
Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 were accepted without any change. As regards paragraph 5, the Delegate for South Africa was of the opinion that the words "economy of effort" were unnecessary because the idea was implicit in the whole text. The Delegate for the United Kingdom expressed his preference for maintaining the words in the text in order to give expression to the necessity for avoiding duplication in the work of inter-governmental organizations.

It was agreed to maintain the text.

As regards Article 57 of the London Report, the Cuban Delegate thought that the addition of a new paragraph was unnecessary and out of place, as Article 57 referred to the obligations of Members and not to the functions of the Organization.

The Delegate for Australia stated that the reason for the inclusion of a new paragraph was to ensure that the Organization had functions in that field. It was decided by the Committee not to include the suggestion made in the paper under discussion, as the new paragraph 4 of Article 61 covered the idea contained in the Australian proposal.

As to the "new Article 14" mentioned at the end of document E/PC/T/C.6/W.80, the Delegate for Australia explained that its meaning was to add the sentence to the end of paragraph 2 of Article 11 (paragraph 3 of the London Report).
It was decided by the Committee to add this sentence to paragraph 2 and not to include it in square brackets.

The Delegate for South Africa was of the opinion that if there were to be headings before each Article, this might lead to misinterpretations. The CHAIRMAN answered that great care has been taken in the drafting of the headings of each Article and that probably, in accordance with international treaty custom only the most important headings will be left in the Charter after the meeting of the Plenary Conference.


The Delegate for the United Kingdom stated that he would like to replace the word "rising" by the word "stable" in sub-paragraph (b) and the Delegate for New Zealand wanted to replace "high" by the word "higher" in sub-paragraph (a) in order to make it conform to the Charter of the United Nations. The Delegate for China wanted to delete the first line of sub-paragraph (c). The CHAIRMAN was of the opinion that the first line of sub-paragraph (c) should remain because the avoidance of slumps and booms was one of the most important tasks of the ITO.

The Delegate for the United States offered to replace the first line of sub-paragraph (c) by the words "to contribute to a balanced and stable expanding world economy".

The Delegate for the United Kingdom and the CHAIRMAN expressed their preference for the text as it stood in the United Kingdom draft.

The Delegate for Cuba wished to replace the words "full employment" by "full and productive employment" in sub-paragraph (a) because it covered better the position of under-developed countries.

/ The Delegate
The Delegate for Belgium pointed out that the meaning of "full and productive employment" was spelt out in Chapter III and the Committee agreed to leave the text as it stood in the United Nations Charter: "full employment".

The Delegate for India was opposed to the replacement of the word "rising" by the word "stable" in sub-paragraph (b) because he felt that for many countries the demand and income will have to be rising and not stable. He thought that the word "stable" had a static implication whereas the word "rising" implied a dynamic force.

The Delegate for the United Kingdom answered that the word "stability" was used here together with the word "high" and therefore could not be interpreted as preventing progress. As income and demand cannot readily go on rising after a certain point, this concept implies a fall in the level of income and demand. On the insistence of the Delegate for India, he proposed the words "high and steadily rising levels".

The Delegate for Belgium supported the Indian Delegate, stating that rising levels of demand and income are of great importance to many countries and that both the idea of progress and of security should be included in the text.

It was agreed to include in the text the idea suggested by the Delegate for the United Kingdom and also to replace the word "high" by the word "higher" in sub-paragraph (e).

3. **Discussion of Article 1 as contained in Document E/PC/T/C.6/78 of the Administrative Sub-Committee**

   It was agreed by the Committee to replace paragraph 1 of Article 1 by the United Kingdom draft, to bring a slight drafting change into paragraph 5 and to delete paragraph 6.

4. **Discussion of the Note Presented by the Delegation of the United Kingdom concerning provisions for two-thirds majorities (Document E/PC/T/C.6/64)**

   The Delegate for the United Kingdom explained that it was the opinion of /his Delegation
his Delegation that both types of provisions for two-thirds majorities may be worth keeping in the Charter. Where rapid decisions are required the second type, namely "two thirds of the Members present and voting" could be applied, whereas in important cases formula 1 - "two-thirds of the Members" should be applied. The Australian Delegate pointed out that the first formula precludes a Member from abstaining as this counts as a negative vote, whereas formula 2 allows a Member to be neutral. He stressed the importance of maintaining both types of voting. The United States Delegate stated that these two formulae applied not only to the two-thirds rule, but also to the simple majority rule. He agreed with the Australian Delegate that the general rule both in simple majority and in two-thirds majority cases should be "Members present and voting". The Chairman closed the discussion by asking that the Report should state the way in which the United Nations solved this problem. The New Zealand Delegate pointed out that the United Nations Charter provides as a general rule for "two-thirds of the Members present and voting". The United States Delegate pointed out the difficulty of deciding which type of voting was required for the different issues. He therefore suggested that the general rule should be to vote by simple majority, and only in questions relating to amendments should the two-thirds rule apply. The United Kingdom Delegate was of the opinion that there were some highly important decisions (e.g. the Impairment Article) where a two-thirds majority would act as a safeguard against hasty decisions. The Delegates for Brazil and Cuba were of the opinion that this whole problem was closely related to that of voting and therefore the discussion should be postponed until the Geneva meeting. 

5. Discussion of Chapter II of the London Draft Charter

The Executive Secretary pointed out that at an earlier stage it had been decided to transfer this part to Chapter VIII on Organization. Concerning paragraph 1 of Article 2, the Indian Delegate suggested the
deletion of the date "31 December". This was agreed by the Committee. Paragraphs 2 and 3 were accepted as they stood. The Executive Secretary asked whether Article 2 could not be blended with Article 88, as the subjects of both were closely related. The United States Delegate was of the opinion that Article 2 should become the first Article of Chapter VIII. It was decided by the Committee to leave the Article at the place where it stood in the London Charter. The South African Delegate asked whether the Economic and Social Council in its Resolution used the words "United Nations Conference". The Executive Secretary answered that in the Resolution the words "International Conference" were used.

As to the query of the Chilean Delegate on the position of non-Members, the Executive Secretary stated that the Resolution of the Economic and Social Council provides that the Preparatory Committee shall report to the Council concerning the states not Members of the United Nations to be invited to the Conference on Trade and Employment

6. Discussion of the Draft of Article 64, if Weighted Voting is Adopted, Suggested by the United Kingdom Delegation (Document E/PC/T/C.6/W.3/Add.)

The United Kingdom Delegation stated that this document had been dealt with by the Administrative Sub-Committee, and the Chairman decided that Article 64 as drafted by the United Kingdom Delegation would be included in the draft Charter without brackets and with a footnote stating that a comparison with Article 68 should be made.

It was decided by the Committee that in order to expedite the work, the Legal Drafting Sub-Committee would deal only with points specifically referred to it, that is, concerning Chapters VI and VII. The Executive Secretary stated that the Secretariat is writing the Report on the basis of the text approved by the Legal Drafting Sub-Committee, and will present that Report to the full Committee for its approval.

7. The Re-draft of Article 67 as Proposed by the United States Delegation (Document E/PC/T/C.6/W.78) was accepted, and on the suggestion of the Executive Secretary the word "Interim" was omitted from the title.

The Committee adjourned at 12:30 until 19 February at 10:30.