

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIALE/AC.6/SR.37
23 August 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Dual Distribution for Council Members

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on

Monday, 23 August 1948, at 10 a.m.

Contents:Pages

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT (Item 27 of the Council Agenda) (Continued)	4 - 22
--	--------

N.B. Will delegates who wish to have corrections made to the Summary Record please submit such corrections in writing to the Secretariat, Room C.436, within 24 hours of distribution of the Summary Record.

22 P.

RECEIVED

8 SEP 1948

UNITED NATIONS
ARCHIVES

Present:

<u>Chairman</u>	Mr. WALKER (Australia)
Australia	Mr. SWAN
Brazil	Mr. CAMPOS
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. SMOLIAR
Canada	Mr. POLLOCK
Chile	Mr. VALENZUELA
China	Mr. HSIAO
Denmark	Mr. IVERSEN
France	Mr. CLERMONT-TONNERRE
Lebanon	Mr. MIKAOU
Netherlands	Mr. RIEMENS
New Zealand	Miss HAMPTON
Peru	Mr. MONGE
Poland	Mr. LANGE
Turkey	Mr. SARPER
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. MOROZOV
United Kingdom	Mr. WARNER
United States	Mr. STINEBOWER
Venezuela	Mr. d'ASCOLI

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Mr. LOPEZ-HERRARTE
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. McDOUGALL
International Monetary Fund	Mr. HEXNER
International Labour Office	Mr. OSMAY
International Civil Aviation Organization	Mr. MARLIN

39

Representatives of Non-Governmental Organizations:

World Federation of Trade Unions Mr. FISCHER

International Co-operative Alliance Mr. MILHAUD

Secretariat:

Mr. Weintraub

Director, Division of
Economic Stability and
Development

Mr. Dumontet

Secretary of the Committee

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT. (Item 27 of the Council agenda) (Documents E/803, E/AC.6/W.28, E/AC.6/W.29, E/AC.6/W.30, E/AC.6/W.31).

Mr. LANGE (Poland) said that in the general discussion on the Report of the International Bank the formal point had been raised whether the resolutions submitted to the Committee were in order, in view of Article 4 of the Agreement between the United Nations and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. He wished emphatically to repeat that discussion and criticism of the activities of the Bank in no way implied lack of interest or a hostile attitude. In his opinion the whole question of Article 4 was irrelevant in so far as the resolution submitted by his delegation was concerned since that resolution constituted neither a formal recommendation nor a recommendation concerning particular loans; it took note of the Report, drew the attention of the Bank to certain situations, expressed an opinion on the proper economic policy with regard to those situations, and finally requested the Bank to consider ways and means of dealing with them.

The basic problem raised in the course of discussion, particularly by the representatives of China and Chile, was that of the fundamental principles governing the International Bank's policy. He believed that there was some misunderstanding with regard to the principles enunciated by the Polish delegation that investments and credits should be allocated in accordance with the criterion of the greatest economic productivity. The purpose of the Bank was to serve economic reconstruction and development and the Report of the International Bank stated that it was a co-operative rather than a profit-making institution.

It was within that double framework that all matters should be considered. It followed therefore that credit policy should be used for reconstruction and development, and not to finance investment in highly developed countries not devastated by war.

The need for reconstruction was rapidly disappearing, even in Europe, and it was the aspect of development which now required stressing. Under-developed countries existed not only in Asia and Latin America, but also in Europe, particularly in Eastern Europe. Services granted to promote development must be applied to producing the best possible results in terms of reconstruction and development and in terms of productivity. The Polish Resolution called the attention of the Bank to the fact that reconstruction and development were faced with certain serious handicaps in the form of special shortages, as for instance in food production, in resources of industrial power, in construction materials - steel and timber. It was most important that the production in those fields of strategic materials in the economic sense should be stepped up; and it was therefore necessary to allocate investments in order to secure an increase in the production of commodities in short supply.

The Polish delegation had no quarrel with the statement made by the International Bank with regard to the principles it wished to apply, namely that its funds be so used as to result in the greatest possible increase in productivity in the shortest possible time. The objection was that the Bank had not carried out the above policy. The reason why it had not been applied was bound up with a phenomenon characteristic of international capital movements during the past two years, particularly during the last year, namely

that such movements were governed not by economic, but by political considerations and a desire to support or oppose certain domestic economic policies. He believed that the Bank, being an international co-operative institution on which all or most of all the Members of the United Nations were represented, should be in a position to resist that spirit of "politicisation". It was its duty to resist any pressure exercised upon it, and he believed that if it did resist, it would not regret having done so. If the International Bank could develop and put into practice a credit policy based on the economic objective of serving the needs of reconstruction and development and of using the economic means most conducive to that end, it would in the long run have reason to congratulate itself.

Thus the resolution submitted by the Polish delegation was intended to give friendly aid to the International Bank by pointing to the basic economic objective and so helping it to steer clear of the pressure of politicisation.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the draft resolution submitted by Poland (Document E/AC.6/W.28) would be considered first.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) asked whether for the sake of expedition it would be appropriate to regard the second paragraph of the resolution submitted by Canada as an amendment to the Polish resolution.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the resolution submitted by Canada was different in intention from that submitted by Poland and was therefore independent. He ruled that the two resolutions were separate; it was however possible for the Committee to adopt them both.

Mr. LANGE (Poland) said that he was prepared to include the second paragraph of the resolution submitted by Canada

at the end of his draft resolution adding on page 2 the words: "REQUESTS the Secretary-General to transmit to the Bank the record of the Council's discussion of this Report".

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) raised the following questions:

1) He assumed that if the resolutions submitted by the Polish delegation were put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, that would be tantamount to a vote being taken on the amendment of Canada; alternatively was the Canadian amendment still before the Committee?

2) With reference to the paragraph on page 2 of the Polish resolution (Document E/AC.6/W.28), beginning with the words "STATES that the measures", he did not consider that it was open to the interpretation given to it, for instance, by the representative of China. The principles enunciated in the paragraph had already been stated in the Report of the International Bank. Consequently, in order to avoid the impression that the Committee was formulating a new principle, he proposed that the representative of Poland accept the following wording: "WELCOMES the enunciation by the Bank of the principle that in the present state of the world its funds should be so used as to result, to the greatest possible extent, in the greatest possible increase in productivity in the shortest possible time and that the Bank is principally a co-operative rather than a profit-making institution".

Mr. HSIAO (China) pointed out that during the preceding meetings a certain amount of criticism had been voiced in the discussion of the Polish proposal and the amendments submitted by China to the Canadian amendment as being repetitive of Articles of the Agreement between the United Nations and the International Bank and because they re-stated well-known policies. The same criticism could be made in regard to the suggestion just made by the representative of the United States.

Mr. LANGE (Poland) accepted the proposal made by the representative of the United States, with the express proviso that the quotation from the Report of the Bank included the words: "and that the Bank is principally a co-operative rather than a profit-making institution".

Mr. HSIAO (China) said that he was not opposed to the latter part of the proposed text. With regard to the first sentence which enunciated the principle of the greatest productivity in the shortest possible time, his delegation, while having no objection to the principle as such, yet did not consider it desirable that the Bank should interpret it too strictly. Productivity was related to the time factor, but there was an inter-play between the time factor and other conditions. It was difficult to have an absolute standard against which to test maximum productivity or a definite period of time. That principle must consequently be interpreted relatively. A strict interpretation of it might do harm in certain under-developed areas where more time was needed to achieve maximum productivity. That fact was indeed acknowledged by the Bank in its Report in the section on Problems. It was essential that the Bank review

its policy with reference to the present discussion in the Committee.

He wondered whether in the event of the adoption of the Polish amendment with the United States substitution there would be any suitable place for the insertion of the Chinese amendment to the Canadian text. If the former were exclusive of the latter he would have to maintain his position.

The CHAIRMAN commented that the Chinese amendment to the Canadian text was in opposition to the paragraph now substituted by the United States and accepted by Poland and beginning with the words "WELCOMES the enunciation". Hence, the Chinese amendment was now virtually an amendment to the Polish draft resolution (E/AC.6/W.28), and the representative of China must vote against that paragraph of the resolution; if the paragraph were rejected then the representative of China could submit his text as an alternative.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) also spoke against the paragraph substituted by the United States delegation. There was involved the question not only of short-term productivity but also that of long-term productivity. The preference of the International Bank was given to reconstruction on the basis of short-term productivity rather than to development activities. If that principle were accepted it followed that the Committee did not request the Bank to make any change in its policy. He was opposed to the concept of short-term productivity and preferred the original statement as submitted by the representative of Poland: "STATES that the measures taken to remedy the situation".

Mr. SWAN (Australia) enquired whether it was certain

that there was any opposition between the newly substituted text in the Polish draft resolution and the Chinese amendment, which requested the Bank to review the content which it attached to the principle enunciated by it. It was quite consistent at the same time to welcome the Bank's statement of the productive principle and to request it to review its policies in the light of that principle.

He suggested that the intention of the final paragraph of the Chinese amendment (Document E/AC.6/W.30) might be incorporated in the Polish draft resolution and follow after the paragraph added at the end of the text and incorporating the second paragraph of the Canadian amendment (Document E/AC.6/W.29). Thus the Committee would request the Secretary-General to transmit the record of the Council's discussion and then invite the Bank to review the principle of the use of its funds.

The CHAIRMAN defined the positions of the Polish and Chinese amendments. While the representative of Poland wished to guard against the perils of politicisation, and welcomed the productivity criterion and emphasised the co-operative character of the Bank the representative of China was concerned lest undue stress on the promotion of short-term productivity would lead the Bank to hold back from certain activities provided for in its Constitution. The representative of China wished the principle to be applied flexibly and to be applicable not solely to short-term productivity. The two attitudes were not contradictory.

Mr. HSIAO (China) proposed to the representative of Poland that he accept the addition at the end of his text, following upon the second paragraph of the Canadian amendment: "REQUESTS the Secretary-General to transmit to the Bank the record of the Council's discussion of this Report", the words "so that it may review its loan policies in the light of these discussions".

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) requested that the Polish Draft Resolution be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph. He regretfully disagreed with the representative of China, since in his view the purpose of the Chinese amendment was to change the Resolution and introduce an element of doubt with regard to the principle which in a preceding paragraph the Committee welcomed. Compromise could only be achieved through ambiguity in the text. First the Committee found that in a world of shortage in capital goods and funds the Bank must act with prudence. Then there followed a request to the Bank to study the Council's discussion and, if it (the Bank) could make up its mind on the principles involved, better than the Council had been able to do, it should then review its policy. He did not feel that it was helpful to the cause of economic development to adopt inconsistent and ambiguous resolutions.

At the request of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. HSIAO (China) formally submitted the addition of the words "so that it may review its loan policies in the light of these discussions" and

Mr. LANGE (Poland) accepted it.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) believed that the Committee's work was not very significant if it merely repeated statements already made in the Bank's Report and in the Agreement between the Bank and the United Nations. He requested that the Polish Draft Resolution be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph. His delegation would vote for the paragraph from the Canadian amendment (E/AC.6/W.29) inserted in the Polish Resolution, and he would oppose the final words proposed by the representative of China, since it would be clear from the records of the discussions that the Committee desired its views to be taken into account by the Bank.

Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom) supported the representative of Canada. In regard to Article 4 of the Agreement between the Bank and the United Nations it was of dubious property for the Committee to propose recommendations to the Bank. He reserved his position on the matter.

Mr. HSIAO (China) asked whether, assuming that the Canadian amendment now inserted in the Polish Draft Resolution were adopted, the Chairman would be prepared to take up the amendments submitted by the representative of China to the Canadian Draft Resolution.

The CHAIRMAN held that, in view of the inclusion of the Canadian amendment in the Polish Draft Resolution, it would be best for the representative of China to incorporate his amendments also in that text. Alternatively, it was open to the Committee to adopt a second resolution emanating from the representative of China. If, on the other hand, the Committee voted for a resolution incorporating both paragraphs of the Canadian amendment, then it would be impossible to adopt another resolution incorporating the amendment of Canada with the Chinese amendments thereto.

Mr. HSIAO (China) emphasized that the amendment submitted by his delegation had the specific purpose of calling the attention of the Bank to development problems. He saw the advantages of the Chairman's proposal but believed that the resulting text would not be fully explicit of the purpose that his delegation had in mind. He wished consequently to move paragraph 2 of his amendment as a separate resolution: "APPRECIATING the statement made..... EXPRESSES its hope that".

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that in the event of the representative of China submitting paragraph 2 of his amendment as a separate resolution, the Committee would have also to consider the Venezuelan amendment to the Chinese amendment.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) declared that while understanding the intentions of the Polish delegation as expressed in the detailed statement submitted, the Soviet Union delegation could not vote for the draft resolution as it did not contain any comments on the activities of the Bank, or any criticisms such as should be formulated by the Economic and Social Council.

On a vote being taken, paragraph 1 of the Polish draft resolution (Document E/AC.6/W.28) was adopted by 14 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 6 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) declared his intention of voting against paragraph 4 on account of the unbalanced emphasis it gave to short-run productivity.

Mr. HSEAO (China) proposed that a separate vote should be taken on that part of paragraph 4 beginning "welcomes the enunciation by the Bank" and ending "within the shortest possible time" and on that part prefaced also by the words "welcomes the enunciation by the Bank of the principle that " beginning "that the Bank" and ending with the words "profit-making institution". The Chairman accorded this request.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would vote against the paragraph because it did not contain the criticism of the Bank's policy expressed by a number of representatives and particularly by himself.

On a vote being taken, the first part of paragraph 4 was rejected by 5 votes to 4, with 8 abstentions.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) explained that one reason alone had prevented him from voting for that particular section of the Polish text, which he otherwise generally supported - the ambiguity which the Brazilian and Chinese representatives had rightly brought out of the words "the greatest possible increase in productivity" in the paragraph

The second part of the paragraph was adopted by 4 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions.

On Mr. d'Ascoli's stating that he had voted on this part in ignorance of the fact that the introductory words "welcomes the enunciation by the Bank of the principles that were included, it was agreed that any member would have an opportunity to clarify his position when the text was discussed in the plenary meeting of the Council.

Paragraph 4, part 2 was then rejected by 4 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions.

Paragraph 5 beginning with the words "requests the International Bank...." was rejected by 4 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions.

The first part of paragraph 6, beginning with the words "Requests the Secretary-General" and ending with the words "the Council's discussion of this report" was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The second part of paragraph 6, reading "in order

that the Bank may review its loan policies in the light of this discussion", was rejected by 8 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

Mr. LANGE (Poland) stated that the purpose of the resolution originally presented by himself was, first to draw the attention of the Bank to the prevailing situation, secondly to request it to consider the appropriate ways and means of remedying that situation. He had accepted the United States amendment in the full expectation that members would vote for the second, and basic, aim of his text. Since that aim had been rejected, he would abstain from the vote on the whole of the resolution.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) had also hoped for a unanimous agreement on the text. The recital of Articles of Agreement of the Bank was pointless unless the requests attaching to that recital were maintained. Similarly the statement that the Bank was a co-operative rather than a profit-making institution was intended to qualify the reference to productivity.

In reply to an enquiry by Mr. Lange (Poland), he stated that he had voted on the whole of the text on page 1 (document E/AC.6/W.28) that he had thereafter voted for the first half of the new paragraph 4, suggested by himself, and had abstained from the second half and from paragraph 5. He had abstained from the first half of paragraph 6, and had voted against the second half of that paragraph. He would vote against the whole of the resolution.

Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom) declared that he also would vote against the whole of the resolution. Following

a protest by Mr. HSIAO (China) against the practice of voting against the complete text, after abstaining from the vote on parts of it, he stated that he had voted against several portions of the draft resolution.

The whole text of the resolution, as amended, was then rejected by 8 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

Mr. RIEMENS (Netherlands) said he had abstained from those parts of the Polish draft resolution which appeared in themselves acceptable, and had voted against the remainder of that text because of the doubtful legal status of the resolution as a whole. For the same reasons he would vote against the second section of paragraph 2 of the Chinese amendment (Document E/AC.6/W.30) to the Canadian draft resolution.

Canadian draft resolution (Document E/AC.6/W.29)

In response to an enquiry by the Chairman, Mr. HSIAO (China) said that he wished paragraph 3 of his amendment (Document E/AC.6/W.30) to be considered in conjunction with the present draft resolution.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) had no objection in principle to the Canadian delegation's draft resolution, which had the merit of being simple even though its scope was not very far-reaching. He would therefore vote in favour of the draft while regretting its failure, unlike the Polish text, to deal with the question in a broader sense.

With regard to the second paragraph of the Chinese amendment, he had already signified his opinion at an earlier stage; in the third paragraph, he considered that the proposal in question had already been examined in connection with the Polish amendment, and that a fresh discussion was therefore unnecessary.

In reply to an objection raised by Mr. SMOLIAN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), the CHAIRMAN agreed that some paragraphs akin to those comprising the Canadian draft resolution, had been voted on in the Polish draft resolution. However, the whole of the latter resolution had a different purport from the Canadian draft resolution. Moreover, the Canadian draft resolution constituted a new item on the agenda of the Committee which had not been withdrawn by its author and had not yet been discussed by the Committee.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) suggested that the words "made by high officials of the Bank on recent occasions to the effect that" should be substituted for the words "made by the representative of the Bank before the Council that" in the first section of paragraph 2 of the Chinese amendments. The report of the Bank referred to such statements by high officials, and the President of the Bank himself had made an important statement at the recent Bogota conference. The Brazilian delegation favoured the Venezuelan amendment to the second section of paragraph 2, since the latter was best designed to overcome difficulties encountered in national investment policies.

He agreed with the point of view expressed by the Venezuelan representative in regard to paragraph 3.

Mr. HSIAO (China) accepted the amendments suggested by the Brazilian and Venezuelan representatives. The Brazilian amendment to section 1 of paragraph 2 assigned responsibility to the right quarter.

Replying to an earlier criticism of the United States representative, he stated that the President of the Bank was subject only to the authority of the Board of Governors, and his statement must be assumed to reflect the policy of the Bank just as statements of the United States Secretary of State must be taken to indicate United States foreign policy.

He accepted the point of view of the Venezuelan representative in regard to paragraph 3.

Mr. LANGE (Poland) whilst viewing with sympathy the intention of paragraph 2, section 1, of the Chinese amendment did not believe that reference could be made to the "European Recovery Programme". Viewed from the point of view of its legal status within the United Nations, it must be regarded as private enterprise on the part of a few national governments. The words "has taken due account of the initiation of the European Recovery Programme and" should therefore be deleted.

Mr. HSIAO (China) accepted the deletion proposed by the representative of Poland, while reserving his opinion as to the reasons for such a deletion.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) stated that in striving to facilitate the economic development of backward countries and to overcome obstacles to international investment, the Bank could not adopt measures falling within the purview only of individual governments or of the investors; consequently he could not approve of paragraph 2 section 2.

He shared the view expressed by the Venezuelan representative in regard to paragraph 3.

Mr. HSIAO (China) withdrew paragraph 3.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) appreciated the legal difficulties mentioned by the Polish representative concerning the mention of the European Recovery Programme. But if the wording mentioned were eliminated then the section would resolve itself into a general statement repeating what had already been set out in the Bank's Report. The initiation of the European Recovery Programme was the reason for the Bank's decision to favour development loans.

He proposed the addition, after the words "Appreciating the statement made by high officials of the Bank upon recent occasions to the effect that", of the following phrase:

"other sources of financing being now available for a substantial part of reconstruction needs."

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that any reference, however veiled, to the Marshall Plan was improper in a document issued by the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) said that, if he had understood aright, the Committee had now reached the amendment moved by his delegation to the Chinese amendment and accepted by the Chinese representative. If that was so, the USSR representative's remark was irrelevant.

On a vote being taken paragraph 2 section 1 as amended of the Chinese amendment (Document E/AC.6/W.30) was adopted by 7 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

On a vote being taken on paragraph 2 section 2, 6 votes were recorded for and 6 against the text, there being 5 abstentions.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) explained that his Government was not at the moment considering applying for a loan. He had voted for that paragraph because he thought it only right to express the hope of seeing capital devoted to assisting the economic development of under-developed countries. He was astonished to find that idea, equitable though it was, meeting with a certain measure of resistance within the Council.

Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark) said he had voted against paragraph 2, section 2, of the Chinese amendments because in his view that text was superfluous. A direction to the Bank to that effect was already implicit in section 1, whilst any hopes in that regard should more properly be addressed to the governments and investors.

Mr. HSIAO (China) assumed that the Netherlands representative doubted the validity of section 2 on the grounds that the Council could not make a recommendation to the Bank without prior consultation.

He would point out first that in the wording proposed the Council expressed a hope rather than made a recommendation. Secondly, a recommendation that the Bank should be prepared to adopt the views which the Economic Commission for Latin America might formulate after the completion of the Economic Survey for Latin America had encountered no objection during the Council's discussion on the report of that Commission.

Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom) pointed out that the text to which the Chinese representative had referred related to technical aspects alone, and therefore did not constitute a precedent.

Mr. CLERMONT-TONNERRE (France) wished to explain his abstention with regard to paragraph 2 section 2. His delegation was far from hostile to the granting by the Bank of loans to under-developed countries. The reason why he had not voted for that proposal was firstly on juridical grounds, and secondly on grounds of expediency. He felt that the Council should leave it to the Bank to define its loan policy on its own responsibility, subject to intervention after a lapse of time if it became aware that that policy was ill-directed. To exert pressure at the present time could only create confusion in a field which everyone recognised to be important.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) agreed with the point of view expressed by the Chinese representative in regard to the legality of section 2.

Referring to the functions of the Bank as outlined by the United States representative, he pointed out that the Bank was in many cases unable to grant loans in view of the improper fiscal structure or other financial deficiencies of the applicant state, and the consequent danger that repayment would be hampered. The bank might therefore take steps to enable states to readjust their financial or fiscal structure so as to enhance their eligibility for loans.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) stated that the Canadian objection to section 2 reflected no opposition to a policy of development loans.

The present paragraph was superfluous in view of the recognised policy of the Bank, and the original resolution proposed by the Canadian delegation served the purpose of those who wished to bring the question to the attention of that body.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) had been pleased to note the statements by various members of the Committee on the subject of loans granted for the development of under-developed countries. For his part, he would vote for the Chinese amendment with a conviction strengthened by the author's explanation that it was voicing a hope rather than making an official request. The Committee, by adopting the former action, arrogated no rights to itself which it did not possess. If specific recommendations could be formulated on the question of development it was plain logic that recommendations could also be formulated on the Bank's general policy with regard to loans intended for the development of under-developed countries.

Mr. HSIAO (China) did not agree that the section should be rejected simply because it repeated the gist of a preceding clause. The statement was of significance in itself and if that section were rejected, then the Chinese delegation reserved the right to raise the matter again in the plenary meeting of the Council. He proposed that the Committee should waive the notice applicable to Rule 46 of the Rules of Procedure, as indicated in Rule 70.

There being no objections, the requirement for 24 hours notice of the proposal for the suspension of Rule 46 was waived.

There being no objections, Rule 46 was suspended.

On a further vote being taken, paragraph 2, section 2 of the Chinese amendments (Document E/AC.6/W.30) was adopted by 7 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

The whole Canadian draft proposal, as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.