

RESTRICTED

SR.24/9

24 November 1967

Limited Distribution

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

CONTRACTING PARTIES
Twenty-Fourth Session

Page 96/97

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE NINTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 16 November 1967, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. K.B. LALL (India)

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Subjects discussed:</u>	
1. Programme for the Expansion of International Trade and	96/97
Trade of Less-Developed Countries	
(a) Report of the Committee on Trade and Development	
2. Balance-of-Payments Import Restrictions	103
3. Central American Common Market	104
4. Arab Common Market	104
5. Central African Economic and Customs Union	107
6. United Kingdom/Ireland Free Trade Area	107

1. Programme for the Expansion of International Trade and

Trade of Less-Developed Countries

(a) Report of the Committee on Trade and Development

Mr. TALVITIE (Finland) welcomed the proposals made by the Director-General to identify and examine those sectors of trade where the conditions of production were best suited for complete liberalization.

He said that Finland, with 70 per cent of her exports concentrated in forestry products, fully endorsed the Canadian suggestion that forestry products was one possible sector in which free trade could be pursued. The relatively low degree of processing of the products concerned justified a sectoral approach. The fact that demand for forestry products tended to grow faster than supply was an additional reason for encouraging further liberalization in this sector. Perhaps free trade might not be achieved in this sector within the foreseeable future.

But a sector approach did not necessarily have to aim at complete abolition of duties. A more limited goal could usefully serve as a starting point.

With regard to agriculture, his delegation supported the idea of revitalizing or even reconstituting Committee II. This Committee could play an important rôle as an instrument for consultations and discussions - not confrontations - over national agricultural problems.

The experience of the Kennedy Round showed that it was not possible to tackle the problem of trade liberalization in agriculture by the methods which had proved so successful in the area of industrial trade, because of the widely differing systems of protection. Furthermore, in the present circumstances it did not seem likely that agreement could be reached on a system to measure and compare the incidence of different protective elements.

Recalling the positive results of the Kennedy Round in the cereals sector, Mr. Talvitie suggested that other agricultural sectors be dealt with in an equally pragmatic way. It should be explored whether the policies applied in the cereals sector could be adopted to stabilize the trade in dairy products. More urgent action was needed in this specific area than in any other.

As had already been proposed by the delegate of New Zealand, one would envisage channelling at least part of the over-production of dairy products into another food-aid programme for the benefit of the developing world. If based on milk powder, such a programme would relieve pressure on the butter market, especially if it were to comprise both full cream and skimmed milk powder. A long-term consequence could be that new market opportunities be opened for vegetable oils and fats originating in the developing countries.

It would also be useful to set up, besides Committee II, a Dairy Council where expert studies on the feasibility of this project and on other problems particular to dairy products could be carried out.

Mr. THRANE (Denmark) said that his delegation shared the general feeling expressed by many previous speakers that it was not possible at the present time to embark on new general negotiations on industrial tariffs. The proposed studies aimed at taking new initiatives might not necessarily be limited to the suggestions made by the Director-General, including that on non-tariff barriers. Identification of low tariffs might not necessarily be the most suitable approach in the industrial sector. It had been generally recognized that the results of the Kennedy Round were far from satisfactory in the agricultural sector where most of the problems remained unsolved. While some of them could only be solved in the long term, others required immediate action. Unsatisfactory as the Kennedy Round was in the field of agriculture, it nevertheless gave rise to some new ideas such as the "montant de soutien" concept, the binding of support levels on which no progress could be made in the negotiations. He believed that the future of international trade in agricultural products was,

in the words of the Director-General, "henceforth bound up with the negotiated co-ordination of domestic agricultural policies in their essential aims and instruments". Recognizing that acute problems existed in marketing of meat and dairy products, he supported the proposal for setting up a working group to study the possibility of establishing fair trading conditions in the dairy sector and evolving a multilateral scheme for the disposal of surplus dairy products through a food-aid programme. Similarly the problems relating to meat and feedgrains might also be examined by other working groups. He also supported the proposal for setting up of a special Committee on Agriculture to carry on the work initiated by Committee II but with a wider mandate which would make it possible to include the search for and negotiation of solutions to the various problems involved.

Major-General WIJAYEKOON (Ceylon) said that in the industrial field much had been achieved as a result of the Kennedy Round negotiations but, unfortunately, similar success had not accompanied efforts in the field of primary products, including agriculture, and in the achievement of the objectives outlined by the CONTRACTING PARTIES for the expansion of trade of developing countries. Although there had been almost continuous discussions in GATT on the problems affecting trade of developing countries and some progress had been made over the years, a number of problems of developing countries remained unsolved. The standstill on tariff and non-tariff restrictions had not been fully implemented; no concessions had been granted on many products of interest to developing countries in the Kennedy Round; quantitative restrictions affecting exports of developing countries and other non-tariff barriers remained largely intact; no progress had been made in the reduction of internal fiscal charges on tropical products; the question of subsidies and that of the disposal of commodities had not been treated in depth as far as they hindered the flow of trade from developing countries; and the problem of tariffs and other restrictions that differentiate disproportionately between processed products and raw materials. He expressed the hope that Ministers would reiterate the objectives of 1961 and 1963, point out the areas which had not benefited sufficiently or not at all, reinforce them with new lines of action and give necessary directions for their early implementation. He commended the Charter of Algiers and its programme of action to the very early consideration by the CONTRACTING PARTIES. He also supported the proposal that the Special Group on Tropical Products be reactivated and that tea should be one of the subjects of study and consultations, taking into account the work already done in other international organizations on aspects of marketing of this product. Panels of experts should be set up to deal with import restrictions affecting products of interest to developing countries, covering also the question of uneconomic production by developed countries of commodities which compete with those originating from developing countries. The increasing competition that natural products of developing countries had to face from synthetics and substitutes, and their effects on the export earnings of those countries also deserved close attention. Studies should be undertaken with a view to evaluating the impact of such competition and to finding ways and means of reaching a via media for mutually advantageous co-existence between the two types of products.

With regard to consultations outlined in document L/2875 he expressed doubts concerning the need for consultations with individual countries combining the trade situation and development programmes. More fruitful studies could be conducted on a sectoral basis. Developing countries exporting the same type of products and confronted by common export and marketing problems of their products in developed countries could participate in joint discussions with those countries. The discussions could deal with production and marketing policies, barriers to trade including quantitative restrictions, restrictive practices operated by monopolies, cartels etc. and other intermediary problems of high freight, cost, insurance, lack of adequate financing facilities, these aspects would have to be covered if the expansion of exports from developing countries were to assume significant dimensions. These consultations should include participation of representatives of trade and industry both from the developing countries and from the industrialized countries; this would help promote a better understanding of the specific problems of developing countries in individual products or groups of products and also help to rectify some of the defects on the exporting side with the collaboration and expertise of the industrialized countries.

Dr. STEDTFELD (Federal Republic of Germany) speaking on behalf of those delegations of the European Economic Community which had participated in the work of the Committee on Trade and Development, supported the Committee's report. The report provided a valuable basis for an examination in depth of the various problems of the trade of developing countries. He expressed the hope that the Committee would continue to play an important rôle in the work of the CONTRACTING PARTIES. The question of advance implementation of concessions in favour of developing countries was under active consideration in the Community and the CONTRACTING PARTIES would be informed of any decision taken. He supported the proposal of establishing panels of experts to deal with the problem of quantitative restrictions on various products without prejudice to the possibility of undertaking bilateral consultations when they appeared appropriate. He also supported the suggestion that the Special Group on Tropical Products be reactivated to pursue work in the more general context of trade of developing countries.

Mr. ARYEE (Ghana) said that the report of the Committee had illustrated that in spite of the far-reaching tariff reductions achieved in the Kennedy Round negotiations, substantial tariff and non-tariff barriers still remained intact. The maintenance of those barriers tended to vitiate the tasks pursued by the CONTRACTING PARTIES. He supported the action suggested by the Director-General in documents L/2906 and L/2893 for the removal of residual tariff restrictions. He shared the feelings of the Director-General that "we should devise some means of moving away from the situation in which wealthy countries, which are not themselves producers of tropical products, continue to impose taxes on these goods, the main producers of which are developing countries". He did not consider that the political and economic considerations claimed to justify the special arrangements existing in this area, should be allowed to stall the endeavours of GATT in this direction, or let contracting parties escape their contractual obligations under Part IV of the General Agreement.

With regard to item 3(c) of the agenda, Mr. Aryee stated that it was clear that tariff reductions secured under the Kennedy Round had been far-reaching particularly for the developed countries, but they had been much less so for the developing countries. It was the realization of this fact that had led Ghana to reserve its position when it was first proposed that negotiations between developing countries be initiated to promote their mutual trade. Ghana felt at that time that, having lost all preferences on her major exports to traditional markets without compensatory access to others, and also being aware of the limited results which negotiations confined to developing countries could achieve, there was not much to be gained by pursuing such negotiations. Noting that it was a part of the action contemplated under the present programme to pursue further the objectives of duty-free entry for all tropical products exported to developed countries, he strongly felt that unless the programme of multilateral negotiations between developing countries was coupled with action to remove such tariff and non-tariff barriers, which were still inhibiting trade of the developing countries, contracting parties would be shying away from the real problem.

He underlined that the development of Ghana's economy, like that of other developing countries, depended almost entirely on her export earnings. His country's ability to export and the readiness with which it found export markets, measured the extent to which imports of plant and machinery, equipment, expertise could be carried and also the extent to which Ghana was able to repay the loans granted to it by certain developed countries. Circumstances were such that Ghana found itself in extreme balance-of-payments difficulties. To correct the imbalance, Ghana had to resort to various restrictive measures which were contrary to GATT. Those measures had adverse effects on the rate of economic growth and the standard of living. His delegation was happy to note that in the Director-General's statement in document L/2906 concern had been expressed over the state of affairs existing not only in Ghana but also in some of the developing countries. He supported the strengthening of Article XVIII:B dealing with consultations relating to trade and the action recommended by the Director-General in document L/2875.

In implementing the programme envisaged under item 3(c) of the agenda, serious attention should be given to the removal of tariff and non-tariff barriers on tropical products of export interest to developing countries. His delegation had noted with some concern that during the negotiations of the Kennedy Round, the inability of certain developed countries to make parallel or comparable reductions in tariffs had led to the withdrawal by others of offers made earlier. It was also a matter of concern that some of the offers made for the advanced implementation of concessions in favour of developing countries had reservations, making them contingent on comparable action being taken by other developed countries. The situation was fraught with considerable uncertainty and might lead to a substantial negation of the results already achieved. He drew attention to the portion of the Committee's report in which it was "... pointed out that the benefits for developing countries of the immediate implementation of concessions could be maximized if all developed countries took parallel or joint action" and appealed to the developed countries accordingly. As a result

of the offers already made by the Government of the United Kingdom, Ghana as a Commonwealth country stood to lose all the preferences she enjoyed in the United Kingdom market for the exports considered vital to her economy. In the advance implementation of concessions adequate safeguards should be made to ensure that developing countries which might lose as a result of such action, were compensated for the loss of preferences which were not adequately compensated for by access to other markets.

He fully supported any action by GATT designed to achieve duty-free entry for all tropical products. He also supported the efforts pursued in UNCTAD to assist developing countries in securing sheltered access to the markets of the industrialized countries through a general scheme of tariff preferences on a non-discriminatory and non-reciprocal basis. Any action contemplated by GATT in this field should be carried out jointly with UNCTAD on the same basis as the proposed joint Trade Centre. Similarly, the country-by-country studies being undertaken by these two institutions should also take the same form in order to avoid overlapping and waste of resources.

He said that any arrangements which would tie developing countries by discriminatory preferences, to the virtual exclusion of others, would merely serve to increase the export earnings of those developing countries who were partners to such an arrangement, but would certainly restrict trade resulting in a net loss of export earnings to developing countries as a whole.

Mr. PRESS (New Zealand) said that it had become abundantly clear from the interventions of the previous speakers that problems in the marketing of dairy products had assumed such proportions as to require immediate consideration, and that they could not wait to be dealt with in the context of the long-term operation which the CONTRACTING PARTIES were contemplating in the field of agriculture. The provisions of the General Agreement were quite capable of coping with such a situation and the CONTRACTING PARTIES would fail in the discharge of their minimal responsibilities if a working party, initially comprising interested countries, were not established to examine problems inherent in the marketing of dairy products.

Mr. WYNDHAM WHITE (Director-General) said that he had listened with particular care to the statement made on behalf of Dr. Prebisch and to the general statement by the representative of UNCTAD on the programme for expansion of international trade. The representative of UNCTAD in his intervention, had referred to the studies in depth which were being undertaken in UNCTAD on the whole range of trade problems of developing countries. He had also said that the proposal for modifying the procedures for consultations under Article XVIII might involve some risk of duplication of those studies. The Director-General clarified that the GATT proposal did not relate to studies but to the consultations which the contracting parties under the treaty provisions of Article XVIII and of Chapter IV were committed to carry out with a view to helping developing countries in facing up to the difficulties which they encountered in their foreign trade. This was a responsibility relating not only specifically to the developing

countries and their rights and obligations under the General Agreement, but it was also to the international trading community as a whole. It was quite clear that any restrictions on trade imposed by the developing countries for balance-of-payments difficulties, would adversely affect international trade as a whole. By helping developing countries avoid restrictions which would be the object of the consultations, the international trading community would also be served in conformity with the objectives of the General Agreement. Consultations under Article XVIII were different from studies. In carrying out consultations of that kind, GATT would draw upon the material available in the studies of all international organizations, particularly those which had special competence in the field of development. The material which would be available as a result of the studies by UNCTAD would be an essential tool of the CONTRACTING PARTIES in carrying out the treaty provisions of the General Agreement. The efficient carrying out of these responsibilities should be considered a major contribution towards attaining the objectives to which UNCTAD had repeatedly drawn attention. When the CONTRACTING PARTIES examine the proposal in greater detail, they should make sure that the GATT consultations be directed to matters where the GATT has a special competence or responsibility bearing in mind that there were numerous organizations dealing with various aspects of the problem. He had thought it was clear from the remarks he had made earlier concerning the necessity to avoid overburdening governments, particularly those of developing countries, with unnecessary duplication of activity. Whatever proposals he would make to the CONTRACTING PARTIES would certainly not be directed in any way at a duplication of work but towards a contribution by GATT to co-ordinated efforts in which all concerned would assist according to their field of competence.

2. Balance-of-payments import restrictions

The CHAIRMAN explained that of the twenty consultations carried out by the Committee on Balance-of-Payments Import Restrictions since the last session, ten had received a preliminary review by the Council which had recommended their adoption by the CONTRACTING PARTIES. The following reports were adopted:

Brazil	(L/2634/Corr.1)	Iceland	(BOP/R/3/Corr.1)
Ceylon	(BOP/R/2)	Israel	(BOP/R/8)
Finland	(BOP/R/4)	New Zealand	(BOP/R/1)
Ghana	(BOP/R/6)	South Africa	(BOP/R/7)
Greece	(BOP/R/5)	Spain	(L/2635)

Mr. O'CONNELL (United Kingdom) presented the reports on consultations completed more recently; these did not contain any points which called for special comments. The following reports were adopted:

Chile	(BOP/R/14)	Pakistan	(BOP/R/12)
Finland	(BOP/R/15)	South Africa	(BOP/R/18)
India	(BOP/R/13)	Spain	(BOP/R/9)
Indonesia	(BOP/R/16)	Tunisia	(BOP/R/17)
New Zealand	(BOP/R/10)	Turkey	(BOP/R/11)

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Committee and the International Monetary Fund for their valuable assistance.

3. Central American Common Market

The CHAIRMAN noted that the Government of Nicaragua, which was the only contracting party among the governments participating in the Central American Common Market, had not submitted a written statement on developments since the previous session of the CONTRACTING PARTIES, nor was a representative of Nicaragua attending the twenty-fourth session.

4. Arab Common Market (L/2887)

Mr. HARB (United Arab Republic) said that, in compliance with the commitments to furnish information on the evolution of the Arab Common Market, his delegation has communicated, in document L/2887, the relevant decisions taken by the Council of the Arab Economic Unity concerning economic, commercial, customs and monetary affairs. In presenting the report, he underlined the following facts: elimination of custom duties and suppression of import and export restrictions had been implemented in accordance with the time-table fixed; all exception lists had been withdrawn, apart from sixteen articles for which Jordan had required exception to safeguard its customs resources - a special committee had been entrusted to carry out studies with a view to reducing this number and, as soon as the committee's work would be completed, his delegation would submit the final list of exceptions to the CONTRACTING PARTIES.

It was difficult to measure to what extent the Arab Common Market had succeeded in increasing the volume of trade among member States, in view of the fact that it had entered into force on 1 January 1965. However, the preliminary statistics for the first half of 1967 showed an increase in intra-trade, as compared with the corresponding period of 1966. A comprehensive comparison with the previous year would be possible when the complete 1967 statistics were available. These would be communicated to the GATT secretariat. The decisions taken by the Council of the Arab Economic Unity had all been compatible with his delegation's commitments under the General Agreement. His delegation attached importance to the efforts made with respect to economic co-operation among Arab countries; these would lead to the expansion of their trade and would favour co-operation with other countries, especially the developing ones.

Mr. GAMAL ELDIN (Chairman of the Council of Arab Economic Unity), said that the creation of the Arab Common Market had emanated from the Arab Economic Unity Agreement, contracted between the Arab league member States, to achieve economic integration among its members. The Council of Arab Economic Unity was the organism in charge of implementing the provisions of this Agreement. The member States of the Arab Common Market were the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Syria and Jordan; the Yemen adhered on 16 May 1967 to the Arab Economic Unity Agreement and was taking the necessary measures to accede to the Common Market.

The Council had noted, with satisfaction, that the CONTRACTING PARTIES, at their twenty-third session, had recognized the Arab Common Market as a regional economic bloc among developing countries. The Food and Agriculture Organization, UNCTAD and UNIDO had also recognized the Arab Common Market as an economic bloc with specified limits and targets.

Referring to the progress achieved within the framework of the Arab Common Market, he said that tariff reductions on industrial products originating from member States ranged between 80 per cent on a limited number of items, 55 per cent on some others, and 30 per cent on the remainder. Reductions by another 10 per cent would be effected as of 1 January 1968. As regards agricultural and animal products, and natural resources, a few items were exempted from tariffs while the rest enjoyed a reduction of 60 per cent, to be increased to 80 per cent as of 1 January 1968. The Council had decided on 6 November 1966 to withdraw all exceptions lists previously submitted by member States, except for sixteen articles submitted by Jordan, to safeguard its customs revenue. So far, 30 per cent of the industrial products and 60 per cent of the agricultural and animal products, and natural resources, which were subject to import and export restrictions, had been liberalized. As of 1 January 1968, this percentage would be increased by 10 and 20 per cent respectively. As regards free movement of nationals between member States, it had been decided that the use of identity cards for this purpose should start not later than 1 January 1968. Facilities as to the right of work and residence in other member countries had been granted with a view to co-ordinating agricultural and industrial policies. A project for a unified customs systems and regulations had been fully reviewed. The unification of customs duties and other duties of the member States towards non-member States would be examined by experts who would, in turn, submit the results of their work to the Council. It was perhaps premature at this stage to assess precisely the effects of the Arab Common Market on trade among member States but it was beyond doubt that further dismantling of trade barriers would lead to a considerable increase in the volume of intra-trade as well as in their trade with third countries. The rising standard of living and income levels in member States would inevitably give rise to an increase in demand for raw materials imported from the developing countries and would have the effect of intensifying their purchases of industrial products from the developed countries for the implementation of their industrialization plans. In conclusion, he expressed gratitude to the GATT secretariat for the close co-operation which they had at all times given to their General Secretariat.

Mr. ASTRAWINATA (Indonesia) said his delegation was pleased to note that there had been further developments in the Arab Common Market since the CONTRACTING PARTIES had approved, at their twenty-third session, the report of the Working Party. Implementation of the Arab Economic Unity Agreement was too recent to justify a thorough examination at this stage. He expressed the hope that it would further develop into a strong and prosperous economic unity.

Mr. SWAMINATHAN (India) expressed the gratification of his delegation that progress, although somewhat slow - but this was in the nature of the situation - had been made. His delegation had always been in sympathy with movements of regional co-operation because this was one of the elements which would help the developing countries increase the size of their markets, give them scope for diversification of their economies and increase their potential for trade, in particular with other developing countries. It had been the experience of countries making these efforts, that the habit of sitting together and ironing out economic difficulties led to compromise and more understanding. He welcomed the initiative of the Arab Common Market and wished their efforts success. His delegation had always emphasized the concept that, in economic terms, developing countries as a whole constituted a region because their problems were similar. These limited experiments and other similar efforts aimed at enlarging the size of markets and removing restraints to trade, should be considered the first steps towards much greater and wider application. These remarks were relevant to other experiments in regional co-operation.

Mr. RYAN (Australia) said that his delegation had been pleased to note the progress achieved within the framework of the Arab Common Market and asked whether the Chairman of the Council of the Arab Economic Unity could give more details on the subject of common external tariffs and its timing which was at present under examination by experts, and on other matters of interest to the CONTRACTING PARTIES in relation to this particular point.

Mr. PAPIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation welcomed the initiative of Arab countries in establishing the Arab Common Market and the results so far achieved, modest as they were. The position of his Government had always been that economic co-operation among developing countries, on a regional basis, would improve their economic situation, contribute to the expansion of economic relations with other developing countries and, subsequently, increase world trade. His delegation was hopeful that the Arab Common Market would achieve its aims and objectives.

Mr. GAMAL ELDIN (Chairman of the Council of the Arab Economic Unity) in response to the question raised by the representative of Australia, said that the unification of customs tariffs towards non-member States would be implemented in five stages, starting in 1970. This question had been thoroughly examined by the Council and the competent committee which had been in charge of the relevant studies and which had submitted the results of its work to the Council. As this was a very complex question and as no concrete conclusions had yet been reached, the Council had decided to submit it to experts who would probably be entrusted with its analysis during the course of the next session of the Council in December 1967.

The CONTRACTING PARTIES took note of the report.

5. Central African Economic and Customs Union

Mr. AGANAYE (Chad) said that, in the absence of the President of the Union, he was making a statement without instructions and without having consulted with the other governments concerned. He pointed out that the Union had been established within the general framework of the co-operation inside the Organization of African and Malagasy States. He referred to the discussion that had taken place at the session regarding the advantages of regional and inter-regional co-operation. At the meeting of Heads of States of OAMS at Bangui in 1962 it had been agreed that the problems of economic co-operation in Africa should be approached in a pragmatic spirit. The regional integration programmes in Central and West Africa should be seen against this background. In Central Africa the Equatorial Customs Union had been successfully transformed into the Central African Economic and Customs Union. The achievements attained - inter alia the adoption of a common customs tariff - would be a good starting point for a still wider co-operation in a second stage, including the co-ordination and integration of the economic policies of the member governments. It was the aim of the countries concerned to promote the development of their integration without hurting the interests of countries outside the area.

Mr. BRODIE (United States) said that his delegation sympathized with the economic goals of the Central African Economic and Customs Union. It was only through regional integration that the smaller developing countries could create competitive industrial units. He regretted, however, that the Union granted preferential treatment to imports from the European Economic Community. The Yaoundé Convention did not - as had been made clear by spokesmen of the European Communities - oblige the African countries to discriminate in favour of the EEC countries. Such discrimination was likely to carry with it economic disadvantages; it did not serve any development purposes and it prevented import products from being bought from the cheapest sources of supply.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Chad for his explanations and said that it was to be hoped that at the next session a written report would be received from the Central African Economic and Customs Union.

The CONTRACTING PARTIES took note of the statement by the representative of Chad.

6. United Kingdom and Ireland Free Trade Area (L/2904)

Sir EUGENE MELVILLE (United Kingdom) recalled that, pursuant to paragraph 7 of Article XXIV, the CONTRACTING PARTIES had first considered and noted the Agreement at their twenty-third session. He believed that the tone of those discussions entailed an element of recognition of the merits of the Agreement in terms of Article XXIV. As regards its implementation the United Kingdom had removed all its protective duties for goods originating in Ireland as of 1 July 1966. On the same date, and on 1 July 1967, Ireland had reduced by

10 per cent the base rate of its protective duties on goods originating in the United Kingdom, other than those for which special treatment was specified. With a number of exceptions, quantitative restrictions had been abolished. In the first year of the Agreement's operation imports by the United Kingdom from Ireland rose by 17 per cent and exports to Ireland by 9 per cent as compared to the previous year. He further noted that Ireland had since the last session negotiated its accession to the GATT, and obtained the necessary two thirds majority. Only the signature by Ireland of the Protocol of Accession was lacking.

Mr. BRODIE (United States) thanked the representative of the United Kingdom for the information supplied. He expressed the hope that it would move towards relaxing quantitative restrictions applied contrary to the GATT.

Mr. KENNAN (Ireland) informed the CONTRACTING PARTIES that the necessary parliamentary formalities had been completed so that Ireland was prepared to sign its Protocol of Accession in the near future.

The CONTRACTING PARTIES took note of the information submitted.

The meeting closed at 12.45 p.m.