

RESTRICTED

SR.27/5

26 November 1971

Limited Distribution

# GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

CONTRACTING PARTIES  
Twenty-Seventh Session

Page 67

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Friday, 19 November 1971, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Carlos BESA (Chile)

Subject discussed: Report of the Council

### Report of the Council (L/3624)

Mr. THRANE (Denmark), Chairman of the Council, recalled that the present Council report was the second report since the CONTRACTING PARTIES, at their twenty-fifth session, had agreed that the Council should undertake a wider range of work in order to relieve the sessions of the burden of a long agenda and thus to enable the CONTRACTING PARTIES to concentrate on trade matters of major importance.

An evaluation of the report, which contained no less than sixty items, gave the Council reason to be fairly satisfied, not so much with regard to the actual results achieved in the period under review, but rather in respect of the working spirit demonstrated by the members of the Council. Besides carrying out all its household chores, the Council had become a forum for discussion of urgent trade questions of major relevance to all. In some of the more important discussions, such as on the various import surcharges, the Generalized System of Preferences and the different agreements and arrangements concluded by the European Communities, representatives of more than thirty countries had participated. The consensus reached at the end of some of these debates had been the lowest common denominator and on several occasions this common denominator had been rather low. Nevertheless, the job done by the Council had not been a bad one, a result which was to a large extent due to the discipline shown by delegations in the debates. He concluded by stating that, for reasons outside the context of GATT, this had not been the most glorious period in GATT's history but, given the circumstances, the results had been, in his view, not so bad at all.

The following comments were made in connexion with the items dealt with in the Report of the Council.

Item 7 - Anti-Dumping Practices

Mr. BURESCH (Austria) informed the CONTRACTING PARTIES that the Austrian Parliament had recently approved a new anti-dumping law which was in conformity with Article VI of the General Agreement and with the Anti-Dumping Code and which would enter into force on 1 January 1972. His Government intended therefore to ratify the Anti-Dumping Code with effect from the same date.

Mr. ROTHENBÜHLER (Switzerland) said that his delegation had read the third report of the Committee on Anti-Dumping Practices with interest.

He suggested, however, that, in future, the reports should bring out more clearly the main points that had arisen in the Committee's discussions on the policies and practices of its members, and that the reports should draw more attention to the points which had given rise to difficulty. Instead of consisting merely of statistical summaries of cases of anti-dumping proceedings coming under the Code, the reports should draw attention to the problems of substance encountered in applying the Code and to the resulting protectionist dangers.

Mr. IUYTEN (European Communities) said that the way in which the Anti-Dumping Code was applied by the United States, despite the fact that it had signed the Code without reservation, was causing considerable concern. Although the Code stipulated that signatories must adapt their domestic legislation to the provisions of the Code, the Community felt bound to point out that the United States Tariff Commission was still applying the anti-dumping Act of 1921. The EEC took the view that, by applying that law, which simply required that the dumping should cause injury to United States industry, the United States Tariff Commission did not take into account either the extent of the injury done or the very precise definitions in the Anti-Dumping Code. It was invariably held by that Commission that any dumping, however small its contribution to the injury done, justified the application of defensive measures. That practice had resulted in a whole series of anti-dumping proceedings; between 1 July 1970 and 30 June 1971, for instance, anti-dumping proceedings had been started in twenty-two cases, provisional measures had been taken in fourteen cases, and definitive anti-dumping duties had been applied in ten cases. That was a regrettable state of affairs and he would ask that United States legislation be made consistent with the provisions of the Anti-Dumping Code.

Item 14 - United States - Temporary import surcharge

Mr. ROTHENBÜHLER (Switzerland), after observing that his delegation had already made known its attitude to the United States surcharge on several occasions, said he was rather disappointed at the recent decision of the United States Senate to grant the President discretionary powers to raise the surtax from 10 per cent to 15 per cent. Uncertainty prevailed about the future of the import surcharge, about the date of its removal and about the terms and conditions on which it would be removed, and he regretted the depressing and disruptive effect which that produced.

Switzerland was aware of the difficulties created for the United States by its balance-of-payments situation, and also realized that the United States had legitimate interests which it was bound to protect. Nevertheless, Switzerland considered that the import surcharge was not negotiable in commercial terms and that its removal should not be made conditional upon trade counterpart measures.

In his view, the measure was not consistent with the General Agreement and would be even less so if it was applied in a discriminatory manner. He hoped that the United States would, in accordance with the opinion expressed by the International Monetary Fund, eliminate the surcharge after the monetary conversations to be held next month.

Mr. PROPPS (United States) in reply to the delegate of Switzerland pointed out that the general position of his country was recorded in the report of the Working Party which examined the United States surcharge and in the minutes of the Council. His delegation did not share the Swiss interpretation of the findings of the International Monetary Fund.

Sir Frederick MASON (United Kingdom) fully supported the statement made by the Swiss representative and shared his anxiety, but like Switzerland saw no point in repeating what had already been said about the United States measures. He fully recognized the United States decisive rôle since the war in promoting world trade and was confident that the United States did not intend to abandon that rôle and that the measures of 15 August were of a short-term nature and would be removed as soon as circumstances permitted.

Mr. SCHWARZMANN (Canada) recalled that he had explained on previous occasions the nature of his concern over the measures taken by the United States because of their serious adverse effect on his country's trade and industry and their wide-ranging implications and adverse consequences for world trade. He noted the view expressed by the Working Party on the United States surcharge, with the exception of the United States delegation, that the surcharge was inappropriate and incompatible with the General Agreement. He thought it worth noting again the assurance given on 15 August 1971 by President Nixon that the surcharge would be removed as exchange rates were realigned and he pointed out that some changes had already taken place. He stressed the importance of keeping this matter under close and continuing review.

Mr. LUYTEN (European Economic Community), Mr. LINDBERG SETTE (Brazil), Mr. KITAHARA (Japan) and Mr. ARCHIBALD (Trinidad and Tobago) recalled that their delegations had expressed their concern about the United States measures on earlier occasions and would revert to the matter later in the session.

Item 19 - EEC emergency action on table apples

Mr. LUYTEN (European Communities) said he wished to provide some information about the EEC's application of the safeguard clause to apples between 1 April 1970 and 30 June 1970. During those three months, 93,000 tons of apples had been imported by the EEC, a figure only 4.7 per cent lower than that for the same period of the previous year. Meanwhile, 110,000 tons of apples produced within the Community had been destroyed. Imports of apples for the whole of the year 1970 had been only 4 per cent lower than in 1969, whereas the Community had destroyed nearly 200,000 tons of apples during the same period. The Community considered that those figures were evidence that the measures it had taken were reasonable, and it hoped that its partners would show equal restraint when they too were forced to resort to safeguard measures.

Items 20-36 - Customs Unions and Free-Trade Areas

Mr. PROPPS (United States) wished to foreshadow a matter for consideration next week. He noted that some contracting parties were negotiating for the enlargement of one of the customs unions, to be notified under Article XXIV, and he believed that the CONTRACTING PARTIES should at this session make an appropriate decision of a procedural nature evidencing their intent to proceed as properly and effectively as possible in the consideration of how to approach the necessary negotiations under Article XXIV:6. Such negotiations were a matter of course when an existing schedule of concessions was given up to adopt the schedule of a customs union. He thought it desirable to make an appropriate disposition on this matter next week when looking at the activities for the coming year.

Secondly, he noted the many times the Council had considered the progress made by countries under arrangements notified under Article XXIV. He expressed the concern of his authorities that these matters, relating to customs unions, free-trade agreements and interim agreements intended to lead to them, were not examined sufficiently methodically. Because of the difficulty in obtaining the necessary information, there was often not adequate opportunity to examine developments. He therefore thought it desirable to establish for the coming year a schedule for the Council to examine reports of countries participating in such arrangements, on progress made. The secretariat should then be asked to contact the organizations and contracting parties involved, so as to obtain written reports to be circulated at least three weeks in advance. If this were done a regularized approach and examination would be possible.

His third point concerned the general question of preferential and special trading arrangements and their significance to the GATT.

He recalled that at the meeting of the Council on 6 October 1971, his delegation had informed contracting parties that his authorities intended to propose at the present session that the CONTRACTING PARTIES initiate a major examination of the extent to which preferential and special trading arrangements, either concluded or under consideration, had eroded or would erode the most-favoured-nation rule of Article I of the General Agreement. His Government was now prepared to advance its proposal.

It was motivated by several considerations.

First his authorities had a sincere and deep belief that strong adherence to the rules of GATT was indispensable to the continuation of progress toward a successful multilateral trading system. If the GATT were to end today, there was little doubt that chaos would rule international trade in a short time.

Moreover, his Government was seriously concerned over a number of developments which indicated that the GATT was being undermined by the adoption of seemingly pragmatic solutions to problems which violated some of its basic provisions.

On too many occasions the attitude seemed to be that a particular proposal should not be opposed or a violation of GATT should be overlooked since only minor trade effects were involved or since the issue was basically a political problem and the GATT should not stand in the way. Individual contracting parties appeared reluctant to press or support charges against their friends, a very understandable characteristic.

As a result, there was growing sentiment in his country that it might no longer be in the national interest of the United States to comply with obligations which were acceptable in the aftermath of World War II but which many now regarded as completely unrealistic in today's trading world.

There were many trading problems and irritants which caused concern in the United States and he was sure the same situation existed in all Member countries. There was however, one problem which in the view of his authorities threatened the entire structure of the GATT and one which they believed had to be given prompt attention if the rules of this organization were to have any meaning. That problem was the proliferation of special and preferential trading arrangements over the last decade and the outlook that such arrangements would continue to grow and alter trading patterns.

When the GATT had been drafted in 1947 great efforts had been made to assure that there would be no expansion of preferential tariffs. Preferential margins could be reduced or at the most remain only where they were. All of this was embodied in Article I. At the same time, the drafters in their wisdom had foreseen the need for an exception to Article I which would enable countries to pursue economic integration. This exception was necessary and desirable and was still so. In developing the principles of Article XXIV however, it now seemed quite unlikely that the drafters could have foreseen the events which had transpired. With the many preferential and special trading arrangements which were now in effect or were on the horizon, his Government considered that the GATT was nearing the point where Article I would be the exception to Article XXIV rather than the reverse. Thus, the basic underpinning of the GATT was being eroded to the point that the entire structure was in grave danger. After all, once the most favoured nation rule was gone, all that was left was a system of bilateral and multi-lateral arrangements that operated against each other. If this was to be the direction, then trade policy and practice was in fact falling back two generations.

His authorities found it difficult to even count the number of preferential and special trading arrangements that existed and were operating. The European Community which itself was based on a system of tariff preferences appeared to have such arrangements with approximately twenty-eight countries in addition to its ties with dependent countries and territories. Special trading arrangements still operated under the Commonwealth preferences system and though those might be changed, his delegation did not know how. There were a number of special trading arrangements in Africa affecting at last count some twenty African countries.

Then there was the EFTA, the CACM, the LIFTA, the CARIFTA, the Australian-New Zealand Arrangement, the Yugoslavia-United Arab Republic-India Arrangement and others. A system of Generalized System of Preferences for developing countries was being established. Most recently, there had been a proposal for a network of preferential trading arrangements among a large number of developing countries.

His country on its part had a system of declining special preferences to the Republic of the Philippines under an agreement which was to expire in 1974. It also had a special arrangement on automobiles with Canada under a waiver.

He did not know what was and what would be the effect of all of these arrangements on his country's foreign trade and he doubted that others had made any penetrating analysis on this subject. His country's share of world markets had continued to decrease but one could not blame this entirely on preferential trading arrangements. What was evident, however, was that the eleven industrial countries covered by the GATT Tariff Study imported \$112 billion of industrial products in 1967 and that 30.4 per cent entered under preferential rates of duty.

That in itself should be grounds for questioning whether Article I was any longer the cornerstone of the General Agreement. But what was more awesome was the prospect that after the United Kingdom became a member of the Community, the remaining countries of the EFTA apparently would consider that they had to conclude preferential arrangements with the Community, thus creating in 1975 or thereafter a vast web covering the bulk of Western Europe, the Near East and Africa. Practically all countries in the Western Hemisphere south and east of the United States were already parties to preferential trading arrangements as were a number of Asian countries. There soon would be very few countries which would not be parties to special trading arrangements.

The problems relating to preferential and special trading arrangements heretofore had been handled as individual issues by working parties. The CONTRACTING PARTIES had never looked at the big picture - where the GATT was and where it was going.

His authorities thought it was well past the time for the CONTRACTING PARTIES to assess these developments. They were therefore, asking the CONTRACTING PARTIES to stop and ask themselves what the consequences of all these developments were likely to be.

His Government thus urged that the CONTRACTING PARTIES at the present session establish a Working Party to examine existing and prospective preferential and special trading arrangements with the following terms of reference:

- "1. To determine for each contracting party that is a member of the GATT as of the twenty-seventh session and for the contracting parties as a whole, the total imports at most-favoured-nation rates and total imports at

preferential rates from all sources by country, including imports from other parties to customs unions, free-trade areas, and special trading arrangements. Calculations should be made for each year in the period 1955-1970 inclusive.

"2. To analyze and evaluate the trends and the implications of the trade flows at most-favoured-nation and preferential rates based on these data.

"3. To report its findings to the CONTRACTING PARTIES within six months."

Some of the facts which were underlying his Government's thinking were the following:

First, the GATT had drifted into two groups of countries, those belonging to preferential agreements and those who did not, or did so on a minor scale. There was thus, in effect, a conditional most-favoured-nation system within the overall GATT most-favoured-nation rule.

Furthermore, if there were to be meaningful negotiations toward further trade liberalization, those operating within the overall GATT rule had to know what the effects on their trade were likely to be. In other words his authorities would want to make a judgment as to whether a concession granted by members of preferential arrangements would have any meaningful trade effects.

In addition, to make such a judgment one had to know the extent of such arrangements in trade terms and what the membership of such arrangements was likely to be once negotiations have been concluded. Only then could one decide what kind of negotiating technique to adopt or whether to negotiate at all.

Finally, all of the considerations evolving from the proliferation of preferential and special trading arrangements posed some hard decisions for policymakers in his country, and probably in other countries as well:

For example, if the examination proposed showed a definite movement toward preferential trading and away from the principles of Article I, should the CONTRACTING PARTIES consider the elimination of all tariffs, and if so, under what kind of an arrangement?

Or if some general solution could not be found, how did one approach the future? To protect their trading position, for example, many contracting parties might have to decide whether they wanted to create or to join preferential arrangements. Or there might have to be some other adjustments to assure that the balance of advantages resulting from the many tariff negotiations was not altered to the disadvantage of many participants in the GATT system.

In conclusion, he emphasized that his Government did not wish the examination to become an investigation of the consistency of each preferential arrangement with GATT provisions. His statement was not directed toward any specific arrangement. His authorities wished this examination to be as broad as possible and was willing to participate fully in a thorough and objective examination and investigation of this subject.

Mr. Fumihiro SUZUKI (Japan) expressed concern of his Government at the proliferation of preferential arrangements, some of which he considered were not in consonance with Article XXIV of the General Agreement. It was a matter of vital concern to all that such arrangements should satisfy the necessary requirements of leading to an expansion of world trade. He expressed the hope that in discussing the issue, reason would prevail over sterile confrontation.

Mr. FOGARTY (Australia) stressed the importance of considering the question of the consequences of the enlargement of the European Communities at an early date. He pointed out that previous discussions of such issues in the Council had produced sharp differences of opinion with some members challenging the compatibility of some of the preferential arrangements with the General Agreement. He pointed out that the friction posed a threat to international trade and was one of the major issues at present facing international trade. He considered the statement of the delegation of the United States merited serious consideration and stated that the preliminary attitude of his delegation to it was a favourable one.

Items 20-28 - Association Agreements of the EEC

Mr. THIEMELE (Ivory Coast), speaking as the representative of a country associated with the European Economic Community, said that his delegation was concerned at the attitude of certain countries towards association agreements such as the Yaoundé Convention. Those agreements, which had been concluded with a view to maintaining traditional relationships and to increasing trade between the parties concerned, should provide developing countries with valuable help in trade and financial matters and furnish them with the technical assistance they still needed.

His country welcomed the assistance agreements concluded between the EEC and other developing countries.

He hoped that the developed countries would in future adopt a more positive attitude towards those preferential agreements, which were in no way intended to restrict trade with third countries.

Mr. LINDBERG SETTE (Brazil) considered the association agreements of the EEC as discriminatory and trade restrictive and while considering the many agreements with developing countries with understanding, he could not help regarding them as contrary to the spirit of the GATT.

Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) declared that he supported the statement made by the representative of the Ivory Coast concerning the Agreement of Association between the European Economic Community and the African and Malagasy States.

Item 22 -- Association between the European Economic Community and Malta

Miss CILIA (Malta) informed the CONTRACTING PARTIES that her Government was now in a position to supply the information required by the Working Party, which would be submitted shortly.

Item 31 -- Caribbean Free Trade Association

Mr. DYETT (Guyana) speaking on behalf of the member States of CARIFTA pointed at the rôle being played by CARIFTA in promoting trade amongst the Caribbean countries.

Item 34 -- Latin-American Free Trade Association

Mr. OLMEDO VIRREIRÁ (Observer for Bolivia) asked why the Cartagena Agreement had not been mentioned in the report.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the Cartagena Agreement was an integral part of the Latin-American Free Trade Association, which was dealt with in item 34 of the report.

Item 38 - Generalized System of Preferences

Mr. REED (Norway) speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries referred to the decision taken by the GATT in June granting a waiver for the implementation of the Generalized System of Preferences. He pointed out that his Government had put its scheme into operation on 1 October 1971 and that the other Nordic countries would implement their schemes shortly. He underscored the importance of the Generalized System of Preferences in promoting the trade and industrialization of developing countries and urged all other industrialized countries who had not yet done so to implement their schemes. He emphasized the need for more trade-promotion assistance for developing countries and the rôle which the International Trade Centre could play in this respect.

Item 39 - Brazil - Renegotiation of Schedule

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Council's recommendation that the CONTRACTING PARTIES adopt the draft decision, contained in Annex I of the report providing for an extension of the time-limit of the waiver accorded to Brazil. The Decision was adopted by 47 votes in favour and none against.

Item 46 - Uruguay - Import Surcharge

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Council's recommendation that the CONTRACTING PARTIES adopt the draft decision contained in Annex II to the Report, providing for an extension for a limited period of time of the waiver accorded to Uruguay.

Mr. REED (Norway) speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries drew attention to the discriminatory element in the Uruguayan surcharge system which he considered as diverting imports away from the cheapest sources of supply and the cheapest means of transport. He expressed the hope that this discrimination would have been eliminated at the time of the next examination of the waiver. Meanwhile, the Nordic delegations were not in a position to vote in favour of the draft Decision.

The Decision was adopted by 41 votes in favour and 3 against.

Item 50 - Accession, Zaire and Romania

Mr. Tong Jin PARK (Korea) extended the warm welcome of his delegation to the Republic of Zaire on its accession to full membership in the GATT. He also referred to the fact that Romania in connexion with its accession had invoked Article XXXV against his country. He pointed out that his Government had fully supported the accession of Romania to the GATT which, he stressed, had been motivated by the desire to observe as fully as possible the principles and objectives of the General Agreement. He expressed the hope that the Government of Romania would soon withdraw its invocation of Article XXXV, and recalled that his Government had recently withdrawn its invocation vis-à-vis the four contracting parties in respect of which it originally had invoked the Article.

Mr. ARCHIBALD (Trinidad and Tobago) extended the welcome of his delegation to Romania and Zaire on their accession to the GATT.

Mr. KANINDA (Zaire) thanked all the contracting parties for the welcome they had given him. His country had trade links with every country in the world and it was determined to continue an open-door policy. He also wished to confirm his Government's intention to participate in efforts to improve world trade.

Mr. PETRESCOU (Romania) said he wished once again to thank all the countries which had welcomed him to GATT. It was his Government's intention to co-operate with the CONTRACTING PARTIES with a view to achieving the objectives of the General Agreement.

Item 51 - Tunisia - Provisional Accession

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft decision contained in Annex III to the Report providing for an extension by two years of the arrangements for the Provisional Accession of Tunisia. Item 51 of the Report, including the recommended Decision on the Participation of Tunisia in the work of the CONTRACTING PARTIES, was adopted.

Item 53 - Poland - Protocol of Accession

Mr. STRUS (Poland), with reference to the question of terminating the transitional period provided for in the Protocol of Accession of Poland, drew the attention of the CONTRACTING PARTIES to the conclusion arrived at by the Council (C/M/74) while adopting the report of the Working Party on the occasion of its fourth annual review. The Council had recognized the importance of the question of terminating the transitional period at an early date and recognized that contracting parties should intensify their efforts to arrive at that end.

This position of the Council gave his delegation reason to believe that the problem would be finally settled during the next annual review.

Item 54 - Application of Article XXXV to Japan

Mr. Fumihiro SUZUKI (Japan) expressed his Government's appreciation for the fact that since the twenty-sixth session the Governments of Chad, Ivory Coast, Kuwait, Niger, Rwanda, Uganda and Upper Volta had withdrawn their invocation of Article XXXV against his country. Furthermore, the Government of Spain had indicated that it would withdraw the invocation, at a date to be confirmed, before the end of 1971. He noted with regret, however, that there were still twenty-two contracting parties who had not yet disinvoked Article XXXV. He expressed the hope that this practice, which created anomalous trading relations among some contracting parties and which weakened the effectiveness of the General Agreement, would be stopped. He stated further that the extension of his Government's Generalized System of Preferences to such countries would be suspended if the article was not disinvoked within three years of the coming into force of his country's System on 1 August 1971.

Mr. PROPPS (United States) supported the Japanese statement and appealed to countries which continued to invoke Article XXXV against Japan to reconsider their attitude.

Item 55 - Environment Measures and International Trade

Mr. SAHLGREN (Finland) speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, expressed their appreciation for the fact that the question of pollution control measures and their likely effects on international trade had been brought to the early attention of contracting parties. He recalled the support given by the Nordic countries to the proposal made earlier in the Council to establish a Special Group and pledged their contribution to its work. He accepted the assurances given that action by the GATT would not duplicate similar activities in other bodies. He pointed out that actions to control pollution and protect human environment might give rise to new trade barriers and the work of the GATT should be directed towards avoiding such barriers.

Item 56 - International Trade Centre - Joint Advisory Group

Mr. THRANE (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, stressed the importance of the rôle of the International Trade Centre in promoting the trade of developing countries. He stated that in view of the modest resources at the disposal of the Centre it was essential that its activities should have the maximum effect. He agreed with the decision to set up a Technical Committee with a membership limited to eighteen, to assist the Joint Advisory Group in its work. He expressed the hope that governments would ensure the Committee the high standard of expertise which it would need for its work.

Item 57 - Training activities

Mr. RATANSEY (Tanzania) expressed the appreciation of his Government to the International Trade Centre and to the GATT for their assistance in training trade officers from Tanzania and other African countries.

Item 59 - Status of Protocols

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the text of a draft decision extending the closing date for acceptance of the Protocol Introducing Part IV until the end of the twenty-eighth session. He pointed out that following the acceptance of Part IV by South Africa the extension of the closing date was necessary for three contracting parties only. Item 59 of the Report, including the recommended Decision, was adopted.

Item 60 - Administrative and financial questions

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to sub-item (i) dealing with the reports of the Committee on Budget, Finance and Administration (L/3527, L/3608, L/3608/Add.1 and L/3608/Add.1/Corr.1). The Council had recommended the adoption of these reports, including the recommendations contained therein and the Resolution on the Expenditure of the CONTRACTING PARTIES in 1972 and the Ways and Means to Meet such Expenditure.

Mr. OHNO (Japan) felt that all contracting parties would share his view that any impairment of the activities of the GATT for financial reasons would have to be deplored. The budget estimates for 1972 were clearly modest and in the view of his authorities the proposed budget was a minimum budget. One had to rely on the wisdom and economy of the secretariat that it would still manage to accomplish as much as possible. He was confident that the very substance of GATT's work would not be impaired. At the same time he was convinced that, through the economy of the secretariat, no additional contributions would be called for. His delegation supported the adoption of the budget as a whole.

He pointed out that there was an urgent need for the rehousing of the secretariat, so that all of GATT's activities were concentrated under one roof. For this reason his delegation supported the recommendation contained in document L/3608/Add.1.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that delegations could assist the secretariat in making savings by considering the economic implications of any task given to the secretariat.

The CONTRACTING PARTIES adopted the report of the Committee on Budget, Finance and Administration (L/3527, L/3608, L/3608/Add.1 and L/3608/Add.1/Corr.1), including the recommendations contained therein and the Resolution on the Expenditure of the CONTRACTING PARTIES in 1972 and the Ways and Means to meet such expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Report of the Council, as a whole, could be adopted.

Mr. PROPPS (United States) said that his delegation had taken note of the statement made by other delegations under items 7 and 14 and that it considered that in so far as these statements related to policies and practices of his country, the essentials of his Government's position were correctly stated in the report of the Anti-Dumping Committee and of the Working Group on the United States Temporary Import Surcharge and in the Minutes of the Council. His delegation therefore supported the adoption of the report.

Mr. FOGARTY (Australia) raised a problem concerning the timely distribution of documents. He pointed out that it was important that even far-away countries such as his received documents which related to meetings well in time so as to enable it to participate in a meaningful way.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL assured contracting parties that the secretariat was well aware of the problem and would do its best to arrange early distribution of documents. It was nevertheless, not to be over-looked that often the circulation of a document in turn depended on the receipt of documentation from delegations. He appealed therefore to delegations to submit such documentation to the secretariat with as little delay as possible.

The Report of the Council was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN expressed on behalf of all delegations his appreciation to Mr. THRANE for his work as Chairman of the Council, noting the importance and the difficulties of the task. He also expressed his thanks to the members of the Council for their active participation in the Council's work.

The meeting adjourned at 12.15h.