Interim Committee (document E/469, Annex D, page 9), but would also like to have invitations sent to Pakistan and the Indonesian Republic. He was not sure of the political status of the Indonesian Republic in view of the

/military

RECEIVED

6 AUG 1947

7 P.

UNITED NATIONS

military action which was taking place. He added that lack of facts prevented him from making further concrete recommendations, which he reserved the right to make at another time. He emphasized that all non-Members should be allowed to participate in the conference on the same basis as Members.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba) agreed that Cuba would comply with any decision reached by the Council although it had strong views on the subjects under discussion.

Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom) also supported the resolution contained in the interim report, advocating that non-Members should have equal status with members, that Pakistan be invited, and that countries such as Burma, Ceylon and Southern Rhodesia, having full autonomy as far as external commercial relations were concerned should also be invited.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) said that he was opposed to extending voting rights to any non-Member nations, in order to avoid a possible source of real difficulty later. A United Nations conference would not be truly representative of the United Nations if all distinctions between Members and non-Members were eliminated. It would break the precedent established in the United Nations Health Conference held in New York in 1946, in which practically the identical non-Members (with the exception of those which had since become Members) had been invited to participate without any voting rights. There was no validity in the argument that absence of voting rights would cause lack of interest in the Charter, since no such difficulty had been encountered in the case of the World Health Organization, at which conference non-Members had the status of observers only. Non-Members should be given full rights to participate in discussions but without a vote. The United States wanted the United Nations to be consistent in its treatment of non-Members and would oppose granting them voting rights in this case as in the case of the Conference on Freedom of Information. He emphasized that without advocating over-exclusiveness within the United Nations, he must advocate some distinction between Members of the United Nations and non-Members in such matters as this. He made it clear that he approved of non-Members becoming full-fledged members of the International Trade Organization upon adhering to the Charter, despite the fact that they were without voting rights at the Conference.

Mr. BEYEN (Netherlands) remarked that the purpose of the meeting was to try to solve problems to the benefit of all involved; that purpose would not be furthered by going into political issues. He agreed with the representative of the United States on the question of voting rights.

/He mentioned

He mentioned the procedure followed by the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East as a precedent for issuing invitations and for the manner in which recipients would be represented. He suggested following the procedure shown in the Report of the Committee of the Whole of that Commission (document E/491, pages 8 and 9).

The CHAIRMAN suggested voting on the question of whether the non-Member countries invited should have the right to vote.

Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom) pointed out that the success of the International Trade Organization would depend upon the widest possible coverage of the world economy. It was a functional conference, dealing with practical matters leading to the acceptance of important obligations. Those who would have to fulfil these obligations should have a full part in shaping the Charter by having the right to vote. The question should be decided on its own merits without fear of creating a precedent. If the invited countries should attend as observers, even with the right to speak, the best results would not be attained. His Government had been consistent on this issue and had taken the same stand in Geneva.

Mr. CLERMONT-TONNERRE (France) drew attention to the fact that the meeting had now before it two different draft resolutions: No. 3 dealing with sovereign States and No. 4 dealing with States which were not fully sovereign. The right to vote should be decided upon separately.

Mr. MARTIN (Canada) opposed the French proposal and suggested a simple vote on all the areas to be invited. He supported the point of view of the United States that it was dangerous to create the precedent that voting powers be extended to non-Members attending a conference convened by the United Nations. He doubted whether it was in accordance with the terms of the Charter to extend the right to vote to non-Members at the present stage. He proposed the following resolution:

"HAVING CONSIDERED the Resolution of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, relating to the invitation of non-Members of the United Nations to the Conference, and

HAVING NOTED that the Report of the Preparatory Committee makes no recommendation on the question of voting rights at this Conference for such non-Members of the United Nations,

RESOLVES that voting rights at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment shall be extended only to Members of the United Nations attending the Conference.

He agreed that Pakistan should be invited to the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN summed up the situation as follows:

If the Canadian resolution should be accepted, then the question of voting would be disposed of. After that a decision should be taken on the countries which should be invited, taking into account that the representative of India had proposed that Pakistan be added. A special resolution on Indonesia should then be considered.

In reply to a question by the French representative, whether the Canadian proposal dealt with non-Member countries, ex-enemy countries, or non-self-governing territories, the Chairman stated that the Canadian draft decided a principle to be applied to all three groups.

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) recommended that the question of the voting rights of non-Member states and non-self-governing territories should be separated. He advocated the right to vote for non-Member states, since the Charter of the International Trade Organization would impose important rules and strict obligations. The situation in the case of the Conference on Freedom of Information and of the World Health Organization was obviously different. He concluded that voting rights should be given to the non-Member states, as listed in draft resolution No. 3, Pakistan included. His delegation still had to consider whether those rights should be extended to non-self-governing territories.

A discussion took place between Mr. CHANG (China), Mr. MARTIN (Canada), and Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America), which resulted in a rewording of the Canadian draft resolution in order to make it quite clear that neither non-Member States nor non-self-governing territories would have the right to vote.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) considered that the arguments put forward by the United Kingdom and Lebanon representatives on the one hand, and by the United States representative on the other hand, were both weighty. He would abstain from voting without prejudice to the stand that might be taken by his delegation in the plenary meeting.

Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom) objected to deciding at the same time on the voting rights of countries named in resolution No. 3 and the territories named in resolution No. 4, since different considerations were involved. The argument against the extension of voting rights to countries named in resolution No. 3 on the ground that they were not Members of the United Nations did not apply to the territories named in resolution No. 4, Burma, Ceylon and Southern Rhodesia, which were associated with the United Nations.

Mr. CHANG (China) suggested amending the Canadian draft resolution to add the words "states and territories" before the words "non-Members" in the first paragraph and to delete the second paragraph entirely.

Mr. MARTIN (Canada) opposed the suggestion of the representative of China and suggested adding the word "governments" instead; he felt that the second paragraph should remain for explanatory purposes.

At the suggestion of Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon), Mr. SUTENS, Chairman of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, explained to the Council that the Preparatory Committee, in
/making

making its recommendations had not been familiar with all the documents and precedents of the Council. However, stating his personal opinion, he advocated that non-Members be given the right to vote for practical reasons. Some of them were important in international trade and could send to the Conference international experts whose views could be instrumental in drafting the Charter before opening it for adherence. It was inadvisable to offend non-Members, possibly creating a bloc opposing the charter.

Mr. D'ASCOLI (Venezuela) explained that it was important to decide whether the Conference should be a United Nations conference or not. The fact that not all the members of United Nations had participated in the preparatory meetings would tend to support the view that the forthcoming Conference in Havana was not exclusively for the benefit of Members of the United Nations. Accordingly he favoured allowing non-Members to vote, thus increasing the effectiveness of the Conference.

Mr. NEHRU (India) called attention to the fact that the Council resolution of 18 February 1946⁽¹⁾ used the word "International" rather than "United Nations" in describing the forthcoming Conference.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) emphasized his country's extreme interest in the preparatory work of the Conference. He deemed it unwise to depart from precedents already established and explained that the United States had been the first to suggest that the responsibility for the Conference be transferred from the United States to the United Nations, where it should remain.

Mr. TARHAN (Turkey) suggested changing the wording of the Canadian draft resolution from "shall be extended only to Members" to "shall not be extended to non-Members."

The CHAIRMAN, replying to Mr. D'ASCOLI (Venezuela), cited the Council's resolution of 18 February 1946⁽¹⁾ to demonstrate that the Conference was to be a United Nations Conference and not merely a conference called by the United Nations.

Mr. NEHRU (India) pointed out that it was then logical to change the word "United Nations" to "International" in describing the Conference, in compliance with that resolution.

In reply the CHAIRMAN noted that it had also been customary to describe the Conference as "United Nations" in many instances.

Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom) supported Mr. NEHRU (India) and quoted from the resolution. He also questioned whether a Member was the government of the country in question or the country itself. Favouring the issuance

(1) See Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, First Year, First Session, page 173, No. 1/13.

of invitations to Burma, Ceylon and Southern Rhodesia, he explained that they were already affected by the decisions of the United Nations.

Mr. MARTIN (Canada) explained that not much was to be gained by trying to distinguish between the words "International" and "United Nations" since it was evident that the Conference was an international conference called by the United Nations. The important consideration was that the Conference was called for the purpose of setting up an organ of the United Nations. This would tend to support the argument that non-Member governments should not be given the right to vote.

On the suggestion of Mr. CHANG (China), the CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the principle that non-Members invited to the Conference should not be given voting rights.

DECISION: The principle was accepted by 8 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then asked whether Pakistan should be included in the list of countries mentioned in draft resolution No. 3.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) stated that he did not know what the status of Pakistan would be when the Conference was opened. He thought that it was difficult to take a decision at the moment in regard to Pakistan. He therefore asked for some time to consider the question.

Mr. CHANG (China) suggested that a separate resolution be drafted on the membership of Pakistan, because it might have become a Member of the United Nations before the Conference opened.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that that was also the case with regard to several other countries named in resolution No. 3.

After a discussion of the actual status of Pakistan, Mr. NEHRU (India) stated that the Government of Pakistan had already come into existence and had taken part in the discussions in Geneva.

DECISION: As there were no objections, it was decided to include Pakistan in the list of countries mentioned in resolution No. 3.

Without objection it was also decided to invite all countries mentioned in draft resolution No. 3, the Allied Control Authorities, and Burma, Ceylon, and Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) referred to the view expressed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Delegation in the plenary meeting in regard to the report of the Preparatory Committee. As the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was not represented on that committee, it would abstain from taking part in the discussion.

Mr. NEHRU (India) submitted the following resolution:

"RECOGNIZING that the Indonesian Republic enjoys in fact autonomy in the conduct of its external commercial relations,

RECOGNIZING further that the participation of the Government of the Indonesian Republic will promote the objective of the Conference,

/RESOLVES

RESOLVES to send a direct invitation to the Government of the Indonesian Republic to participate in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment."

Mr. CLERMONT-TONNERRE (France) asked for clarification of the point whether Indonesia was to be considered, if invited, as belonging to the group of countries in resolution No. 3 or to the territories mentioned in resolution No. 4.

Mr. NEHRU (India) answered that he had submitted a separate resolution dealing with Indonesia because the situation was at present confused. As the Government of Indonesia was recognized as de facto, it could not be included under resolution No. 4. Personally, he had no objections to including it among the countries mentioned in resolution No. 3.

After some discussion, adjournment was suggested in order to study the Indian proposal.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) stressed the desirability of inviting Specialized Agencies and other appropriate governmental organizations. He also expressed the wish that the invitations to the Allied Control Authorities, especially in Germany, be drafted in such a way that each of the four occupation zones could send their own representatives.

Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom) supported this suggestion.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba) wished to make it clear that his Government did not believe in blocs, and was not prepared to take part in blocs at the ITO Conference or at any other time.

The meeting rose at 1:10 p.m.
