

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

RESTRICTED

SR.10/15
26 November 1955

Limited Distribution

CONTRACTING PARTIES
Tenth Session

Page 163

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTEENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 18 November 1955, at 2.30 p.m.

Chairmen: H.E. Mr. Fernando Garcia Oldini (Chile)
Mr. Paul Koht (Norway)

Subjects discussed:

1. Transport insurance (cont'd)
2. 1956 negotiations

1. Transport insurance (L/383 and Add.1-4, W.10/15, W.10/18) (cont'd)

Mr. HEBBARD (International Monetary Fund) called attention to the Fund's interest in the exchange aspects of this matter arising out of its general interest in exchange restrictions, particularly those of a discriminatory nature. The Fund wished, to the extent possible, to assist in working for the co-ordination of its approach and that of the CONTRACTING PARTIES.

Mr. de BESCHE (Sweden) said that this was a problem which had not existed before the last war, when there had been no question but that buyers and sellers were free to agree on whatever terms seemed most advantageous to them. Since the war, however, the freedom to choose transport insurance had been abolished in many countries either by legislation or administrative order in such a manner as often to force parties to buy insurance in a particular market. His country sympathized with the wish of less developed countries to organize national insurance businesses where none had existed, but was doubtful whether their purpose was best served by discriminatory measures. It would be more efficacious to try to make the national companies competitive by using technical assistance or similar arrangements. The development of discriminatory transport insurance was of serious concern to Sweden. It had been said that it affected only the inhabitants of the countries having such laws, but that was only the case when goods were paid fully in advance. Otherwise both the buyer and seller were interested in the costs of transport and insurance. His delegation had submitted a document (L/383/Add.4) setting out some of the adverse effects of this practice and they agreed with the views of the International Chamber and the International Union of Marine Insurance. The question had been discussed in various United Nations bodies with out conclusive results. He hoped that the CONTRACTING PARTIES would take some action and supported the draft recommendation proposed by the United States.

Mr. RAMASUBRAN (India) said that in India there was complete freedom for the importer and exporter to make their own insurance arrangements. The nature

of the problems of the countries which followed a different course must be understood. This was firstly, not a question of discrimination; non-discrimination in the sense of the General Agreement meant making no distinction between one foreign country and another, it did not mean giving the same treatment to a foreign product or service as to a national one. The International Chamber of Commerce had stated that its wish was to secure freedom for the insurer to carry on business without interference from governments. International bodies should remember that governments also disliked interference from international bodies. The reasons which led governments to place restrictions on the freedom of transport insurance were either conservation of foreign exchange or protection of the domestic industry. When a country was in such need to conserve its exchange as to necessitate economizing even on transport insurance, the CONTRACTING PARTIES were not justified in saying that this was not an important reason. As to the question of protecting the domestic insurance, if the present method were objected to, some alternative should be suggested. It had been argued that the consumer in the importing country had to pay more in the end, but that was the case whenever any industry was protected and was a matter for the government concerned to weigh rather than for the CONTRACTING PARTIES to address a recommendation on. The International Chamber report stated that the widespread adoption of c. and f. sales in commerce was harmful, but the experience of his own government was that a large portion of its export trade was on an f.o.b. basis and therefore it was not surprising that buyers wished a c. and f. basis. From the Chamber's report it was clear that whether a contract was on a c.i.f., c. and f. or f.o.b. basis would in effect depend on the bargaining strength of the supplier and the buyer. In a seller's market, the buyer could not afford to dictate such terms, and vice versa. If the CONTRACTING PARTIES believed in letting the ordinary forces of supply and demand in international trade operate, they should not suggest that it was better to buy c.i.f. than c. and f. Moreover, if the CONTRACTING PARTIES recommended a policy regarding transport insurance on the ground that it affected international trade, should they not also consider such questions as shipping, an industry which was sometimes protected by legislation compelling a proportion of certain types of cargo to be carried by national shipping. The wider implications of the adoption of a recommendation must not be overlooked. There was also the fact that the number of countries restricting freedom of insurance was relatively small and most of them were outside the GATT, but the adoption of a recommendation by an international body might lead to the development of protectionist lobbies in individual countries.

His Government therefore felt that the matter should be proceeded in with caution. Attention could be drawn to certain things which were not inherent in the policy of protection and might harm domestic insurance companies' long-term interests. Those countries which restricted freedom of choice should undertake positive measures to ensure that the company issuing a policy under these conditions was able to fulfil its obligations. When a party concerned had no choice but to insure in a particular country, remittances should not be forbidden by action under exchange regulations. Whenever this form of restriction was exercised, there should be adequate supervision over the activities of insurance

companies. This line of thought would be practical, consistent with the CONTRACTING PARTIES' interests as an organization concerned with international trade, and would not bring into question the legitimacy of protection in the field of insurance with which the CONTRACTING PARTIES were not directly concerned. Such a recommendation could be prefaced by drawing attention to some of the undesirable consequences of restrictionism in this field, for example, that two-way traffic was a better method to develop domestic insurance companies. However, if existing insurance companies behaved in an exclusive manner and did not permit new firms to participate effectively and obtain a fair share in international insurance and re-insurance, whatever recommendations were made would only lead to greater restrictions. He would therefore like some reference in the resolution to the desirability of commercial insurance companies promoting the development of new business in all countries. In the view of the Indian delegation, the United States draft required considerable modification.

Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark) said that Denmark had been conscious for some time of the existence of a problem in this field. They had joined the other Scandinavian countries in a proposal that provisions against such practices should be inserted in the General Agreement, but the proposal had found only limited support and had been withdrawn. Between the last session and the present one, his Government had studied the matter but concluded that it would be difficult to assess quantitatively the damage caused to their trade by these discriminatory practices. Much evidence could, however, be found to prove that it caused damage by creating an artificial supplement to the cost of transport of goods to the markets where these practices were in force. The insurance of goods was closely related to problems dealt with by the Agreement and would fit naturally into the activities of the CONTRACTING PARTIES. It was hardly possible to find another intergovernmental organization competent to handle the question. The extended use of discriminatory practices in this field called for action. They would support the United States recommendation as a first step, although a modest one, and would hope that the review proposed under it in 1958 would show such an amelioration as to make more drastic action superfluous.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) opposed the resolution submitted by the United States. Recalling the wish of his delegation expressed during the Review that the CONTRACTING PARTIES should go into all fields related to international trade, he stated that if the GATT were prepared to take action on all barriers to trade, Brazil would support action in this field also. However, at the last session proposals to deal with tied loans and freight had been rejected. A resolution had been passed on surpluses but it was now clear that that resolution could not even be interpreted. Action had been undertaken on the question of commodities and it was clear that it would not go much further. On the question of transport insurance, it appeared that the non-discrimination asked was in favour of business, but how could a country which denied foreign exchange for more valid humanitarian, social or cultural reasons make foreign exchange available for insurance? This situation was not one of discrimination - there were a number of international companies operating in Brazil and permitted to operate on exactly the same basis as Brazilian companies - but of lack of foreign exchange. Mr. Machado called attention to the examples quoted in the

memorandum transmitted by the International Union of Marine Insurance which, inasmuch as they referred to non-contracting parties were most unfortunate, and hardly apt.

Mr. KLEIN (F.R.Germany) said that in Germany there was complete freedom to resort to foreign insurance companies and regretted that in a number of contracting parties it was almost impossible for foreign insurance companies to carry on their activity because c.i.f. contracts were prohibited. This increased in many cases the insurance costs which were passed on to the purchaser. His Government felt that the elimination of free competition in this field had prejudicial effects on trade and was inconsistent with the objectives of the General Agreement. He shared the view of the International Chamber of Commerce and supported the United States draft resolution. With reference to some of the observations that had been made concerning the balance-of-payments aspects of the matter, there seemed no reason on those grounds why the CONTRACTING PARTIES should not investigate.

Mr. IBSEN (Norway) said that the information received since the Executive Secretary's Note at the Ninth Session on the subject of transport insurance had proved that lack of freedom for exporters or importers to place insurance at their will constituted a real barrier to trade. It was appropriate for the CONTRACTING PARTIES to deal with this question. His delegation had been impressed by the statements of the International Chamber and of the International Union of Marine Insurers. Trade in different commodities and the relationship between exporter and importer called for certain types of contracts which could be called natural contracts. F.o.b. was the natural clause for commodities sold on payment upon delivery on board ship and the exporter in such a case was not interested in insuring the goods, although he might undertake to do so as a service to the importer. On the other hand, if a commodity were sold on payment upon delivery from the ship, the natural clause was c.i.f., since the exporter was interested in having the goods insured during the voyage. Obviously the party insuring the goods would prefer to do so with a company operating in his own country. The presumption was that recovery of any losses as quickly as possible could best be achieved by giving the insurer the greatest possible freedom as to where to place the insurance. When governments compelled the insurer to place his insurance in a certain country or currency, this freedom was seriously restricted. At the best, this caused inconvenience to the insurer; it could also lead to double insurance or to a change in the terms of payment; and at the worst it could lead to the termination of a business relationship. While impossible to measure arithmetically, lack of freedom in transport insurance certainly constituted an obstacle to trade and it was questionable whether there was any benefit to the countries applying discriminatory measures in this field. From the balance-of-payments point of view the fact of double insurance would result in the same cost in foreign currency as if there had been a c.i.f. sale, and even if there was no double insurance the exporter's higher risk would influence the export price. The same would apply in reverse to compulsory insurance in national companies for exporters where what was gained in foreign currency for the insurance companies would probably be lost on the export price.

On the question of protection, whatever might be gained by protecting the insurance industry was probably lost because of retaliation which seemed to figure rather largely in the spread of these practices in the past few years. Moreover, the tendency increasingly to indulge in discriminatory practices would be of concern to all countries believing in a free exchange of goods and therefore to the CONTRACTING PARTIES. His Government felt that the CONTRACTING PARTIES could give a statement of policy at the present time and should keep the matter on the agenda for further consideration. The United States Resolution would make this possible, and the Norwegian Government supported it.

Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) opposed the United States Resolution, which, if merely a recommendation would nevertheless commit the CONTRACTING PARTIES to certain definite statements of policy. He doubted whether there was sufficient evidence to warrant the view expressed by the Resolution. It was suggested that foreign exchange control was misused in order to discriminate, but the Fund report reply to the Economic and Social Council Resolution concluded that only very few countries used their exchange control machinery so as to restrict specifically the making of payments to foreign insurers in respect of transport insurance. Was not this conclusion sufficient in itself to destroy that argument? He agreed with the Brazilian delegate that those countries which controlled the granting of foreign exchange for balance-of-payments reasons and in so doing deprived their own people of exchange even for urgent needs, could hardly regard the limiting of exchange for purposes of acquiring insurance as more reprehensible than other restrictions. The General Agreement itself recognized balance-of-payments difficulties as a proper basis for the control of the granting of exchange. The Executive Secretary's Note at the last Session concluded that discriminatory practices affected the interests of the insurance business and that there was some prima facie evidence of harmful effects of these practices on international trade. He doubted in fact whether this conclusion was justified, but even if it were it was clearly not a strong conclusion on which to base the drawing up of a resolution by the CONTRACTING PARTIES. In the same paper which contained that conclusion it was stated that "the majority of countries replying to the questionnaire were evidently not aware of any adverse effects on their trade", and the memorandum just submitted by the Swedish delegation (L/383/Add.4) stated that the damage could not be measured quantitatively. How could the CONTRACTING PARTIES base a recommendation on such slender evidence?

It appeared that the main reason for putting forward this Resolution was the wish to protect "established trade practices of financing and insuring shipments" but surely this was inadmissible in a time of change in various countries and economic development which had led many countries to protect their new industries. There was no reason why the insurance industry should be singled out and precluded from enjoying protection. In Ceylon there was no discrimination between indigenous and foreign industries established in Ceylon, and some degree of protection was given to them in that traders were required to obtain cover in respect of marine insurance from insurance companies in Ceylon. It might be true that this sort of action led to a slightly higher price of imports, but this was a small price to pay for the benefit of building up new business in a country, and whatever damage might be entailed was the concern

of the country itself. It had been argued that this type of protection affected the volume of world trade, but that could not be supported by any evidence at all. On the contrary, the total volume of world trade had been steadily growing. Almost any measure of protection taken by an underdeveloped country could have some impact on established business, but it was always limited to a particular field, a particular country, or a limited period of time. Nothing should be done which might discourage the process of development. He opposed the Resolution and thought the matter might be reverted to at the Eleventh Session when more definite information in this field might be available.

Mr. GARCIA OLDINI (Chile), without wishing to enter into the substance of the question itself or the CONTRACTING PARTIES' competence in this field, shared the views of the Brazilian and Ceylonese delegates. In view of his country's need to protect its insurance industry as other new industries, he could not accept the United States Resolution.

Mr. VAN WIJK (Kingdom of the Netherlands) supported the Resolution. His country had a completely liberal policy in transport insurance and the Dutch importer and exporter was free to choose his own insurance. He could not agree with the view that, because the GATT had not attempted to deal with all matters that might be regarded as related to commercial policy, it could not begin to deal with any individual one. He hoped that this proposed action in the transport insurance field would be the first in a general process of liberalizing shipping.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) wished to comment on some of the doubts expressed by the Ceylon delegate as to the validity of the evidence that discriminatory practice in transport insurance had caused damage. The International Monetary Fund statement to which he had referred did point out that few countries used their exchange control to restrict specifically the making of payments to foreign insurers in respect of transport insurance, but it went on to say that about one quarter of the countries reviewed had legislation protecting their domestic insurance industry which precluded their residents from entering into transport insurance contracts with foreign insurers, or with companies not authorized to operate in the national territory, and that these countries refused to make exchange available for payments in respect of unauthorized insurance contracts. It could reasonably be concluded that the Fund had found in the sense of the reports by others. With regard to the general argument that world trade had expanded continuously in recent years, this, if carried to its logical conclusion, would discourage all efforts toward reducing trade barriers. It was true that there was no mathematical evidence of the amount of injury inflicted, but it was nevertheless clear from the documentation that there was a strong presumption that widespread damage had in fact occurred, and that the cumulative effect justified describing this as an obstacle to international trade.

As to the best method of dealing with this problem he was aware of the importance of the considerations stated by the delegates of India and Brazil.

He did not think that the drafters either failed to understand the difficulties of such governments or wished to dictate the policy they should follow. Reference had been made to the freedom under the GATT to raise tariffs to protect industries. In the field of tariffs and other restrictions, however, countries had firm obligations under the Agreement. The present proposal was merely for a recommendation. It was after all some two years since the Economic and Social Council had requested the GATT to give consideration to the matter. There was strong evidence that action in this field was needed and the United Kingdom delegation found the proposed Resolution to be the proper sort of action to take at the present time. The term "established trade practices" to which exception had been taken only meant that the established practice was freedom of choice.

Mr. SRONEK (Czechoslovakia) referred to the consideration of the matter by the Economic and Social Council and to its Resolution on the subject which only invited the attention of members to the study prepared by the United Nations Secretariat, but did not propose any concrete measures for the elimination of discrimination in transport insurance due principally to existing domestic regulations in this field in certain countries in the process of economic development and having balance-of-payments difficulties. Article XIV of the GATT permitted discrimination in certain circumstances for the protection of the balance-of-payments position, and his Government did not consider that a less flexible attitude in transport insurance than in trade matters should be followed. He could not support the draft Resolution, as it envisaged more substantial measures than the Council's Resolution which for some countries represented the maximum compromise possible. The CONTRACTING PARTIES should not go further on such a matter than the Council.

Mr. NOTARANGELI (Italy) considered it essential in order to facilitate international trade that traders should be permitted freedom of choice in placing insurance contracts for goods either in the country of origin or destination, through freedom to conclude either a c.i.f. or an f.o.b. contract of purchase or sale. Legislation which permitted this possibility, even if it obliged a domestic trader to insure with a domestic or foreign insurance company, authorized to operate in the home market in accordance with the laws of the country, did not constitute an obstacle to international trade but merely a necessary safeguard of the rights of traders. His Government was prepared to undertake the obligation to eliminate certain practices. These practices (which his Government had never indulged in) were requiring nationals to conclude c.i.f. export contracts and f.o.b. import contracts which arbitrarily limited the freedom of contractants and tended to reserve for the home insurance market the insurance of both imports and exports; making the delivery of licences and the granting of foreign exchange conditional upon the placing of the insurance on the domestic market; prohibiting insurance in foreign currency even in cases where this means of cover was justified by the nature of the risk; and preventing foreign insurance companies from carrying on their activities on an equal footing with local companies.

Mr. STUYCK (Belgium) said that the experience of his government in this field had been made known to the secretariat (L/383/Add.2). Any restriction of freedom of choice in transport insurance could constitute a barrier to trade. This freedom of choice was linked to the question of the right of foreign insurance companies to operate on the same terms as indigenous companies, subject only to the imposition by governments of certain necessary safeguards, and to transfer freely premiums and indemnities. The Belgian delegation felt that the CONTRACTING PARTIES should try to achieve these objectives and supported the United States Resolution as a modest but indispensable first step in this field. Without going into the substance of the objections voiced by some delegates, it was to be feared that countries could be led into retaliation. A diminution of the freedom that had hitherto prevailed would cause serious injury to international trade.

Mr. M.U. AHMAD (Pakistan) referred to the memorandum of the International Union of Marine Insurance which stated inter alia that restrictive measures in this field were applied by Pakistan. His Government's arrangements merely required importers in his country to insure imports with companies registered in Pakistan, but no distinction was made between foreign and indigenous insurance companies. In fact the foreign companies outnumbered the local ones and had the bulk of insurance business, as they were in a position to offer insurance facilities on a competitive basis, on a large scale and at short notice. The United States representative had referred to an element of protection in the insurance policies followed by certain countries. No national market in the restrictive sense existed in Pakistan and the question of protection did not therefore arise. At the same time he could see no objection in principle to protection being afforded to new local insurance ventures where the government found it necessary within the framework of its overall plan of economic development, as in the case of a new industry. For Pakistan the problem was at the moment a balance-of-payments one, which was clear from the fact that no such regulation applied to the insurance of exports from Pakistan. It had been stated that these practices had resulted in infringement of international trade, but his Government's experience had been that the measures adopted had resulted in a saving of foreign exchange which had in turn been used for additional imports. No practices such as double insurance which could deprive them of the effects of this saving had come to their notice. This was particularly so because imports were in general paid for in advance by a confirmed letter of credit, so that the exporter did not have to concern himself with insurance. His Government's practice was, in their view, consistent with the letter and spirit of the General Agreement, and had even resulted in furthering the objectives of the Agreement by increasing the volume of Pakistan's imports. It had been said that the Resolution did not impose an obligation, but his delegation would wish to attach the same importance to a recommendation of the CONTRACTING PARTIES as to a direct or specific obligation and would endeavour to abide by it as far as possible. He therefore felt that the CONTRACTING PARTIES should give careful consideration to the matter before reaching a decision. He could not accept without qualification the statement contained in the proposed Resolution that a system of the

type in force in Pakistan constituted an obstacle to international trade and could not therefore subscribe to the recommendation in the Resolution that governments should apply no measures that would interfere with the freedom of the buyer and seller to undertake insurance. The matter should for the present rest with the Resolution of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. de SAINT-LEGIER (France) agreed in principle with the United States Resolution and would not oppose its adoption. France had, in common with other countries, experienced difficulties in its foreign trade because of the restrictive practices in transport insurance adopted by other countries. The damage could not be measured but undoubtedly existed. The matter was, however, a complex one, having both commercial, financial and economic development aspects. Surely, between the complete freedom, even anarchy, that was presented as a model in the proposed Resolution, and complete restriction, intermediary positions existed, characterized less by the wish to establish a monopoly in the local insurance market than by the desire to submit foreign insurance companies to certain rules safeguarding the public interest. It would be a paradox if a system of complete freedom should have the result of discrimination against indigenous insurance companies. The Resolution - the principles of which he agreed with - seemed a little vague and too far-reaching, with the attendant risk that nothing would be achieved. He would prefer to eliminate the first paragraph of the affirmation and that the text be confined to certain precise points, in which connexion he supported the Italian proposal. He also found the reference to "established trade practices of financing and insuring shipment" somewhat misplaced and better deleted.

Mr. RAZIF (Indonesia) agreed with the statements of the delegates of India, Brazil and Ceylon and was not in a position to support the Resolution.

Dr. STANDENAT (Austria) said that, although the Resolution was not acceptable to his Government in its present form, the underlying idea appeared to them sound and they considered the CONTRACTING PARTIES competent in this field, although he agreed with the Brazilian delegate that they should consider also other problems concerning services of a commercial character. He was prepared to accept the Resolution with two amendments, firstly the insertion of a supplementary consideration in the preamble to read: "Recognizing, on the other hand, that in certain countries insurance companies were not yet in a position to meet international competition, and that in consequence the protective measures taken in their favour could only be eliminated progressively", and secondly, the division of the recommendation itself into two parts. The first part would recommend a standstill, the importance of which had been underlined by the United States representative who feared, with reason, retaliatory protective measures. The second part would envisage a progressive elimination within the bounds of possibility having regard to the different position of national insurance markets.

Mr. FOMERUN (Haiti) said that as there was no legislation in Haiti providing for discrimination in insurance, his Government had no direct interest in the matter. It seemed, however, that there was insufficient information to reach a conclusion on the two views which had been presented and, since the CONTRACTING PARTIES must be concerned with the general interests of their members, a further study of the matter was necessary before a delegation like his own could take a position.

Mr. LEDDY (United States), replying to comments that had been made on the draft Resolution, said that he would have no objection to removing the word "discrimination" if that would meet the point of view of the Indian representative, although he did feel that the meaning of the word went somewhat beyond that ascribed to it by the Indian representative. The inference that adopting the Resolution would mean that the GATT was entering into the services field seemed to him a strained interpretation; this Resolution related to a practice whose direct incidence was not on the insurance companies but on the buyers and sellers of goods. The Resolution, of course, would be addressed only to contracting parties. It was not directed to non-contracting parties. As for the question of protection required for economic development, the issue was whether the method of discriminatory transport insurance practices was not a particularly awkward means to that end and one whose deleterious effects on international trade outweighed whatever advantages of development might be attained. The temptation to reciprocal measures in other markets might frustrate efforts to protect a local insurance industry. The draft was of course preliminary and intended to serve as a basis for discussion.

The CHAIRMAN said that the debate had shown a considerable divergence of opinion and it seemed to him doubtful whether a working party could usefully study the matter at this point. It might be more fruitful if those delegations in favour of the Resolution met informally with those against to see whether any common ground could be reached before the matter was formally taken up by the CONTRACTING PARTIES. This matter might best be left to the Eleventh Session.

Mr. LEDDY (United States) did not think the establishment of a working party carried the implication that there was any consensus of opinion in favour or against a question, and hoped that his Government's proposal would be considered serious enough to warrant the establishment of a working party.

Certain other representatives having supported the request for a working party, it was agreed to establish a working party with the following membership and terms of reference:

Chairman: Mr. de Saint-Légier (France)

Members:

Austria
Belgium
Cuba
France

Haiti
India
Italy
Norway

Pakistan
United Kingdom
United States

Terms of reference:

To consider the Resolution proposed by the Government of the United States on "Freedom in Transport Insurance", in the light of the discussion in the plenary meeting on 18 November, and to submit recommendations to the CONTRACTING PARTIES.

2. 1956 Tariff Negotiations (L/408)

The CHAIRMAN referred to the earlier discussion of this matter (SR.10/4, 5 and 6) and his proposal (SR.10/6, page 57) for the inclusion in the summary record of an understanding relating to the Working Party's report (L/408). At that time the United Kingdom delegate had not been in a position to accept the suggestion but had since advised that he was prepared to withdraw his reservation.

Mr. VARGAS GOMEZ (Cuba), without wishing to re-open the debate on the Working Party report, stated the position of his Government. Cuba accepted the procedure laid down in that report for the conduct of the 1956 tariff negotiations on the understanding that, despite the preparation of consolidated lists of offers at the beginning of the conference (Rule 6), the items finally included in the schedules would be bound only to the countries with which they had in fact been negotiated. Moreover, with regard to paragraphs 7(c) and (d) of the Rules and Procedures, his Government had favoured the maintenance of the old rules and observed with concern the increase in the scope of the powers of the Tariff Negotiations Committee. On those provisions he would reserve the position of his Government.

The CONTRACTING PARTIES adopted the Report by the Intersessional Working Party on Tariff Reduction and agreed that the Tariff Negotiations Committee, in giving consideration to the application of Rule 11(c) should pay due regard to the nature of the product. Thus a level of duty which might be considered to be low in respect of a manufactured article might well be judged to be high when applied to a primary product.

The meeting adjourned at 5.00 p.m.

