

**United Nations**

**Nations Unies**

**ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED  
E/P.V.102  
August 1947  
English

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL  
Fifth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SECOND MEETING

Lake Success, New York.  
Friday, 1 August 1947, at 11 a.m.

Acting President: Mr Jan PAPANEK

NOTE: This verbatim record is issued under rule 35 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council.

The rules of procedure do not provide for the submission of corrections to the verbatim record, but only to the summary record (rule 49).

Interpretations as delivered at meetings are recorded in the present verbatim record for the convenience of delegates, and corrections to these interpretations need not be submitted.

Corrections to the text of original speeches should be sent to the Secretary of the Economic and Social Council for the guidance of the Committee of the Summary Records.

RECEIVED

4 AUG 1947

UNITED NATIONS  
ARCHIVES

The PRESIDENT: I declare the one hundred and second meeting of the Economic and Social Council open.

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

The PRESIDENT: We shall begin the discussion by considering paragraph 3 of document E/AC.6/14.

I should like to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that we have adopted the deletion of the second sub-paragraph of paragraph 3, and adopted some amendments to the third sub-paragraph; we are discussing only the principle concerning the voting or non-voting rights of those nations to be invited to the Conference.

Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom): A few days ago this matter came before the Committee of the Council and a vote was taken on the principle involved as regards the voting rights of those countries which are to be invited to the World Conference as distinct from those countries which will come to the World Conference automatically as Members of the United Nations. The vote we took resulted in a majority of eight to four against the principle, with six Members of the Committee abstaining.

I can assure you it is with a real sense of responsibility that I venture to reopen this question at the Council. It is because I have a real sense of responsibility that I do so. The United Kingdom delegation believes very strongly that the matter is one of very great importance to the future of the International Trade Organization which we are going to try to bring into being at Havana. Therefore, I ask leave briefly to put the case before the Council as it presents itself to us, in the hope that the Members of the Council will be prepared to consider this important question once more.

Essentially the question is a simple one. The context is, of course, the forthcoming Conference at Havana, a Conference in preparation for which the Members of the Preparatory Committee, consisting of some seventeen or eighteen nations, have been in session for many months, at Geneva at the moment and in London last fall for their first session.

What we are considering now in that context is the status of those countries invited to attend the World Conference. We are not considering here and now what exact provisions the charter of the proposed International Trade Organization should contain as to status of Members, or as to any other field. That is a matter for the Conference itself to determine; and it is precisely because we feel it to be a matter of high importance that the Conference should be given every chance of success in dealing with the very weighty matter of shaping a charter which will contain in it, we think--and I am sure everyone here will agree--the terms of success or failure for the economic system of the whole world.

On the World Conference, therefore, will depend the shape of the charter on the one hand, and the degree of the support to be received by the Organization.

Perhaps I may deal now with some of the objections which have been raised to the proposal that voting rights should be accorded to all states attending the Conference. As I understand it, the opposition rests principally, at least, on the fact that the Conference is called by the United Nations and the claim that at such a Conference, whatever the subject, only Members of the United Nations should be allowed to exercise the vote, and that, quite irrespective of the fact that it is the intention that the Organization -- though we hope it will become in due course a specialized agency of the United Nations -- will embrace and be subscribed to by countries Members or non-Members alike of the United Nations.

I think I need not deal with the nature of the proposed organization except to say, without any fear of denial, that its establishment on the widest possible basis and its success, which we feel to be really synonymous, are of the highest importance to the world. Perhaps I need only add to that, as has been said before on many occasions, the organization will be a functional organization with severely practical ends and involving very considerable obligations on the part of those who become its members. I cannot possibly aspire to elaborate on the practical issues in any way as eloquently, as well or as comprehensively as did the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee who has been here this week. I think that most of the Members of the Council have heard Mr. Suetens personal views, but

they are views which must be given the greatest possible weight, since Mr. Suetens was the Chairman of the first session of the Preparatory Committee in London and the second session which is now going on in Geneva. I am very sorry that there is no verbatim report of what he said on that occasion.

We believe that if it matures, the organization will result in great benefits for all, but I must emphasize that each Member will be asked to contribute to the degree of limitation of its freedom; each Member will be asked to accept obligations which for some--and perhaps for all in varying ways--will be heavy obligations; obligations which may be difficult to persuade that country's public opinion or parliament to assume. Therefore, a great deal depends on our obtaining the willing cooperation of all countries in the common interest.

I should not think that the organization would be entirely unique in this regard. There have been and there will be other organizations, but its field is exceptionally wide and its problems exceptionally complex, especially at this time of slow and painful recovery from the participation in the war.

We feel this is a problem so wide and so complex that we cannot afford to have large gaps, or many gaps, in the area of international trade or in the field of employment in the widest sense which the organization is designed to cover.

I have mentioned the obligations of members. We believe they are very far-reaching and we feel it is going to be very difficult indeed for some countries to persuade their public opinion and their governments to accept definitively such obligations unless they can show that they have had a full and equal chance with Members of the United Nations to argue their points of view in the formulation of the obligations and to vote on them.

There is a great difference between a government presenting to its public and its parliament proposals which possibly contain obligations that are not altogether palatable, if it can say that it pressed its point of view to a vote, or, on the other hand, asking for the ratification of an agreement in the formulation of which it did not have that type of opportunity.

The whole point is that the International Trade Organization should be as comprehensive as possible; that the maximum number of possible units should undertake obligations not to indulge in practices inhibiting world trade. In some cases -- in many cases, perhaps -- this is going to involve a considerable departure from the economic methods of prospective Members and will represent, therefore, a step which

PF/gpr

E/P.V.102

22-25

involves political and administrative difficulties of a high order.

We feel that we must do everything to ease the position of such countries.

There are other considerations of importance. We must see that the Conference is a success. As I have said, no country has done more than the United Kingdom in looking for the success of this Conference and in preparing for it. However, I must readily admit that no country has done more than the United States; but I do think that the United Kingdom, too, can legitimately assume to itself some credit for the fact that the world conference is ultimately going to be held, and held on a wide basis.

It is a matter which is very clear to our beliefs that this is the sort of way in which world problems of this complex order ought to be tackled. I feel that for both my country and the United States it is particularly unfortunate that I should find myself at issue with my United States colleague on this important point. The practical character of the issues, the functional nature of the organization and the gravity of the obligations all combine, we feel, to make it essential that we should have willing cooperation. Are we likely to get that cooperation in the case of members of the Conference from countries to whom it is proposed to address invitations, but from whom it is proposed to withhold voting rights? I doubt it very much. Can we necessarily expect countries who are not to have voting rights at the Conference to accept the invitation, and would it not be a very great pity if we found that when we got to Havana there were a number of important gaps which may represent countries with differing points of views, just those points of view perhaps which we want to take account of? Or if we find countries coming to the Conference and accepting the position of having no vote on issues which may be of extreme importance to them, I wonder what the future then would be.

I feel in those circumstances I would at least exercise my right to speak and to speak at very great length. Even if you take it a stage further and obtain their agreement to become members of the Organization and deprive them of voting, I wonder whether we shall not find at the Conference that they would wish at an early stage to introduce amendments to the Charter, which has given us so much difficulty here.



I have pointed out that we are not here to consider anything but invitations to and procedure at the World Conference, but I think it is legitimate to suggest that there can surely be no question as to the voting rights of members of the International Trade Organization when established. Perhaps I am wrong in this opinion. The World Conference is, so to speak, the constituent assembly of the Organization. Is it seriously contemplated by anyone that non-members of the United Nations should not be given a vote in the International Trade Organization itself, a conception which, in our view, would radically alter the whole nature of the Organization. If that is so, I think we can be quite clear beyond doubt that no non-member of the United Nations will join.

We are told it would be a very bad precedent. I suppose that it will become an Englishman to decry precedent or tradition, but I think there is probably an even better test, the test of merit. I think also perhaps it would will become an Englishman not to press for reasonable flexibility.

As I say, we do not feel that there is any better test than merit, and we feel that we <sup>can</sup> really do wrong unless we do think about the merits of the case. I have yet to hear any word spoken against the proposal that there should be voting rights for all those invited at the Conference and I have yet to hear any word spoken in opposition to merit.

We are told that it would be in some way a bad principle. It is not in the United Kingdom's view a matter of necessity in any way that a United Nations Conference--and I will call it that. I will call it that though it has been pointed out that the words used in the original resolution of the Council, which looked towards this gathering, merely said an International Conference. But let us say that it is an International Conference or, at any rate, it is a Conference which has been called under the aegis of the United Nations. There is no reason in our view why that should not be attended in the capacity of full members of the Conference by non-Members of the United Nations, just as we look towards the establishment of something which will be a specialized agency in which non-Members of the United Nations will function on the same basis as everyone else.

Why are these invitations being issued at all? Is it not because we desire to have all states present which have an

appreciable interest in world trade and because it is only by their own wish that they can be covered by the provisions of the Charter? That is why <sup>in the list</sup> you will find that some countries which, though separate sovereign states, are not Members of the United Nations, and some countries which, though they may not be altogether or entirely autonomous in all aspects of their international relations, are autonomous in the matters provided for by the Charter, and are also covered through the metropolitan country with which they are associated in the United Nations. But all alike are fully responsible for the matters provided for by the Charter and are totally in charge of their external commercial relations.

We feel that we want them there, and we want them there willingly. We want them there for their advice and the help they can give us. We have been working on this matter for a long time and perhaps we may not altogether see all the wood for all the trees. We feel very strongly that if we do finally decide not to give voting rights to all the countries invited, it would be very regrettable.

Mr. THORP (United States): I believe this is the third day we have discussed this problem, and I do not propose to go over the positive arguments in support of the Report of the Committee of the Whole. I should rather take a few minutes for what might be called comment upon the arguments presented by the representative of the United Kingdom. I am assuming that he feels, in reopening this matter, that he has additional light to provide beyond that shed in the discussion before, and therefore I shall limit my remarks rather than go over the entire ground, to two basic points which seem to me present in his comments.

The first point in the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom is an underlying assumption which goes through his entire statement that somehow we can isolate this problem and separate it from the general problems of the United Nations; that this is a special case; that this is sui generis, and that we can deal with it only in consideration of the International Trade Organization. That is a premise with which I am forced to disagree very substantially. I do not think we can act on this matter in this case and regard it as a final determination which will not carry over with it additional problems and precedents in other cases.

Quite frankly--I am going to speak very directly on this problem--I think this Council is threatened with getting involved in very serious difficulties. In the first place, in this particular case, if we decide to open up the voting procedure to everybody who is invited, then we shall have this same problem in connection with every conference which comes along from here on, and we shall have to decide each one. I am not at all sure that we have any criteria. The one criterion suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom seems to be that this is a very important matter. If we debate each time as to whether or not a particular

AC:cc

E/P.V.102  
37 - 45

conference is a very important matter, I can see the procedures at our meetings being prolonged substantially. I think we are much better off if we try to develop a real degree of consistency in our treatment of these problems. But more difficult than that is the problem that is created in any specific case in which we determine that those invited shall receive a veto.

Those countries, for one reason or another, are not Members of the United Nations. Some of them have not applied for membership; some have applied for membership but have not yet qualified. If we admit them fully to voting privileges in a conference such as the one under consideration, then it seems to me we are forced to give very careful scrutiny to those countries and consider why they have not been given membership in the United Nations. It is very difficult, it seems to me, to be arguing in one body that a particular country, for some reason, is not qualified to be a Member of the United Nations, and in another body to be supporting strongly the view that it should be allowed to vote in a conference called by the United Nations.

It is this kind of difficulty that distresses me because it becomes a difficult problem if one has to face it in those terms. I think the suggested solution of going as far as one possibly can in the way of participation without giving the right to vote avoids that difficulty. It gives us the opportunity of having the benefit of the viewpoint of these countries. It gives them the opportunity to present that viewpoint. Certainly that course of action is much more important in effecting the ultimate conclusion than whether or not they have a vote.

If matters are decided in a world conference on a basis where one or two or three votes is the deciding factor and there is therefore no world opinion in support of a particular program, I question the wisdom of trying to carry out such a program. We must have substantial support, real majority support, in order to make these organizations operate. Therefore, the voting by a small number of nations, I think, is not a matter of great importance in effecting the ultimate pattern to be decided.

I do want to emphasize the point that if we decide we are going to give the vote to certain specific countries not Members of the United Nations, I fear that leads us into considerations which most of us should prefer not to have to face in connection with this kind of problem.

The second point on which I wish to comment is this very gloomy picture which has been painted -- the dire consequences. If this Conference is as important as the representative has indicated, it is difficult for me to see why a country should not wish to take the opportunity of expressing its point of view at the Conference.

I should like to assure the representative of the United Kingdom that I am not in any way trying to argue that when an organization is set up and the responsibilities and obligations of members have been determined, then we should have within that organization some provision relating to voting and

non-voting members. I think that would be an unfortunate thing to do so far as the ultimate situation is concerned. However, as far as this World Conference is concerned, I doubt whether the consequences are as serious. My reason for feeling that way is based on actual experience. In the FAO, in the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund and in UNESCO, the fact that countries were not at the original conferences which set them up has not apparently prevented countries from requesting membership at a later time. All those organizations have had adherences to membership by countries which were not at the original conferences. It seems to me that under these circumstances, we are not taking steps which are likely to hold down the Membership of the International Trade Organization. We are suggesting a procedure which will give us the full benefit of the advice and point of view of these countries; and I do think that the Members of the United Nations who will attend this Conference will certainly give full consideration to their point of view. The Members of the United Nations who are there will be able to find the wise answers to the problems which are raised at the Conference.

Mr. RADIMSKY (Czechoslovakia): I have listened with great attention to the arguments presented by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States. However, I do not wish to speak on the substance of the matter at this moment. I only wish to make a proposal to deal separately with sovereign states on the one hand and with the non-sovereign territories on the other. As I understand it, some of the delegations have a different point of view regarding the voting rights of these two kinds of countries and it would facilitate our debate to deal with them separately. It seems to me that such a proceeding was proposed by the representative of France in our Economic Committee, and I am beginning to be fully aware of the wisdom of his suggestion.

Mr. LUNDE (Norway): I should like very briefly to state the position of the Norwegian delegation on the subject which is now before us. We have very carefully considered the arguments which have been so eloquently put forward by the representative of the United Kingdom and the Chairman of the Interim Committee in favour of extending voting rights to non-Member countries. We fully understand that there are serious reasons in this special case to defend such a view.

On the other hand, we think that considerations of a general and principled nature make us support the opposite view in this case.

The situation now is that a rather large number of countries outside the United Nations have to be invited separately from the other countries which would automatically be members of the Conference, and it was certainly not contemplated that such a situation would arise when the Charter was drawn up in San Francisco. At that time we probably had reason to hope that in a few years nearly all the countries in the world would have joined the United Nations; certainly we must still have that hope.

I think there would be a certain danger for the United Nations <sup>it</sup> if/established the principle that conferences and undertakings of the United Nations are carried out in such a way that equal rights are given to Member and non-Member states alike. In other connections, we have seen a certain tendency on the part of the specialized agencies to make themselves more or less independent of the general policies of the United Nations. I think that same consideration is involved here in a certain way.



I should like to add a minor consideration which perhaps also has a certain weight when we talk about principles, and that is that this Conference as well as other conferences arranged and organized by the United Nations involve expenditures which are certainly paid by the Members of the United Nations. It would not be right to extend exactly the same rights to countries which would not share in these expenses.

Mr. MARTIN (Canada): This question is, by itself, seemingly unimportant, but it has so many implications that one must reach the conclusion that it involves an extremely important question of principle. I prefer to be very frank in view of the attitude which my delegation took on this matter in the Committee. Our attitude in the Committee, of course, was that non-Member states should not be given voting rights. The reasons which we gave at that time were not dissimilar to the reasons given this morning by the representative of the United States.

I have listened with very great attention to the persuasive argument of the representative of the United Kingdom this morning. Coming fresh from Geneva, as indeed the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee has come, one could readily understand the attitude of the representative of the United Kingdom on this matter. But we are a Council of the United Nations and we have to view the matter, not in the light of the atmosphere of any particular place at the moment, but in the light of what this means to the much more important question, and that is the continued integrity and effectiveness of the United Nations Organization as a whole.

It is with that background that I speak this morning. I would be frank to say that when I asked the Council yesterday to adjourn the discussion of this matter, it was because I had brought before me certain considerations which caused me to feel that the view I had

EW/gpr

E/P.V.102  
53-55

taken earlier might not be the correct one. It was on the strength of that that I made two requests that the matter be adjourned. Since that time, we have given this matter a great deal of thought. The main argument adduced by the representative of the United Kingdom is that in view of the character of the proposed organization in relation to world trade, it would be very regrettable -- and indeed I think his words were even stronger than that -- if we did anything that might preclude full participation and ultimate Membership in the Organization of certain non-Member states.

I must say to him that I can hardly bring myself to believe that could be the case. I do not pit my particular experience in the matter at the moment against his, but I cannot believe that to be the case. If it is the case then one has to consider whether or not the advantages of non-participation ultimately by certain non-Member states is more important than the principle which has been so carefully and correctly stated by the representative of Norway, who spoke a moment ago.

I believe we are developing a dangerous tendency in this Council. This Council could easily become a mere filing agency, and I am not so sure that critics of the Organization would not be justified in making that kind of an observation. When this Council was established -- certainly at its first meetings, when discussions took place as to its terms of reference and as to the kind of developing functions it would assume -- it was not intended to be a body that would exercise, vis-a-vis the specialized agencies, the function of an equal partner, but it was to be a co-ordinating body, a sort of a cabinet. I doubt if we are developing that function. It would seem to me that we must view this question in the light of that situation.

I feel that the Economic and Social Council will lose in prestige and in efficacy if it does not develop into a body that exercises more than mere moral authority on the specialized agencies, with whom it has now entered into contractual relationships on terms that are settled. On that account, it need not be discussed at this time. However, in my judgment and in the judgment of my delegation, this matter does give reason for a good deal of concern.

This Conference was originally proposed by the United States. That country had done a great deal of work in preparing the ground for the holding of a conference, and at the First Meeting of the Economic and Social Council the initiative was transferred in form from that country to the Council. When we supported the motion made by the United States for the convoking of such a conference, we did it in the light that it was important that the conference be convoked under the auspices not of a single power, but under the auspices of the United Nations.

That is the important fact which we must bear in mind. For that reason, I feel that we would be withdrawing from the original intention if, in respect of a specialized-agency-to-be of this body, we gave to non-Member states the full voting rights that are now only extended to Members of the United Nations. I feel that the prestige of the United Nations is involved in this matter. Secondly, I feel that we would be establishing a dangerous principle in doing here what we have failed to do at the WHO and in respect of other matters that have arisen involving the same principle.

Furthermore, I think it is contrary to the Charter, as I said in the Committee, and I should call the attention of the Members of the Council to the observations made in document E/491 on another matter, but which I think have equal force here. These observations were made when the Chairman invited a legal opinion from the Secretariat. I quote from page 6 of that document:

The Assistant Secretary-General in Charge of the Legal Department discussed the Charter provisions bearing on the question. He concluded after an examination of the relevant

PF/tk

considerations that, while there was no explicit provision in the Charter on the subject, the Charter in spirit and in principle envisages a clear difference between Members and non-Members and that this difference rested upon the fundamental principle that rights of membership should not be granted unless the obligations of membership were also assumed. Only in very exceptional circumstances should full membership of a subordinate organ be granted to a non-Member; this had once been done but in circumstances justifying an exceptional act. As for non-self-governing territories, he stressed that full membership would be contrary to the special regime prescribed for such territories in Chapters XI, XII and XIII of the Charter. Thus, for both categories, i.e. non-Member states and non-self-governing territories, although they were not in exactly the same position, the rights and privileges of full membership should not be granted."

The circumstances there were not fully the same as they are here, but the principles involved, I think, were the same.

I am afraid I have spoken longer than I should have, but it is because I wanted to give this matter the attention that it merits. In view of the very strong position taken by the representative of the United Kingdom, I thought that I should give the matter more extended consideration than I otherwise would have.

For these reasons, I feel that I must take the position that I took in the Committee, namely, that voting rights should not be extended to non-Member states.

Mr. NEHRU (India): It seems to me that the case both for and against full voting rights for invitees has been, if I may say so, very brilliantly put forward by some of my colleagues today, and all we have to do now is to arrive at a decision.

There are only two points I should like to refer to. The first point is the one made by my distinguished colleague from Canada about the interpretation to be given to the provisions of the Charter. He referred to certain observations made by the Assistant-Secretary General in charge of the Legal Department who was invited at my request in the Committee of the Whole to explain these provisions to us. Now, the circumstances of the case, as my colleague from Canada himself pointed out, were entirely different. We were concerned with the question of full membership of a subordinate organ of the Council. We were concerned with the question of whether a subordinate organ, such as a commission, could admit as full members, certain non-member states.

I am not sure whether the opinion expressed by the Assistant Secretary-General has been very fully brought out in this Report, and if so, which I doubt, it seems to me that we should call in the Assistant Secretary-General again. But I would like to explain that we were dealing not with the question of whether non-member states should be invited, and if so in what capacity, to an International Conference, but we were dealing with the question of a subordinate organ of the Council.

This brings me to the second point. What have we asked the Preparatory Committee to do? Last year we adopted a resolution setting up a Preparatory Committee to prepare an agenda for an International Conference. We decided to call an International Conference which would consist of all the nations that are interested in world trade. This International Conference will meet some time this year.

AD:cc

E/P.V.102

62 -65

The Preparatory Committee has been asked to prepare an agenda for the Conference and to prepare the groundwork for it. The Preparatory Committee is naturally anxious to make a success of the Conference. The question before us is this: should we or should we not do everything in our power to enable the Preparatory Committee to make a success of this Conference, or should we be decided by such considerations as have been pointed out by the representative of Canada; namely, whether we would be jeopardizing the future of this Council by giving full rights of membership to invitees? It does seem to me that we shall not be jeopardizing the future of this Council in any way if we were to make a success of this Conference and other similar conferences. This Council is interested in seeing that the sort of work in which the Preparatory Committee is engaged, the kind of conference which we have decided to convene, should be completely successful.

The object of the Conference is to promote production, expansion of trade, consumption, employment, and it is essential that we should have the full cooperation of every nation interested in these problems.

If the Council were to interpret the provisions of the Charter liberally, if it were to try to overcome difficulties by putting a liberal construction on certain provisions, and in a case like this, to give full voting rights to invitees, <sup>providing</sup> / there are no explicit provisions / <sup>to the contrary</sup> in the Charter in order to make a success of this Conference, it seems to me that we will be adding to our prestige, we will be adding to our power and position; we will be adding to our reputation and we will in every way be raising our status in the eyes of the world. We would not be jeopardizing our position; we would not be weakening our position or undermining our position in any way by doing everything in our power to make a success of this Conference.

Mr. MARTIN (Canada): I should like to make one simple correction. If I did say that this decision would affect the prestige of this Council, I did not mean that. What I meant to say was that this would be a factor in a developing situation which, I believe, would affect the prestige and the efficacy of this Council.

The PRESIDENT: I hope the Members of the Council are ready for the decision on this important subject. But before asking the Council to take its decision, I should like to inform the Members that my attention has been drawn to an important telegram which has been received from Geneva, addressed to the President of the Preparatory Committee. Inasmuch as this telegram deals with the problem we are presently discussing, I feel that, in the absence of the President of the Preparatory Committee, this telegram should be read and the Council should know of its contents. I will therefore ask the Assistant Secretary-General to read it.

Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in Charge of Economic Affairs): The following telegram has been received, addressed to Mr. Suetens:

"The Chairman's Committee of the Preparatory Committee, comprising heads of all delegations, unanimously adopted today for communication to the Economic and Social Council a resolution in the following terms:

'The Preparatory Committee has learned with concern of the resolution adopted by the Economic Committee of the Economic and Social Council whereby non-Members of the United Nations invited to participate in the World Conference would not have the right to vote in the proceedings of the Conference. It is the unanimous view of the Preparatory Committee that all states invited to the World



Conference should be entitled to participate with full voting rights. The Preparatory Committee has noted in particular that, if the resolution of the Economic Committee were to be confirmed by the Economic and Social Council, Pakistan, which has been recognized as entitled to sign the general agreement on tariffs and trade, would not be permitted to vote in the World Conference. It is strongly the view of the Preparatory Committee that confirmation by the Council of the resolution denying voting rights to any participants in the World Conference would seriously impair the prospects for a successful Conference. The Preparatory Committee would accordingly urge the Economic and Social Council to accord full voting rights to all countries invited to participate in the Conference."

The PRESIDENT: After this thorough discussion of the subject, I would suggest that the Council proceed in the following manner: There is a proposal by the representative of Czechoslovakia that the two issues set forth in paragraphs 4 and 6 of the document under discussion should be separated. If this proposal is adopted, we would then vote on the text in paragraph 3. Those in favour of excluding the right of vote would so indicate by voting for the text of paragraph 3. Those in favour of granting the right to vote to those named in paragraphs 4 and 6 would vote against paragraph 3.

Mr. NEHRU (India): Also paragraph 7.

The PRESIDENT: That is not the recommendation of the Committee. We have a special document on paragraph 7. We shall take that up separately.

The representative of Czechoslovakia proposed that we should consider paragraphs 4 and 6 separately; that is, whether the right to vote would be accorded to the countries mentioned in paragraph 4 and in paragraph 6. If we agree to vote on the two paragraphs separately, then, we should do so immediately. However, if that proposal is rejected, we shall come back to paragraph 3 and vote on that.

Mr. TEORP (United States): I am still not quite clear. If we take up paragraph 4, then it seems to me that it is important to take up the question with respect to the right to vote before committing ourselves to the list of countries.

The PRESIDENT: We shall vote on the principle first; that is, whether the paragraphs should be voted on separately. If this is rejected, we shall vote on paragraph 3 and afterwards go to paragraphs 4 and 6.

Mr. NEHRU (India): I just wanted to point out that paragraph 6 contains only three countries, whereas paragraph 4 contains many more. It does not seem to me quite clear what advantage there is in dealing with these two lists of countries separately. It seems to me that if we were to pursue the idea recommended yesterday, namely, that we adopt the general principles in paragraph 3, it would be much more advantageous.

The PRESIDENT: Some representatives will vote one way concerning one category and in another way concerning the other category. They desire to vote on the paragraphs separately. If the Council does not wish to vote on them separately, we shall just reject the proposal.

We shall now vote on the proposal that paragraphs 4 and 6 be taken up separately.

The proposal was rejected by two votes to three, with thirteen abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal is rejected.

We shall now vote on paragraph 3, excluding the second sub-paragraph, but including the amendments already agreed upon.

The proposal was adopted by eight votes to four, with six abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal with respect to paragraph 3 is adopted.

We shall now take up paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 8.

As there is no objection, paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 8 are adopted.

We have before us document E/504, the proposal of the Indian delegation concerning the Indonesian Republic.

Mr. NEHRU (India): On the assumption that there will be no speeches against the motion, I do not wish to make any speech in favour of it. We know all the facts, and I should request that the President put the draft motion to the vote.

The resolution was adopted by six votes to four, with eight abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The Indian resolution is adopted.

#### ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile)(Interpretation from Spanish): As the speech which I intended to make is rather long, I should suggest that we adjourn at this time, and I will make it after lunch.

The meeting rose at 1:00 p.m.