

# GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

RESTRICTED  
LIMITED B  
GATT/CP.6/SR.14/Corr. 2  
9 October 1951  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONTRACTING PARTIES  
Sixth Session

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOURTEENTH MEETING

### Corrigendum

#### Pages 2 and 3

Mr. Thorp's statement should read as follows:

"Mr. THORP (United States) said he had listened to the charges and incomplete explanations of the representative of Czechoslovakia to which he would reply if he were prepared to take up the time of the Contracting Parties. For example, he would explain in detail the statement made by Secretary Acheson who had testified before Congress that certain action proposed by the Congress would constitute a violation of existing international obligations. He could point out that Congress had initially intended to require the termination of certain trade agreements within ninety days; and Secretary Acheson had called attention to the fact that certain agreements require six months' notice for their termination. If the instructions to the United States Government had remained in their original form a violation of international obligations would have resulted, but as a result of Mr. Acheson's testimony the legislation had been altered to read - "as soon as practicable" and on that basis these trade agreements are in process of terminating in accordance with the terms of the specific agreement. No-one could claim that there was a violation of an agreement if it were terminated in accordance with its terms. The representative of Czechoslovakia had also referred to the refusal of passports to United States citizens as a means of restricting commerce between the two countries. The measure to which reference was made had been taken last June for the reason that the United States Government could no longer assure to its citizens the kind of protection in Czechoslovakia which is implicit in the issuance of a passport.

"He had selected two cases at random to indicate the whole story had not been told but he was prevented from giving a complete answer by the logic of the declaration as well as his promise to the Contracting Parties that he would not expect them to make a decision except on the one fact that exceptional circumstances exist.

"He could rebut the assertions of the representative of Czechoslovakia for the sake of the record of the meetings; he could use the time of the Contracting Parties for the purpose of propaganda, but he was only concerned that the Contracting Parties should recognise the definite existence of

of exceptional circumstances which nullified the benefits of the Agreement. On this point he thought his arguments had best been proved by the representative of Czechoslovakia himself. One had only to examine the statements of the two delegations to see that the circumstances described therein were most certainly exceptional. This was recognised in the first two points of the proposed declaration and the remaining paragraphs followed automatically. The debate had been long and much of it was not related to the immediate consideration of the subject, and he suggested that, on the strength of his own testimony and that of the delegate of Czechoslovakia, the Contracting Parties should now be able to vote favourably on the proposed declaration."