UNITED NATIONS *NATIONS UNIES*

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

CONSEIL ECONOMIQUE ET SOCIAL

RESTRICTED
E/PC/T/T.C/PV/21
16 September 1947

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

VERBATIM REPORT

TWENTY-FIRST MEETING OF THE TARIFF AGREEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 1947 AT 2.30 P.M. IN THE PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA.

Hon. L.D. WILGRESS (Chairman) (Canada)

Delegates wishing to make corrections in their speeches should address their communications to the Documents Clearance Office, Room 220 (Tel. 2247).

Delegates are reminded that the texts of interpretations, which do not pretend to be authentic translations, are reproduced for general guidance only; corrigenda to the texts of interpretations cannot, therefore, be accepted.

CHAIRMAN: The meeting is called to order.

It was agreed at our meeting yesterday that our first order of business today would be the United Kingdom proposal for a new paragraph 6 of Article XIV, formerly XIII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The United Kingdom proposal is given in paper W/327 to which there is an amendment of the French Delegation given in W/329 and an additional sub-paragraph proposed by the Belgium-Luxembourg Delegation which is given in paper W/336, this supplanting the previous proposal of the Belgium-Luxembourg Delegation which was given in paper W/331.

Mr. J.R.C. HELMORE (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I think I could be very brief in introducing this amendment. It will be within the recollection of the Committee that when we came to this Article at second reading the United Kingdom Delegation said that, owing to the present external financial circumstances, they would be unable to put into force the provision of that Article in the first period of Provisional Application and we promised to circulate a text which would give effect to the most reasonable solution we could think of for that difficulty. I think in putting forward this amendment I should express our firm support for the provisions of the previous paragraphs of this Article. This is simply a question of postponement of its application.

If I might just refer to the amendments to our amendment which you have cited, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say of the French amendment which amends our proviso that I think perhaps it would be clearer and more explicit than our wording and I would gladly move the amendment with the French amendment added to it. As regards the proposal of the Delegation of Belgium/Luxembourg in paper W/336, it seems to us also that this is a very reasonable addition to be made and we should have no objection at all to that being added to our new paragraph.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments? Since the United Kingdom Delegation has accepted the amendment proposed by the French and by the Belgium/Luxembourg Delegations we can now regard this proposal as being one, amended according to the amendments proposed by the other two delegations: I would like to know if any other Delegation would like to speak on this proposal as a whole.

If not we will take up the proposal paragraph by paragraph. The first would be sub-paragraph (a) which is the original United Kingdom proposal as amended by the French proposal with respect to the proviso. The numbers of the Articles referred to in the original United Kingdom proposal will have to be changed. That is Article No. XII on the first line becomes Article XIII, Article XI in the third line becomes XII, and Articles X and XII in the sixth line become XI and XIII respectively.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a remark on a typographical error in the French amendment. In the fourth line of the English text, third line of the French text, the words "contracting parties" should be printed without capital letters.

I think that regarding the words "contracting parties" we will have to find something else than capital letters to differentiate because this morning in the Drafting Committee we went over Article XXIV, paragraph 3(a) which reads:

> "Any contracting party proposing to enter into a customs union shall consult with the Contracting Parties and shall make available to the Contracting Parties such information regarding the proposed union as will enable them to make such reports and recommendations to contracting parties as it may deem appropriate".

So this seems rather complicated.

CHAIRMAN: We will be able to deal with this question after the Legal Drafting Committee have given some more study to it, but

I hope they will find a way of reconciling the use of "Contracting Parties" with capitals with the other "contracting parties with small letters and avoid this complication in the text.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments with regard to the new paragraph 6(a) of Article XIII?

We will now pass to sub-paragraph (b) of the new paragraph 6. This is given in document E/PC/T/W/336. Are there any comments?

Agreed.

There is also a proposed Note for the Protocol of Interpretative Notes regarding paragraph 6 (b) of the new Article XIV. Are there any comments on the proposed Note?

MR. J.R.C. HELMORE (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I am willing to take your arbitration on the point, but the English of "interpretive" is "interpretative".

CHAIRMAN: I do not accept that challenge.

Are there any comments with regard to the proposed Note?

Agreed.

We will now resume our discussion of the former Article XXVII, paragraph 1. We dealt yesterday with paragraph 1 of this new Article and we now come to paragraph 2 of the Australian proposal, which is given in document E/PC/T/W/335. Are there any comments with regard to this paragraph?

The New Zealand Delegation yesterday proposed that the word "the" in line 4 and also in line 6 should be replaced by the word "any".

MR. J.P.D. JOHNSEN (New Zealand): It was only in line 4, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: The New Zealand Delegation proposed that in line 4 the word "the" should be replaced by the word "any", reading

"whether any relevant provision".

MR. R.J. SHACKLE (United Kingdom): I had read the words "relevant provision" here as referring back to paragraph 1 - "an objection to any provision or provisions of this Agreement". Well, if that is so, I rather doubt whether it is necessary to make this substitution. If one provision is objected to under paragraph 1, then that is the relevant provision in paragraph 2, and if more than one provision is objected to, then those are brought up under the relevant provision in paragraph 2.

Therefore I really do not see the necessity for making this change. This is a case where the singular includes the plural.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments on the New Zealand proposal?

The Delegate of the United States.

MR. J.M. LEDDY (United States): Mr. Chairman, I think there is some confusion here in some cases about the corresponding provisions of the Agreement and the relevant provisions of the Charter, and so forth. However, I think we all know what we are talking about and could we not just ask the Legal Drafting Committee if they could put this better in a clearer way?

CHAIRMAN: Would that be agreeable to the New Zealand Delegation?

Mr. J.P.D. JOHNSEN (New Zealand): Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments on paragraph 2?

The Delegate of France.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I apologise, but I would like to ask the Australian Delegate again if he could not agree to the deletion of the words "or as soon thereafter as is practicable" because the delay which is provided for is already very long - sixty days after the end of the Havana Conference - and that will make one hundred and twenty days altogether and if we add another delay we might find ourselves still sitting in November of next year. Therefore, I should like to ask the Australian Delegate whether he could not agree to the deletion of these words.

CHAIRMAN: Dr. Coombs.

DR. H.C. COOMBS (Australia): I have no objection, Mr. Chairman If you have got a last day on which objections will be received, you will then have to call the countries together and, while it would be reasonable to expect that you could arrange a time within sixty days when it would be convenient for them to meet, it is perhaps not certain that you could, and it would be a little embarrassing if you could not arrange a meeting within two months. However, I presume that this is not the sort of Article which is likely to cause a revolution, and therefore I have no objection to the deletion of the words "or as soon thereafter as is practicable".

CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to the French proposal to delete the words "or as soon thereafter as is practicable" in the second line of paragraph 2?

Agreed.

Are there any other comments with regard to paragraph 2?

Mr. Faivovich.

MR. A. FAIVOVICH (Chile) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I will not press my point here and ask that we should decide to what the word "agree" corresponds. It seems to me that there is a tacit agreement between the Members of the Committee to leave the settling of this very difficult problem to the future.

CHAIRMAN: I thank the Delegate of Chile.

Are there any other comments on paragraph 2?

Are there any comments on paragraph 3?

Are there any comments on paragraph 4?

The Delegate of China.

MR. D.Y. DAO (China): Mr. Chairman, in the Protocol of Signature I think the date given was the 1st November. Is there any reason why we should change to January 1st here and then go on to state "or on such earlier date as may be agreed"? Is there any special reason, because in the Protocol of Signature it is stated that should the Charter not have entered into force on November 1st, 1948 the contracting parties will confer and decide what to do with the Agreement?

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of China will recall that when the Tariff Negotiations Working Party made their first draft of the General Agreement it was provided that provisional application would commence on November 1st, 1947, and it was felt that a year after the provisional application would be a reasonable period for the entry into force of the Charter. Now that the period for provisional application has been fixed for January 1st, 1948, this date has also been moved back by two months.

Are there any other comments on paragraph 4?

There will also be added to this new Article a paragraph 5 which was approved yesterday. This Article will now be Article XXIX and it will be headed "Suspension and Supersession". It will take the place of the Article which appears on pages 62 and 63 of document E/PC/T/W/196.

We now have to consider the consequential amendment to what is now Article XXVI, paragraph 5. This is the Article dealing with Entry into Force. At the bottom of document E/PC/T/W/335 is given a proviso to be added to paragraph 5 of Article XXVI. This reads as follows: "Provided that no such entry into force shall take place until any Agreement necessary under the provisions of Article XXIX, paragraph 2, has been reached".

CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to this proposal regarding Paragraph 5?

(Agreed)

Before passing on to the form of the Schedules, which is our next item of business, I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to a note from the Tariff Negotiations Working Party, which was considered at our meeting this morning and which is given in Document W/338, which has been circulated to Members of the Committee.

At the request of the Head of the Norwegian Delegation, the Tariff Negotiations Working Party gave consideration to the question of the earliest date on which the Final Act could be signed.

In the light of all the circumstances, the earliest date which the Tariff Negotiations Working Party decided could be fixed for this purpose would be October 15. Accordingly, the Tariff Negotiations Working Party recommends that every effort should be made to conclude the tariff negotiations, so that the Final Act can be signed about that date.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom.

Mr. SHACKLE (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, the Committee will remember that the other day, when we were discussing paper W/330 - Joint Action by the Contracting Parties, we left over Paragraph 6, which was about the transfer of the functions of the contracting parties to the ITO. That was left over to be considered along with Article XXVII, Paragraph 1. Now that we have considered Paragraph 1 of Article XXVII, it seems to me that we can simply leave Paragraph 6.

We can either leave Paragraph 6 as it stands or we can delete it altogether. Between the two, I have no preference. I think it would do no harm to leave it exactly as now drafted.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on the proposal of Mr. Shackle?

The Delegate of the United States.

Mr. LEDDY (United States): Mr. Chairman, my view of this paragraph is exactly the same as that of the Delegate of the United Kingdom. I think it is unnecessary, but if any Delegate considers it is necessary I should have no objection.

CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested by the United Kingdom and the United States Delegates that Paragraph 6 of Article XXV - Joint Action by the Contracting Parties - might be deleted. When we were considering Article XXV the other day, we decided to leave over this paragraph until we had established the text of the Article dealing with suspension and supersession. I would therefore like to know if any Members of the Committee have any objection to the deletion of Paragraph 6 of Article XXV.

The Delegate of New Zealand.

Mr. J. P. D. JOHNSEN (New Zealand): I have no particular views on the subject, but this Paragraph 6 does seem to indicate a definite course of action, on which I think we are all in agreement, and I would be in favour of it being retained.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

The Delegate of France.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I thought it would be preferable to keep Paragraph 6, but to stop the wording of this paragraph after the words "to the Organization," deleting the last part of the sentence. When Part II is superseded by the corresponding provisions of the Charter, once the

Charter is adopted, then the functions of the contracting parties (with small letters) will be transferred to the Organization. I foresee no difficulty here.

Unfortunately we also refer to contracting parties with capital letters in Part III of the Agreement; if nothing is provided here in this text we shall have to have recourse to the procedure of amendment wherever the words "contracting parties" appear with capital letters in Part III of the Agreement.

I wonder if it would not be clearer here to adopt the following text: "As soon as the contracting parties have made a decision under the terms of Paragraph 2 of Article XXIX their joint functions will be transferred to the Organization."

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

The Delegate of the United Kingdom.

Mr. SHACKLE (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, should it not be "unless the contracting parties decide otherwise, under the terms of Paragraph 2 of Article XXIX . . ."?

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of Belgium.

M. FORTHOMME (Belgium): I would just like to ask, if we adopt the text proposed by the French Delegate, what happens if contracting parties have to make a decision under Paragraph 3?

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, under Paragraph 3 of Article XXIX, the contracting parties are not labelled with capital letters.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of the United States.

Mr. LEDDY (United States): I think we really ought either to delete this paragraph or leave it as it is, because under the supersession provisions as they now stand the contracting parties must agree whether some or all of the provisions of Part II shall be superseded or whether some or all of the provisions of the Agreement shall be retained. It may be that the contracting parties will agree to retain some provisions of Part II. In that case we would not want a provision allowing for the automatic transfer of those functions to the ITO. Perhaps in some cases it may be feasible to transfer even those functions to the ITO, but in the absence of any definite information we cannot reach a decision.

Paragraph 6 as it now stands makes provision for that, with the exception clause: "except to the extent that they may agree otherwise under Paragraph 2 of Article XXVII."

I really think we had better stick to the present text unless this is needed to complete the paragraph.

CHAIRMAN: Do any other Members of the Committee wish to speak?

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia.

H. E. Mr. Z. AUGENTHALER (Czechoslovakia): Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the French proposal, because I think that what we are doing here - drafting the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade - is only subsidiary to the Charter, and I think we have to consider it as an interim measure. That is why I think it should be clearly expressed and that is the right place to express it, as proposed by the French Delegate.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of Norway.

Mr. J. MELANDER (Norway): Mr. Chairman, I do not think it matters very much whether we delete this paragraph or not, but, in view of the fact that some Delegations attach some importance to it, I do not think it would do any harm at all to maintain it. It does add clarity and therefore I would support the French proposal.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of France.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, there is another solution, an alternative proposal, which the Committee might prefer. That would be to insert a clause in Paragraph 2 of Article XXIX stating that the contracting parties will agree, or will reach agreement, on the transfer of their functions to the Organization, in accordance with the provisions of Article XXV.

(After the interpretation, M. Royer corrected the sentence, to read as follows:- "The contracting parties will agree on the transfer of their functions under Article XXV . . .").

CHAIRMAN: Would that be a new Paragraph 6 to Article XXIX?

M. ROYER (France (Interpretation): No; this would follow Paragraph 2.

CHAIRMAN: Another paragraph?

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): No; that would not be necessary; just a sentence could be added.

CHAIRMAN: We are now faced with a number of alternatives: one is to delete Paragraph 6 of Article XXV; another is to retain it in the way it is worded at present; another proposal is to re-word it according to the proposal made by the French Delegate, and the fourth proposal is to add a sentence to Paragraph 2 of Article XXIX, reading as follows: "The Contracting Parties (with capital letters) will agree to the transfer to the International Trade Organization of their functions under Article XXV."

M. ROYER (France): No, Mr. Chairman; "contracting parties"with small letters.

CHAIRMAN: I would like to know which of these many proposals meets with the general wish of the Committee.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom.

Mr. SHACKLE (United Kingdom): I would suggest the adoption of two of the solutions. That would have the advantage of diminishing the residue of the unsettled matters. I would suggest that we adopt M. Royer's latest proposal and that we keep Paragraph 6 of Article XXV as it is.

The French proposal was that the contracting parties will agree "regarding the transfer", not "to the transfer" of their functions to the Organization. That would mean his addition to Paragraph 2 of what is now Article XXIX would then be complementary to what is said in the present paragraph of Article XXV.

I think that by those two proposals we should have a logical result.

CHAIRMAN: Since we cannot adopt all four proposals, perhaps Mr. Shackle has made the best compromise possible in suggesting that we adopt two of them.

Is the Committee in agreement? Any objections?

The Delegate of France.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): I have no objection: I think, nevertheless, that paragraph 6 is superfluous but this is only a personal opinion.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could first of all agree to the wording to be added to paragraph 2 of Article XXIX. Would the following wording meet with the Committee's approval:

"The contracting parties will agree concerning the transfer to the International Trade Organization of their functions under Article XXV." Is that agreed? Agreed.

The other part of Mr. Shackle's proposal is to delete the square brackets around paragraph 6 of Article XXV. Are there any objections?

Mr. R.J. SHACKLE (United Kingdom): I would be quite prepared to agree to the proposal of M. Royer to suppress this paragraph.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shackle now comes back to the original proposal to delete this paragraph. Are there any objections?

The Delegate of China.

Mr. D.Y. DAO (China): With regard to paragraph 6 of Article XXV I must take it for granted that when decision is reached under Article XXIX, paragraph 2, the function will not be transferred until the Organization has been established, because under Article XXIX, when the decision is taken, I assume that neither the Charter nor the Agreement has come into force.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any remarks on the comments just made by the Delegate of China?

The Delegate of France.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I think that the draft which we have just proposed must not prejudge the issue. I really do not see how the contracting parties could transfer the question to a non-existent Organization.

CHAIRMAN: Can the Committee come to a decision as to whether or not to delete paragraph 6 of Article XXV? Will all those Members who are in favour of deletion, please raise their hands.

Dr. H.C. COOMBS (Australia): Is it on the assumption that the other one is in?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Against? Two dissentients.

I trust that the Delegates for China and New Zealand do not feel strongly on this point. The paragraph is deleted.

Before taking up the form of the Schedule I would like to call the attention of the Committee to Document E/PC/T/W/338 - Note from the Tariff Negotiations Working Party regarding the establishment of the earliest date on which the Final Act could be signed. The date given is October 15th, as I mentioned earlier in this Meeting. Are there any comments?

As there are no comments on that Document we will pass on to the next order of business which is consideration of the form of the Schedules. There are a number of Documents concerning the form of the Schedules. The relevant Document is that given in Document E/PC/T/153 which sets forth the proposals for the Tariff Negotiations Working Party. There is also an Annotated Agenda relating to the Schedules which is given in Document E/PC/T/W/325.

These are the two main Working Papers regarding the form of the Schedules, but delegates may wish to take into account the comments given in Document E/PC/T/195 regarding the procedure necessary for the preparation of the signature to the Final Act and to the General Agreement.

On pages 1 and 2 of Document T/153 there are set forth the proposals of the Tariff Negotiations Working Party regarding the Identification of Schedules. These follow closely the contents of Section E and Section G of Annexure 10 to the Report of the First Session as well as Part III of the Drafting Committee relating to the General Agreement.

No comments were received from Delegations regarding this part of the Report of the Tariff Negotiations Working Party, and therefore I can take it that there is no need for us to have any discussion regarding pages 1 and 2 of Document T/153.

The Delegate of France.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): In front of Schedule XI I see "French Republic (French Union)". I think we ought to have "French Union", and one sub-division regarding the metropolitan territories and another regarding overseas territories.

CHAIRMAN: Then I take it that the Delegation of France would wish to have this Schedule headed "Schedule XI - French Union."

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I think we may have to alter the numbering of the last items, because Southern Rhodesia is not listed at present, if I am right, and therefore it would not be proper to have a blank in front of the name of the country.

Mr. R.J. SHACKLE (United Kingdom): As far as I know, this is perfectly correct.

CHAIRMAN: In that case we would delete Southern Rhodesia from this list and remove the countries that come below that up one number.

Are there any other comments?

Mr.J.P.D. JOHNSEN (New Zealand): We would prefer that instead of the "Dominion of New Zealand", "New Zealand" should be inserted.

CHAIRMAN: That change will be made at the request of the New Zealand Delegation. Are there any other comments?

We will then pass on to point 2 in our Annotated Agenda, covering the statement relating to each Schedule, that is, that one page 5 of Document T/153 paragraph 1 should be replaced by the paragraph on page 4 of the same document, to meet the case of territories which are negotiating exclusively on maximum margins of preference.

You will also recall that we had an amendment of the French Delegation to paragraph 2 of Article II and when we were considering this amendment in the second reading we agreed that we would defer consideration of this proposal until we had come to dealing with the heading or the covering statement to the Schedule, so that it will now be in order to take into account the amendment proposed by the French Delegation to paragraph 2 of Article II, in considering the covering statement in the Schedule.

Referring to paragraph 1 of the covering statement, the note given on page 1 of Document W/325 is that the French Delegation consider that this paragraph is unnecessary in view of the provisions of paragraph 2 of the General Agreement and in view of the following redraft of Paragraph 2 of Article II proposed by the French Delegation.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): As we stated previously, it would be rather inconvenient to insert in the heading of the Schedules provisions which ought to appear in the text of the Agreement itself. This might only be a question of form of presentation of the text, and not of substance, but, nevertheless, this is, to our mind, an important point.

If one inserts in the headings provisions which are already in the Agreement, then there might arise difficulties in the interpretation of this text in the future; therefore, this is the reason why the French Delegation propose to delete Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 which are to appear in the headings of the Schedule, and we would be expressing there difficulties which may arise in the future. This is, I think, the proper method of dealing with this question. The method should be that the General Agreement must quote undertakings which countries are going to underwrite and in the List one ought only to state the rates of tariffs and the various charges or taxes.

As regards paragraph 2 we would be ready to negotiate on the proposal which we have made and we think that we could reach agreement on a text which could be satisfactory to everyone; but as I have stated it seems to me that there is some inconvenience in inserting provisions which ought to appear in the Agreement in the headings of the Schedules, because these provisions, if they should appear in the headings of the Schedules might be interpreted in a different way and they might have a different juridical validity.

Dr. G.A. LAMSVELT (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, my Delegation quite agree with the observations made by the Delegate of France that the contents of the covering statement are unnecessary and my Delegation would prefer Schedules as just Schedules which do not need any covering statement. Actually the question seems to be that either the covering statement repeats principles laid down in the Agreement and is therefore superfluous or it contains some new elements and, in that case, those should, in my opinion, not be in the covering statement but in the Agreement.

If there should be opposition to this idea I should like to hear the arguments in favour of retaining the covering statement in the hope that these arguments would convince me that it is not here a case of in cauda venenum..

Mr. J.M. LEDDY (United States): Mr. Chairman, I do think we need something which says that the duties we shall apply shall not exceed those in the Schedules plus any other supplementary charges which might be in force on the date of signature of the Agreement. It is only that way that we know exactly what the concessions are that we are getting. On the other hand we do feel that there may be some merit in these proposals of the Delegations of France and the Netherlands that these provisions should appear in the Agreement itself. If we can work out a draft which will cover all

the Schedules on this matter we shall save duplicating these various paragraphs shown in the Tariff Negotiations Working Party's Report fourteen or fifteen times, and, if that were agreeable in principle, I would suggest that we appoint a small Sub-Committee to prepare that draft. It will require rather considerable recasting of the provisions given in the Report of the Working Party. But we have no objection to, and I think probably some preference for, making an attempt to put them in Article II of the Agreement rather than repeat them in the Schedules.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of Belgium.

M. Pierre FORTHOMME (Belgium): Mr. Chairman, while agreeing with all that has been said up to now, I think that the first sentence of paragraph 1 ought to be kept in any case because that is the one that stipulates that there will be reductions or concessions in the various tariffs.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

Dr. H.C. COOMBS (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I think that Mr. Leddy's suggestion is a good one. I feel that it is not necessary in the Schedules to have anything more than headings which are sufficiently descriptive for understanding the nature of the various parts of the Schedule, without seeking to embody any commitments in the Schedules; but actually I think it is unnecessary to add anything to the Agreement itself. It seems to me it is already in the Agreement. That may not be so, but I think the only way we could check on that would be by having a very small group to work over it.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

Dr. Z. AUGENTHALER (Czechoslovakia): Mr. Chairman, I think also that these preliminary notes to the Schedules should be suppressed to avoid confusion. Anyhow, if anything remains here I have certain doubts whether, in the expression "ordinary customs duties", the word "ordinary" is correct. I think that wordshould be entirely deleted. It is "from customs duties in excess of those ....."

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

The Delegate of the United States has proposed that a small working group be established to study this question of the Covering Statement to the Schedule in its relation to the amendment proposed by the French Delegation to paragraph 2 of Article II. Is this proposal approved?

Agreed.

I therefore wish to propose the following delegations to compose the Sub-Committee:- Australia, Belgium, France, United Kingdom, United States.

Dr. H.C. COOMBS (Australia): I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that any other delegation who believes that, because of oddities of their tariff, they have a special problem should notify this Sub-Committee so that those problems can be taken into account by calling the particular delegation in. I think some of the problems will arise from the peculiarities of the tariffs of the particular country.

CHAIRMAN: Is the composition of the Sub-Committee approved? I would nominate Dr. Coombs to be Chairman of this Sub-Committee. This Sub-Committee to meet tomorrow morning at 10.30 and, as suggested by Dr. Coombs, they should invite any delegations who have any special problems to appear before them or to present the problems in writing so that they can take them into consideration. Is that approved?

Agreed.

We have some other proposals with regard to the covering statements which are more of a special character, but it will be, I think, desirable that we should discuss them here before we decide whether or not to refer them to a Sub-Committee.

On page 3 of document W/325 we have a proposal of the Czechoslovak Delegation to insert a provision into this Schedule, and it would have no objection if a similar clause were attached to any other Schedules as far as specific rates are concerned. This provision relates to the value of the currency of a national unit in which the specific duties are expressed.

The French Delegation associates itself with this proposal of the Czechoslovak Delegation.

Are there any comments on this proposal?

The Delegate of Brazil.

Mr. E.L. RODRIGUES (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, because we have a tariff in most parts specific, and because we had occasion already to present our case in the Preparatory Committee, I have to associate Brazil with this proposal of Czechoslovakia. I should like to be clear whether later on, if we have some depreciation of the value of our currency, we shall be able to make another readjustment; or if we have to wait until the end of the three years, the first period of this Agreement.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of Norway.

Mr. J. MELANDER (Norway): Mr. Chairman, we have also a tariff which is to a large extent specific, and we take it also for granted that if we have a formal depreciation of our currency - I am not talking about a fall or rise in prices but a formal depreciation of the currency, - in our case in accordance with the Articles of the Monetary Fund Agreement to which we are a party, then of course that would lead to an automatic adjustment of the Tariff Schedules as contained in this Agreement.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of the United States.

Mr. J.M. LEDDY (United States): Mr. Chairman, I think the negotiations here at Geneva have shown quite conclusively that it is impracticable to contemplate a provision which will allow countries automatically and unilaterally to increase specific duties that have been agreed upon in conjunction with depreciation of the currency. I think there is really nothing automatic about it because the effect of the depreciation is quite different in different cases. For example the United States reduced the gold content of the dollar, I think, in 1934. Well, now, that should have had an effect on prices, but as a matter of fact it did not and it would have been patently ridiculous for us to increase our specific duties to offset that and we should not for a moment, if we had had trade agreements in force, have considered that we had any right to do so.

I notice this also; that there is no provision in any of the parallel provisions for reducing specific duties in terms of depreciation of the currency in terms of the Monetary Fund's par value, and I should think that any proposal would be balanced on both sides.

Now we must recognise that there is a problem and I would suggest that there are two ways of handling it: one, to insert a general provision in the Agreement providing for consultation with a view to any appropriate adjustments which might be agreed upon in the event of a change in the par value of the currency of any contracting party: or, alternatively, that the countries which desire to have some such provision in connection with their Schedules make that proposal directly to the countries with which they are in negotiation. But I do not see any possibility of agreeing upon a provision which would give every country a unilateral right to increase duties in connection with depreciation.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of the Lebanon.

MR. J. MIKAOUI (Lebanon) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, the Lebanese Delegation, as well as the Syrian Delegation, would like to support the proposal made by the Czechoslovak Delegation, which was in its turn seconded by other Delegations.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of Czechoslovakia.

H.E. Dr. Z. AUGENTHALER (Czechoslovakia): Mr. Chairman, when we were discussing this matter for the first time in London, it was decided there that changes in tariffs, owing to the depreciation or devaluation of the currency of the country maintaining the tariffs which do not result in an increase of the protective incidenc of the tariff, should not be considered as new tariff increases under this paragraph.

Well, what we have proposed here is a logical consequence of this decision taken in London, and I think it is quite just, because if a currency is officially depreciated it is actually a new currency, and it means that customs duties have to be re-calculated to the level of the new currency. It does not mean that each country is obliged to do so, but it should have the right to do so.

For instance, Czechoslovakia has devaluated its money, and, instead of 30 crowns to 1 dollar before the war, now it is 50 crowns to 1 dollar. Now, we recalculated our customs duties but we always remain below the highest level, and we consider it as our right to do so because we think that there is no wrong done to other countries. If, for instance, some commodity costs 1 dollar or, let us say, 50 crowns, and then later the dollar is equal to 100 crowns, if the duty is raised from 10 crowns to 20 crowns, the incidence remains

exactly the same, that is, it would remain at exactly 20 per cent.

Therefore, if this is not admitted, it would mean that the countries which have specific duties are put in a situation of inferiority against the countries having duties ad valorum..

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of Belgium.

M. P FORTHOMME (Belgium); Mr. Chairman, I do find that there is considerable force in the objection advanced by the Delegate for the United States. I was wondering, perhaps, whether we could not have a compromise to meet his objection by adding after "in proportion to the depreciation of its currency" some such words as "provided that the movements of the general index of wholesale prices consequent upon this depreciation justify such action".

Perhaps we should change the word "consequent" to "commitment" to indicate that at some time the movements in the index precedes the necessity for depreciation.

Dr. H.C. COOMBS (Australia): Another possible compromise, which follows out of the extract from the London Report which the Czechoslovak Delegate read, might be to substitute for the words "in proportion to the depreciation of its currency" the words "to the extent that the protective content of the rates is not increased".

The difficulty about that, of course, is that it is less precise, but it would give a basis for judgment of particular cases, and perhaps a basis for complaint if the country did abuse the situation.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of the United States.

MR. J.M. LEDDY (United States): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the suggestions made by the Delegates of Belgium and Australia, but, quite

frankly, I do not think that it will matter what indicators or texts we might attempt to apply to the proposal.

The provision for a unilateral right would be acceptable to us. We have had provisions in our trade agreements dealing with this question, and perhaps something along the lines of those provisions might work. I am going to read from the Agreement between France and the United States of, I believe, 1936: "In the event that a wide variation occurs in the rate of exchange between the currencies of the United States of America and France, the Government of either country, if it considers the variation so substantial as to prejudice the industries or commerce of the country, shall be free to propose negotiations for the modification of this Agreement or to terminate this Agreement in its entirety on thirty days' written notice".

In other words, an agreement must be reached as to what is done, or if the Agreement fails then the country which is dissatisfied with the situation can withdraw from the Agreement at short notice.

I think that is a reasonable proposal, but I do not think that a unilateral right to increase duties no matter on what basis is reasonable without adjustment of the matter by the other countries concerned.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

The Delegate of Norway.

MR. J. MELANDER (Norway): Mr. Chairman, the Agreement to which Mr. Leddy just referred would not seem to cover the case completely. The agreement of 1936 between France and the United States refers to the fact that there were fluctuations in the rates of exchange. Now,

in that period the rates of exchange were fluctuating, but now we operate with fixed rates of exchange under the Monetary Fund Agreement, so that the circumstances are really not the same. In the pre-war period you had a fluctuation in the exchange rate to a much higher extent than you have now, and consequently the circumstances are not exactly the same.

On the other hand, I think there is some force in Mr. Leddy's point that there might be cases where the depreciation ought not automatically to lead to an adjustment in the specific duties and the protective incidence ought to be the criterion, I think, It might be that the best solution would be to have a clause, preferably in the Agreement, to the effect that if there is devaluation of a currency which does alter protective incidence of their specific customs duty, then that duty could be altered, but I think also that it is reasonable to have a provision for consultation, or perhaps one could establish the right of a country to make an alteration, or an adjustment, subject, of course, to the right of other countries to maintain that the circumstances could not justify such action.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of Brazil.

Mr. E. L. RODRIGUES (Brazil): M . Chairman, I think this matter of monetary devaluation or depreciation in regard to tariff rates should be considered in the light of the level of the tariff. A country with a low level of tariff will be extremely affected by a monetary devaluation or depreciation, whilst a country with a high tariff will not be affected in the same way by a monetary devaluation or depreciation.

Because of this, some countries, like Brazil, had a very sad experience. In Brazil, most of the specific rates - what we call the ad valorem rates - of 30 per cent were decreased by the monetary devaluation to as little as 8 or 10 per cent. You can very easily see what the situation would be if the same thing were to happen again.

As Mr. Melander said, we do not expect to have to face the same situation in the future, but we must be prudent when we are discussing this matter here.

Another remark I should like to make is that if you are dealing here with a multilateral agreement it is neither fair nor wise to reason on the lines of a bilateral agreement, especially in regard to the procedure for deciding this question.

If we have later on - automatically or not - to deal again with every other country which has taken part in this Agreement, we shall have a lot of difficulty. I think there should be a general principle attached to this Schedule, or to the Agreement, giving to a country which finds itself with a low level of tariffs caused by monetary devaluation or depreciation the opportunity to correct such a situation.

It is not unilateral action, because it takes into consideration the necessity of correction to put all countries on the same level of negotiation, not to give to one country a privilege or an advantage in that matter over another country.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of Canada.

Mr. L. E. GOUILLARD (Canada): Mr. Chairman, we would agree with the statement made by Mr. Leddy, that consultation and approval by the contracting parties would be a fair and equitable way of dealing with this problem. We recognise, of course, the existence of this problem and, indeed, the Canada-United States Agreement of 1938 contains, in Article XIII, a clause very similar to the one which Mr. Leddy read out of the United States-French Agreement of 1936.

The Agreement as it now stands provides for consultation and approval. It is my impression at least that attacks on the benefits to be derived from concessions scheduled in the Agreement are less serious than the attack which might be reflected in unilateral action of raising specific rates as a result of depreciation.

The Norwegian Delegate mentioned that the situation obtaining on variations in rates of exchange in 1936 was different from what obtains now, because the rates are fixed by the Monetary Fund. That may be, but the very fact that he does support, along with other Delegates, the inclusion in the Agreement of a clause providing for variation points to the very existence of the problem, whether those variations be wide or not.

The Canada-United States Agreement of 1938, for example, reads as follows: "If a wide variation should occur in the rate of exchange between the currencies of Canada and the United States of America, and if the Government of either country should consider the variation so substantial as to prejudice the industries or commerce of their country, it shall be free to propose negotiations for the modification of this Agreement; and if agreement with respect thereto is not reached within thirty days following the receipt of such proposal, the Government making such proposals shall be free to terminate this Agreement in its entirety on thirty days' written notice."

It might be the best solution, Mr. Chairman, to refer this question to the Sub-committee appointed this afternoon, since it has closely related aspects of the same problem, namely, the preface to be included with the Schedules to the Agreement. Canada is not a member of that Sub-committee and therefore I was anxious to state our position.

CHAIRMAN: It is now time for us to adjourn for refreshments. I am wondering if the Delegate of the United States wishes to speak now or if I should call upon him after we resume.

Mr. LEDDY (United States): I merely wished to support the proposal of the Delegate of Canada, to refer this matter to the Sub-committee.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of Canada has proposed that this question be referred to the Sub-committee which we set up to deal with the form of the Schedules. I am wondering if it might not be possible, before referring the matter to the

Sub-committee, to obtain the sense of the Committee on the question of unilateral action versus consultation and adjustment.

There seem to be two different schools of thought in the Committee: some Members propose that countries should be given a unilateral right to increase specific rates of duty in the event of devaluation or depreciation of their currencies; others consider that this should only be done after consultation with the other contracting parties.

The Delegate of the United States.

Mr. LEDDY (United States): Mr. Chairman, if the Committee is to take a decision or come to a conclusion on this point, I shall have to make a very much stronger statement than I have made before. I wonder if it would not be better to allow the Sub-committee to explore the matter a little further.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of France.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I support Mr. Leddy's proposal to refer this question to the Sub-committee, but I would ask that the Delegate of Czechoslovakia be included in the list of members of the Sub-committee. I notice that amongst the members of the Sub-committee there is no country represented which has a large part of its tariff constituted by specific duties.

CHAIRMAN: I might say that before the Delegate of France made his statement I had already come to the conclusion that it might be necessary to add the Delegate of Czechoslovakia to the list of members of the Sub-committee, or to broaden the terms of reference of the Sub-committee. I was going to propose,

in order that there should be full representation of all points of view, that the Delegates of Canada and Czechoslovakia be added to the Sub-committee, making the total number of the Sub-committee seven instead of five.

The Delegate of the Netherlands.

Mr. G. A. LAMSVELT (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, as you have decided that this question is going to be dealt with by the Sub-committee, I would suggest the insertion in the text of the Czechoslovakian proposal, after the words "specific rates of duty", the words "and other charges expressed in money."

CHAIRMAN: The Sub-committee will take due note of the remarks just made by the Delegate of the Netherlands and, as I mentioned earlier, all Delegations are invited to present any special problems they have in connection with the Schedules to the Chairman of the Sub-committee. Then they can either attend a meeting of the Sub-committee to explain their points of view or submit their proposals in writing. No doubt, in the case of the Netherlands, it will be possible for the representative of Belgium on the Sub-committee to put forward this particular proposal.

Mr. LAMSVELT (Netherlands): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Is the proposal to refer this question to the Sub-committee and to add to the members of the Sub-committee the Delegates of Czechoslovakia and Canada approved?

(Agreed)

There will now be an adjournment until 5.20 p.m.

(The Meeting adjourned at 4.50 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN: The meeting is called to order.

The next point on page 3 of Document 325 concerns the schedule itself. The French Delegation suggests that Part I should be headed "Most Favoured Nation Tariff"and that Part II should be headed "Preferential Tariffs".

The Delegate of France.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation). Mr. Chairman. We only proposed this for reasons of convenience. We did not think that this would create difficulties to the Canadian Delegation; if it does we apologise for it. But we thought it would be easier in this way for those who would refer themselves to the text; and now the possibilty of solving this problem will be to put at the beginning of the schedule a statement a few words stating that the first part refers to Most Favoured Nation Tariffs and the second part to Preferential Tariffs. Otherwise would would have to look out the item in the Agreement itself to find the proper reference.

CHAIRMAN: The delegate of Canada.

M. L.E. COUILLARD (Canada) (Interpretation) Mr. Chairman I would like to thank the French Delegate for his statement. Really we do not see the necessity of repeating the words "Most Favoured Nation Tariffs"and Preferential Tariffs" on the top of each page of the Schedule. We might find a solution of compromise by just putting this after Part I on page 1 and after Part II on page 2.

CHAIRMAN: Any other remarks regarding the French proposal?

Any objections to putting the words "Most Favoured Nation Tariffs" after Part I on page 1, and "Preferential Tariffs" after the words Part II on page 2?

Mr. R. J. SHACKLE (United Kingdom) I take it that would apply to each schedule for each particular country. There will be

Part I and Part II for each Schedule and each would have "Most Favoured Nation Tariffs" and "Preferential Tariffs" on the first page.

CHAIRMAN: That would only apply to those countries that have preferential tariffs. I would judge from the remarks of certain members that they have no preferential tariffs and therefore they could not have a Part II.

The Delegate of Australia.

Dr. H. C. COOMBS (Australia) I am not quite sure what we are discussing.

CHAIRMAN: We are discussing page 3 of Document 325. Bottom of the page.

Dr. H. C. COOMBS (Australia) What I wanted to add, Mr. Chairman, was that from an examination of our own position it does appear to us that there will need to be more parts than two. I do not know if it is relavent to raise that point at this date.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, this is the place to raise that question.

Dr. H. G. COOMBS (Australia) The position is that, as Delegations who are negotiating with us are aware, we have in our tariff, in addition to the normal customs duties, certain other duties, and while these are modified along with the customs duties, in some cases there are a number of items of which the only part of the tariff which is affected by negotiations is the primage duty itself, and we feel it may be necessary, therefore, for us to have a Part 3 dealing with these items, where the only concession involved is a concession on the primage.

Furthermore, it does seem to us that it would be desirable, at any rate, to have a further part which would deal with items on which the commitment accepted relates to the preferential margin, but not to either of the rates. We have some items for which we have requests where, for reasons relating to the protective

incidence of the item, we are unable to bind the rates, either the preferential rate or the Most Favoured N tion rate, but where we are prepared to negotiate and bind t.e protective margins, and it does mee to be a rather different category, and, just offhand it would appear to us that we would need to have, for the purpose of clarity, four groups of items - that is, four parts under this schedule.

CHAIRMAN: I should like to call the attention of Dr.Coombs to page 6 of Document E/PC/T/150 in which a sample schedule is given. The Tariff Negotiations Working Party, in considering this question, gave very careful consideration to the possibility of dividing the Schedule into a number of parts, including one part to take care of special charges such as primage, and another part to take care of maximum margin of preference.

The Tariff Negotiations Working Party, after very careful consideration and long deliberation of this problem decided that it would be much better after the transfer, for the sake of simplification, to confine the schedule to the two parts we have recommended, one to take care of the Most Favoured N tion rates, and the other to take care of Preferential rates which apply to another group of countries.

As regards primage, they have recommended that it should be taken care of in a manner set forth in this sample schedule. If you will note under Item 538 of this Schedule - Table and Kitchen Articles - there is a provision here for taking care of primage.

As regards maximum margin of preference, for which no boundary is provided, a similar example is given at the top of the page in Item 48 - Electrical Apparatus. There you have a binding maximum of 10% without any binding of the rate. You will also see with regard to Table and Kitchen Articles that provision is made for the binding of primage without any binding of the rate.

The Tariff Negotiations Working Party considered in this way it would be possible to take care of these various types of items without providing for a number of parts which would unduly complicate this schedule, and the various schedules would then lack uniformity. Some countries would have four parts, others one part, others two parts, and in this way some countries would only want Part 1 of the Schedule and other countries which have preferential rates would have two parts, so that there would be the maximum uniformity that it would be possible to obtain in the drawing up of the schedule.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

Dr. A.J. BEYLEVELD (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, we just have another exception to Parts I and II and that is where the preference is eliminated but the rate is not bound.

CHAIRMAN: That could be done under the example which is given here for electrical apparatus. We could then have a note that items provided for in Article 48 shall be exempt from ordinary Most-Favoured-Nation customs duty which do not exceed the rate for preferential purposes.

Are there any other comments?

Dr. H.C. COOMBS (Australia): Mr. Chairman, your Committee is quite satisfied I presume that the advantages of uniformity between Schedule and Schedule are sufficient to outweigh what appears to me, at a relatively superficial study of this question, to be a somewhat confusing way of representing these items, with particular exceptional cases scattered through the main lists. It does seem to me that the main purpose of the Schedules should be to enable the countries interested to consult them for purpose of reference readily and from that point of view there might be some advantage in having more than two parts. I am not sure about this.

CHAIRMAN: The Tariff Negotiations Working Party did come to the conclusion that this division into two parts would have the advantage of facilitating consultation of the lists by countries interested. For instance, a country that was entitled to Most-Favoured-Nation treatment, not preferential treatment, could look at Part I and see there the treatment accorded to it in respect of various types of tariff treatment. It would not have to consult various parts to find out what its tariff treatment was. For instance, if it was interested in electrical apparatus it would only have to look at this part.

For instance, if there were three parts, it would look at Part I to see if the rate were bound; it would look at Part II to see if the Most-Favoured-Nation rate applied, it would look at Part III to see if the primage duty were covered. In this way it could readily find out what treatment was accorded to electrical apparatus.

Similarly a country enjoying preferential tariffs could look at Part II to see what it so enjoyed, and the countries of its same category, and then it could turn to Part I to see what the Most-Favoured-Nation countries were enjoying under the various types of Tariff treatment in Part I.

It was therefore felt this was a simpler way of dealing with it and it would simplify consultation by countries interested.

The Delegate of the Netherlands.

Dr. G.A. LAMSVELT (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, our Delegation would like to know whether the Committee could agree to have in some cases three columns of rates of duty instead of one. For instance, at the present moment a surtax of 50% in the Netherlands is levied on products of the Netherlands Indies. So it would be more clear if we had one column for the basic duty, one column for the surtax, and one for the total tax. In fact it has been asked for by one of the delegations to draft the Schedule like this.

CHAIRMAN: The most practical difficulty in the way of having more than one column is the size of the paper which it is necessary for us to use. Mr. Lacarte pointed out, when we were discussing the question of procedure the other day, that the only type of paper which is available in the quantity and quality required for this purpose is paper of this width.

That does not permit more than one column to be placed conveniently on the sheet. That was in the minds of the Tariff Negotiations Working Party when we were considering this question. The Delegate of the Netherlands will see one example, under Automobiles on page 6 of document T/153, where a product is subject not only to duty but to special charge in addition, and that was the way we thought it could be dealt with. We feel that it is quite impracticable to have more than one column because of our limitation of the width of the paper which we have to use.

Mr. R.J. SHACKLE (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make any revolutionary suggestions. I am not pronouncing on the substance of the question at issue, but it does strike me that it might be possible to broaden our paper. If we do that it might save a certain amount of waste space which the setting out of, say, page 6 involves. It seems to me you might conceivably economise some space that way.

CHAIRMAN: That has also been considered but that would really lead to a great waste of paper, because you would be taking up all this space for the sake of getting in. , more than one column; and then the appearance would not be at all in keeping with a document of this character and, moreover, it would be very difficult to consult it.

Dr. G.A. LAMSVELT (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, in the case I just mentioned it might perhaps be better to insert a note stating that there is a surtax. Otherwise you have to repeat "surtax" on every item.

CHAIRMAN: If the surtax applies in every case, then it would be proper to put it down in the heading or some other place.

Dr. G.A. LAMSVELT (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, on page 4 of paper W/325 there are some observations of the Netherlands Delegation of which the first seems to be covered by the new text of paragraph 3, Article I; so we could pass that by.

In regard to the second observation about the note in the Schedule on item 331 where the words "internal tax preference" seem to cause some confusion, if that be the case, on "internal Tax", it is going to be withdrawn.

(After interpretation)

Perhaps it would clear the confusion out of the way if we delete the word "preference"; it has many meanings.

Mr. J.M. LEDDY (United States): Mr. Chairman, I am not quite clear what the problem is but I think that this note here is meant just to be illustrative. It is not an attempt to set out precise language. It is just an illustrative way of handling the problem.

It is to be recalled that at one stage it was proposed to except in the regulations all existing internal tax preferences, and then the Committee examined the number in existence and they thought that a better way of doing it would be to permit the imposition of a tariff preference equal to the internal tax preference and provision was made in one of the Annexes saying that the replacement of internal tax preference by tariff preference would not constitute a new tariff preference under the Agreement; and this note is simply designed to illustrate the way in which a right could be observed in the Schedule to impose a tariff preference equivalent to an internal tax preference. It was really with no intention of drafting exact language.

CHAIRMAN: As Mr. Leddy mentioned, these are merely examples to show the way in which the various concessions agreed upon in the course of the negotiations can be expressed in the Schedules. In this case, it does refer to a margin of internal tax preference. If what is agreed upon between the negotiators, was/the difference relating to stimulation between internal taxes on domestic products and imported products, that would be an entirely different matter.

Dr. G.A. LAMSVELT (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, we saw the possibility of two cases in the observations made on page 4, the last sentence, and I would like to ask Mr. Leddy to explain to me which of these cases he meant. I take it was No. 1, but there is a distinction here.

Mr. J.M. LEDDY (United States): Yes, it is related to a Note appearing in Annex A and, I think, Annex D, which says "The imposition of a margin of tariff preference to replace a margin of preference in an internal tax existing on 10th April, 1947 exclusively between two or more of the territories listed in this Annex, shall not be deemed to constitute an increase in a margin of tariff preference", and what this Note refers to is the margin of preference in internal tax as between the country receiving the preference and all other countries.

Mr. G.A. LAMSVELT (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. Leddy.

CHAIRMAN: Would the Delegates kindly speak somewhat louder. The Verbatim Reporters are finding it impossible to take down verbatim

because they cannot hear Delegates at this end of the room at that end of the room.

M. P. FORTHOMME (Belgium): Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if we are not losing a good deal of advantage in having only two parts by the somewhat cumbersome method of expressing concessions. In Article II we say "Each contracting party shall accord to the commerce of the other contracting parties treatment no less favourable than that provided for.....etc.". Then, would it not be sufficient, for instance, on page 6 - No. 48 Electrical apparatus - to say "maximum margin of preference 10%" instead of having that whole Note? The same applies at the bottom of the page with Table and Kitchen Articles, one could just say "primage at so much".

CHAIRMAN: As I mentioned before, these tables which are given at the end of this document are purely for the purpose of illustration. If the parties to the negotiations agree on a simpler wording, and the parties to the Agreement also agree, that would be quite in order. It is important, however, that the wording should be sufficiently clear in order that there should be no dispute in the future, and it is possible that by just stating "the maximum margin of preference 10%" there may be some dispute in the future as to what that 10% means - whether it means the difference between the most-favoured-nation rate and the preferential rate or something else.

The Delegate of France.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I had written on my document indications similar in nature to those observations just made by the Belgian Delegate.

I am afraid that we are going to have a very long document, and one which is most difficult to read. Therefore, I am wondering about the solution which has just been suggested, that is, that we should come to an agreement between the different countries to make these Notes lighter or to suppress them, because if the seventeen countries have various ideas on the Notes, then we would have a most heterogeneous list and notes varying in nature and in appearance for each article.

It seems to me that the presentation of the tariff lists of most countries represented here are somewhat similar and therefore we could simplify the presentation of the lists here and, let us say for item 48, just put "preferential rates plus 10% ad valorum"; for item 367, instead of having this somewhat cumbersome Note in the margine, just simplify it and say in one line "40% ad valorum" and in the next line "primage duty 8%"; for item 538, instead of having this very long Note, we could just state the customs duty on the first line, then in the second line "primage 8% ad valorum", or we could suppress the first line. This would avoid, I think, these Notes which have only a juridical appearance and which are most complicated. It would give to this document a clearer appearance, which would be most necessary to our mind.

MM P. FORTHOMME (Belgium): May I add that I do not think there could be any confusion if we put "maximum margins of preference" in view of the fact that paragraph 3 of Article I explains in great detail what margins of preference there are.

Mr. J.M. LEDDY (United States): May I suggest that the nature of these Notes and the way this is stated will depend upon the language

decided upon for tying up the Schedules to the Agreement. You may use one method and follow the procedure suggested by the Tariff Negotiations Working Party, appearing under Parts I, II and II. On the other hand, if we simply have a provision that the treatment to be accorded will be no less favourable than that provided for in the Schedules, then you must follow a different procedure, and I think that we cannot make any real progress until we settle first the questions relating to the concessions in the Schedules which are to be included in the Agreement itself.

CHAIRMAN: We shall have to give further consideration to this question of the Schedules as Delegations begin to commence the preparation of their consolidated lists, and, no doubt, Delegations will be bringing their problems for attention and we will have to consider them further.

I think that the suggestions made by the Delegations of Belgium and France are very practical ones, and anything which can simplify the Schedules and make them less lengthy is to be commended. We will take another look at this question later on when we come to deal with the mechanics of preparing the different Schedules.

I think there has been general agreement that the general form proposed in this document is one on which we can work, and the other details can be worked out later.

Monsieur Royer.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate for practical reasons if we could get by tomorrow a pattern of the Schedules, a pattern specifying the frame of the Schedules, the width of the paper of the Schedules, the number of columns and the width of each column. This would help us in preparing the stencils for the frame of the Schedules themselves.

There is another point which I would like to raise, I think that before the numbers of the Items we ought to put "ex" if the Items following the negotiations have been broken up.

CHAIRMAN: At the conclusion of this discussion I was going to deal with the mechanics for preparing the stencils; perhaps the Delegate of France could wait until then. I will deal with that particular point then.

I think we have agreed that there can be only one column according to the width of the paper, which is this (holding up a document of foolscap size).

As regards the suggestion of "ex", that of course is entirely up to the country concerned. In the case of Canada, we must put "ex" because that is our custom. It depends entirely upon the practice of the country. There cannot be uniformity in that respect, because the practice of countries differs. It is entirely up to the country concerned to deal with setting forth the items in accordance with their usual practice.

The Delegate of the Netherlands.

Mr. G. A. LAMSVELT (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, as you are aware, the actual wording has been produced by the Delegation of Canada so it might be useful for all parties concerned to know whether they can follow that example or not.

CHAIRMAN: The Canadian Delegation, in preparing the consolidated list, were guided by this paper of the Tariff Negotiations Working Party. They used that as a model so far as it is possible to do without contravening the usual practice of setting forth the Canadian tariff and I should think all countries would have to make that exception. The only way in which they have deviated from what would be necessary is in respect of the size of the paper, because, as Mr. Lacarte explained, there is only one size available in

volume and that size does not happen to coincide with that of the Canadian Delegation.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia.

H. E. Mr. Z. AUGENTHALER (Czechoslovakia): Mr. Chairman, as the Schedules of different countries should have a legal value in those countries, so we suppose they must correspond to the general customs of those countries. That is why we proposed - though it is not exactly as it is reproduced in this Tariff Negotiations Working Party Paper W/325 - our suggestion that the explanatory remarks or notes should not be directly in the Schedules, but separately;

It refers only to Czechoslovakia because in our legal procedure the customs duties have a different legal value from the remarks themselves. So we are forced to put remarks, such as, for instance, the remark below Item 331 on Page 6 of Document T/153. We would be obliged to put it separately after the Schedules, but I think it has nothing to do with other countries; it is only in the case of Czechoslovakia, because of our legal procedure.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of New Zealand.

Mr. J.P.D.JOHNSEN (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I was away during part of the discussion, but I was wondering whether you finally disposed of the question whether there should be Parts I and II. From my point of view, I think it would be much more convenient to show all the information in one part, under the headings of "Negotiated Most Favoured Nation Tariffs" in one column; "Preferential Tariffs" in the second column, and, where there was a purely maximum margin of preference, that could be in the third column. Then there is no need to refer to the different parts.

I notice, in this fine example of the Canadian Delegation, that in the second part there is a quite considerable volume; if there is any question of saving paper, it could be effected there.

This example which we have before us is not, I think, a good one from the point of view of setting out. It is quite evident a lot of space could be saved by setting up these columns and putting a reference to the ad valorem or the specific unit at the side of the first column. I assume that aspect was fully considered but I was not quite clear and am not aware what decision was arrived at.

CHAIRMAN: We did discuss, as soon as we came back from tea - those of us who took a short time over our tea - the question of the division into two parts.

With regardto the suggestion of the New Zealand Delegate, I take it he is proposing two parallel columns.

Mr. JOHNSEN (New Zealand): Two or three.

CHAIRMAN: That question was raised by the South African Delegate and we did explain the difficulty of having more than the columns dictated by the size of the paper, but the main reason which led the Tariff Negotiations Working Party to decide on division into two parts was that Part I related to one group of countries and Part II to another group.

There was a suggestion earlier in our meeting to make more parts. The objection to that was that it might be confusing having to look at a number of places. The suggestion of the Delegate of New Zealand would simplify reference, having only to look at one place, but I am afraid that the practical difficulty of having more than one column is due to the width of the paper we must use.

I want to reply to the other point raised by the New Zealand Delegate with regard to placing "ad valorem" to the left of the column. He will notice that is a procedure followed by the Canadian Delegation in preparing their consolidated list. That is the usual practice of setting out the Canadian tariff. I am afraid one point we shall have to agree to is that each country will set forth its Schedule in the form in which it usually sets forth its official tariff.

The Delegate of Canada.

Mr. L. E. COUILLARD (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Delegate of the Netherlands and I shall gladly pass on his kind remarks to our Secretariat.

At the same time he has opened the door - a kindly door - and I would like to take advantage of the kindly attitude of the Committee to raise two points in the French text, on the headings to the various Schedules.

You referred, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the paper we used is not the correct size, for the reason it was not available in Geneva at the time of reprinting. However, the stencils are cut - something like 250 stencils. We certainly hope we shall not have to re-type the stencils, except for corrections.

If you will permit me, I would like to raise those points and speak in French on them because they concern the French text.

(Mr. Couillard continued his speech in French).

(Interpretation): I would like to state that our tariff position is published in Canada both in French and English. Therefore, in that connection, I would like to raise two questions regarding the translation of two words from English into French. The first is the word "Schedule" and the second expression is the words "rates of duty".

In making this statement I look at M. Royer from the corner of my eye and of course I adhere wholeheartedly to the criticism he has made on the use of the word "Barême", which was used to translate the word "Schedule" into French, but he proposed the words "Liste Tarifaire" and I would ask him if he would see any inconvenience in adopting the word "Annexe" in French instead of the word "Liste".

I see advantages in the proposal which I make and, after looking through the text of the Agreement and seeing that the word "Annexe" is used in the General Agreement, we shall have the General Agreement Annexes labelled "A", "B", "C" and "D", and we may also have numbered Annexes.

Then, in the text of the General Agreement, when re-reading it, if we replace the words "Liste Tarifaire" or "Schedule" by the word "Annexe", I do not think it will lead to any confusion or wrong interpretation; indeed, in Canada the word "Annexe" is used in official documents to mean "Schedule".

There is another reason, which is a practical one. This is, that in the unification of our tariff we have used the word "Annexe" and therefore we would have to correct everything which we have done already. We do not want to correct what we have done, except of course where this is essential.

As regards the second point - the translation of the words "rates of duty" - instead of the word which is used in the French text, I would propose the following translation: "Taux des droits", which is the proper expression as used in Canada.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of France.

M. ROYER (France) (Interpretation) Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a difficulty which arises when two nations use the same language. The same difficulty arises at times between the American and English languages. The word "liste" is used in our trade agreements and therefore this is why we have used the word, and it seems to me that the word "annexe" in French might bring about some confusion. Nevertheless we could avoid this confusion and misinterpretation. We could alter in some places the word to Agreement. I am referring here to Article XXXIV of the Agreement which states that the Annexes to this Agreement are hereby made an integral part of this Agreement. But we see also in Article II of the Agreement it is stated that the appropriate schedule annexed to this Agreement will be made an integral part of Part I thereof. To avoid all confusion regarding Article XXXIV, you could add the words Annexes A and B and this would avoid confusion. There would be other parts of the Agreement where perhaps amendments ought to be made so as to replace in French the word "liste" by "annexe"; but of course we would prefer to keep "liste" unchanged in the French; but if the Canadian Delegate had experienced difficulties regarding the use of the word "liste" we would be ready to agree. Nevertheless, I wonder if the Canadian Delegation in order not to change the heading of the schedules, could not use the following procedure, that is, use a rubber stamp and before the word "annexe" in French stamp the word "liste". Then we would have "liste" and "annexe" in the general schedule. We would have no objection to that.

Regarding the other matter brought up by the Canadian Delegate regarding translation of the words "rates of duty" we would have no objection to the translation which he proposes, although this expression would not be customary in French.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of New Zealand.

Mr. J.P.D. JOHNSEN (New Zealand) Arising out of the two parts of the Schedule, there is one point I would like clarified. In our negotiations we have made it known that where we take off the surtax in the fixed MFN rate, we take a primage off the preferential rate, the object being to endeavour to get a single unit tariff. In some cases the surtax is also taken off the preferential rate.

I take it in a case like that the position could be covered merely by marking with an asterisk the articles in Part I where such action was taken, and adding a fitting note to the Schedule. If that is not done all the items affected would have to be repeated in Part II, I take it, and that would involve a lot of work and use of paper which might be avoided. I would just like to have that point made clear.

CHAIRMAN: I think that would depend largely on what the countries with which Brazil was negotiating preferential rates would wish. If the suppression of the surtax in the case of preferential rate is consequential upon the expression of the most-favoured-nation rate, I think it should be left to the legislative authority to take care of that. The preferential application in the Trade Agreement would only apply to the most-favoured-nation; if it applied also to the preferential country that country would want it shown in Part II.

Mr. J. F. D. JOHNSEN (New Zealand). I do not think the preferential country has any particular wish. It is a matter of convenience, largely, and from their point of view I gather they would not want it to be shown in Part II. I think it would serve their purpose if it is covered by the Note. I just wanted to

make sure that it would not be necessary to list all these articles separately.

Mr. C. E. MORTON (Australia). For the purpose of saving paper, would it be possible, where we have a number of Notes which are similar running down the Schedule, to express these in terms of "See Note A", "See Note B." and at the end of the Schedule set out the matter to which the Note refers, and repeat it on each page of the Schedule?

CHAIRMAN: I should think that could be done.

Mr. J. M. LEDDY (United States). I should think that a number of countries will have special notes that will have to be included in the Schedule for legal reasons or for reasons of convenience. Where you cannot cover many items by one note, they might well go as a general note rather than in the Schedule itself. I see no reason why that procedure should not be followed.

CHAIRMAN. Are there any other comments?

The Delegate of Brazil.

Mr. E. L. RODRIGUES (Brazil). I have no wish to disturb the discussion, but this is an important matter and is rather different. We have been pressed by certain Delegations, especially this afternoon, to present a complete list of the taxes and charges on imports. We have no objection to doing that, but we should like to know if the other countries are willing to give the same list; in this case we will do so immediately. The matter is a very important one, because the negotiations may not perhaps be finished as delegates will be leaving, and we may not have the list within this week. It is because of this I am forced to bring this matter to the attention of the Committee.

It is my understanding that when finally dealing with this second paragraph of the last part of this paragraph 1 of Schedule 1,

page 5, Document E/PC/T/153, it is indicated that this Committee will have to decide in what manner we have to give this list to indicate the tax or charges on imports. I would like to know if we have to wait for the decision of the Committee as to inserting this indication in the Schedule in a general way for everyone, or if we have to send the list to the other delegations.

The Delegate of Norway.

Mr. J. MELANDER (Norway). Mr. Chairman, as representative of one of the countries which have asked for this list, I will only say that we are very well content to have a statement from the Brazilian Delegation on the import charges relating to those specific products on which we are negotiating. It is only three or four products and we find that it is no good negotiating on tariff duties if at the same time we do not know what the import charges are, or the specific charge of a more or less discriminatory character.

We feel that on the basis of the principle of Article XVI of the Draft Charter, that would be quite a normal thing.

We would not, of course, demand that the Brazilian Delegation should make a long list to all the Delegations. We are quite satisfied if we get a statement from the Brazilian Delegation on the charges relating to the particular products on which we are negotiating, and we think that the most practical way in which to deal with that would be to include those in the Schedule relating to those particular items. Of course, we on our side have given the Brazilian Delegation information about the import charges for any of the products which we import from Brazil and which are included in our tariff negotiations. So from our point of view it would be quite satisfactory to have just information on the charges relating to specific products and we think that the practical solution would be to have them included in the Schedule relating to these particular products.

CHAIRMAN: I should think the request of the Norwegian Delegate is a reasonable one. When we consult Article 18 of the Charter we see that taxes of this kind can be subject to negotiation, and I take it that what he is asking for is a list of the taxes of this kind which apply to the products that are subject to negotiation between Norway and Brazil.

Mr. E.L. RODRIGUES (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, I had no idea to make any commitment unpleasant for my Norwegian colleague. I have been pressed by the Negotiating Team and they told me specially that the requirement for the Norwegian Delegation was for a complete list. At the same time I always understood that this matter could be decided in regard to the discussion of this same provision which we are treating in this Schedule: perhaps in a general way to have at the end of the Schedule for each country a complete list of taxes and other charges imposed on imports. If I am not correct I would accept the suggestion of the Delegate of Norway and in this case we have to give this information on to the countries with whom we have to negotiate; but if, as I understood before, we will have to give a complete list in the Schedule, I do not see any reason for giving to different countries different lists, even in regard to particular products. In any case the Brazilian Delegation has no objection to giving lists to other countries. But the feeling of our Negotiating Team is that if you give to a certain country you are giving to all countries, and we are not receiving from all countries this same treatment.

I am not giving the final word, I am not here in a Negotiating Team; but in the sense of the conversation I had with my Brazilian colleagues, I had no other way than to explore the views of this Committee and to have a decision upon it.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Leddy.

Mr. J.M. LEDDY (United States): Mr. Chairman, I do not quite see how this matter gets into this Committee. I should think that the ordinary procedure would be this: that the Tariff Negotiating Teams, each Tariff Negotiating Team negotiating with another, would ordinarily be familiar with this Tariff and Customs List, would have documents on it, and, if there were any doubt about any particular product they would normally ask the other team what the situation was and the other team would give the information. I do not think that the Brazilian Delegation is being treated in any different way from any other delegation here. I should think that the countries are expected to provide any information that is not available to the other country if they want it.

On the other hand I see no need for all of us sitting down and trying to find all of the charges other than regular customs duties which may be collected on importation for all of the products, and distributing lists to everybody. I think that would be just wasted effort. And there is no need to put them in the Schedules unless they have been subject to particular negotiation; because if the regular customs duties are bound against increase, then all other supplementary charges except internal taxes, anti-dumping duties and fees relating to services, are all bound against increase. So I think this is entirely a matter of referring to the negotiation of a particular product. And I think certainly the Delegate of Brazil need not feel that he is being dealt with any differently from anybody else. He should provide information requested by the countries in question.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of Norway.

Mr. J. MELANDER (Norway): Mr. Chairman, there are just one or two points I might mention in this connection. The list which we have in mind is, of course, the list of charges referred to in Article 16 of the Charter, that is charges of any kind imposed on or in connection with importation. That is the one category.

Secondly, there are the charges on like products; that I do not think comes into this picture to a large extent. I do not know myself - I am not familiar with the details - but I do not think that that would cover much. It might be that it would cover, a little, some few items, but there of course I take it that in regard to like products there would have to be a complete abolition of the existing internal taxes in so far as they are higher for imported products than domestic products.

Then there is a third category, namely that referred to in the second sentence of Article 18, paragraph 1, the charges referred to in regard to products other than like products. I do not know whether they would cover a large part.

But what we have in mind is that there is a possibility that there might be taxes under each of these three headings and that, of course, we would like to know them in order to be able to complete our negotiations.

That is just an explanation to show what we have in mind.

On the other hand, of course, I would certainly say that we do not ask for information on the whole complete tax system in Brazil dealing with all products. That is not of the question. We only ask for information dealing with those particular products on which we are negotiating. I do not exactly remember how many there might be - probably somewhere in the region of between five and ten.

Mr. E.L. RODRIGUES (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied with the explanation given by the Delegate of Norway and I thank the Delegate of the United States also for having given an interesting explanation. I feel that we can leave this matter, if there is some other difficulty, for the Tariff Negotiations Working Party, because I think that the interested countries can go there and discuss the problem.

CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that the Norwegian and Brazilian Delegations have a further discussion on this matter and then, if either one or both the parties think that the Tariff Negotiations Working Party can be of assistance, we would be very glad to take the matter under advisement and to consult both Delegations.

Are there any other comments on the form of the Schedules?

May I take it, then, that the Committee is in accord with adopting the model set forth in this document T/153 with the variations which have been agreed upon during the course of our discussion? I would also ask if the Committee is in accord with the suggestion of the Netherlands Delegate in which he so kindly suggested that the Canadian Consolidated List might also serve as a model.

Is that agreed?

Agreed.

Before we leave the question of the Schedules, I would like to reply to a question which was raised yesterday by the Delegation of Cuba regarding a Spanish translation of the General Agreement and the Schedules. As I replied yesterday, this question raised certain technical difficulties which it was necessary to refer to the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York. The Secretariat have received a telegram which reads as follows:

"The Cuban position seems fair, that they accept the English text as final in case of dispute. There are no rules regarding the way in which a Spanish text may be made operative for Cuban purposes. The Secretariat can be expected to supply a reasonably accurate text, but the Preparatory Committee itself will have to decide whether to accept the United Nations Secretariat text without examination or not."

I would also like to ask Delegations if they would be so kind as to supply the Secretariat with the information requested in document T/195. So far, only five or six delegations have replied giving the information requested in this document. It is particularly desired that the Secretariat should know at an early date the number of mimeographed copies which will be required of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, because they wish to place orders for the paper in the near future, and they cannot do so until they have some indication from the delegations as to the number of mimeographed copies which will be required. In view of the necessity to preserve the secrecy of the document, I take it that delegations will confine their requests to a limited number.

CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat are also proposing to arrange for a meeting of Secretaries of the various Delegations to discuss the mechanical details of preparing the Schedules. The Secretariat will meet with the Secretaries of Delegations to go into the various points which have to be attended to concerning the mechanical preparation of the Schedules. The first meeting is proposed to be held at 9.30 on Thursday morning, to last for one hour, and this will be followed by another meeting on Friday at the same time, also to last for one hour. So, the first meeting will take place at 9.30 a.m. on Thursday next.

Tomorrow I propose that we should take up as the first order of business the Report of the ad hoc Sub-Committee on the new paragraphs 6 and 7 of Article XVIII, to be followed by the Report of the ad hoc Sub-Committee on paragraph 3 of Article XXIV; after that, if the Delegations are ready to discuss the question, I propose to refer to the Protocol dealing with treatment to be accorded to Germany, Japan and Korea; after that we shall take up the paragraph in the Final Act which is given in document E/PC/T/W/319, and which deals with the question of Reservations.

H.E. Dr. Z. AUGENTHALER (Czechoslovakia): Mr. Chairman, I apologise for coming back to this question of copies to be ordered, but I think that the Tariff Agreement remains restricted only until a certain date, that is, 15th November. Now, it is possible that different countries will need a larger number of copies, but it would not be necessary for all those copies to be supplied at once, and I was informed that it would be of certain advantage for the Secretariat to know the number of copies to be ordered. I think that possibly

Delegations might first order a restricted number of copies to be supplied immediately, and then a larger number of copies to be supplied later, say about the 15th November when the Tariff Agreement is no longer secret.

CHAIRMAN: As outlined in document E/PC/T/195 this is envisaged in two separate editions. The first is the mimeographed edition, which would be prepared at the same time as Signature - that will be both in English and French; then there will be the printed edition, which will be available only a few days after the date of the simultaneous announcement. It is not possible now to envesage the exact date on which that printed edition will be ready, but we will endeavour to have it ready as soon as possible after the date of simultaneous announcement.

Therefore, Delegations will have to take that into account in determining the number of mimeographed copies they will require. The Secretariat would like to know what number of copies in English and French of the mimeographed edition, and what number of copies in English in the printed edition are required. The requirement for secrecy, of course, only applies to the mimeographed edition, but Delegations cannot be sure that their Governments will have the printed copies until a few days after the date of simultaneous announcement.

Mr. J.P.D. JOHNSEN (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, there is just one point in connection with this matter - where will the printing be done? The mimeographed edition, of course, will be done in Geneva, but it will depend on where the printing is done as to what distribution might be made. If the printing is going to be done in

New York, then it might be a case of arranging delivery of copies to Governments - I do not know who is going to pay the postage from their to the various countries, because if it is a matter of air mail it is going to cost a lot of money.

CHAIRMAN: It has not yet been decided as to where the printed edition will be printed - that will depend on where facilities are available, but I imagine that it will be either in Geneva or New York.

As to the cost of sending the documents to the various Governments, I imagine that the Secretariat will have something to say about that, and if a large number of copies are ordered Delegates may have to pay for their carriage, but I am not sure.

I am afraid I cannot be more exact in replying to the question of the New Zealand Delegate.

Mr. J.P.D. JOHNSEN (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, it is really more a question of when the printed copies will be available. Obviously, unless they are going to be sent air mail they will not be distributed to some Governments until a few months later.

Mr. R.J. SHACKLE (United Kingdom): I imagine, Mr. Chairman, that as there are no author's rights attached to this, any Government which want to re-print it can always do so.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

The Sub-Committee on Schedules will meet tomorrow morning at 1030.

The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.