

UNITED NATIONS

NATIONS UNIES

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

RESTRICTED
E/PC/T/EC/PV2/3
8 May 1947

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

Third Meeting of the Executive Committee held on
Thursday, 8 May 1947 at 10.30 a.m.
in the Palais des Nations, Geneva

M. ERIK COLBAN (CHAIRMAN) (NORWAY)

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

CHAIRMAN: I will ask the delegates to verify in their files whether they have Document 45, Revision 1, concerning consultation with non-governmental organisations in Category A, and also Document T.60, Report upon Credentials, because at our next full meeting I intend to ask you to pass a decision on these two points.

Furthermore, likewise at our next meeting we shall have a paper, T.59, on base rates, on which you will also be invited to express your views; and there will finally be a paper on a slight amendment to the Rules of Procedure. I mention this only that you may be prepared and not be taken unawares when we meet again.

You know that the meeting has been called in order to discuss Articles 15 to 23 and Article 37 of the Draft Charter. This morning I received - and I take it that none of you have received it earlier - a great number of amendments to those Articles. Previously we received a paper from the United States Delegation, also containing amendments to those Articles.

You have also received this morning Document W.28; that is a paper made up by the Secretariat and intended to be - as I am sure it will be - very helpful, as it will clarify the situation up to date.

Amongst the amendments there is one of a particular character which I want to mention; it is Document W.29. It is submitted by the Cuban Delegation. It contains amendments to Article 15 and the following Articles, but in addition to that it raises two rather important questions: one is, whether it would not be desirable to have a kind of general discussion on the purposes of the Charter; and the second raises the question of the mutual relations between the intended multilateral trade agreement and tariff agreement and the existing bilateral trade agreements.

That is the documentation before you.

I do not know whether delegates find that they have had time enough to go sufficiently into the substance of all these documents to be able to start a formal discussion this morning. I myself would like to reserve the Cuban paper, with the exception of the express proposed amendments, for further consideration, and even so, to start a discussion on Article 15 and the following Articles, with all these amendments in our hands but perhaps not even read, would seem to me to be rather difficult and I would like to have the opinion of some of my colleagues on that point.

MR. OSCAR RYDER (United States): I am entirely in agreement with you, Mr. Chairman, that we should not seriously continue this discussion until there has been time to study these documents and these various amendments.

G.

- 4 -

(Mr. FAIVOVICH):

THE DELEGATE OF CHILE/ (Interpretation): The Chilean Delegation thinks that the logical order which we should follow in examining the various articles of the Charter should be the one in which the various Charters and Articles are given, and we believe that we should really follow this logical way, and we are going to give here the reasons why we believe that this should be done in this way and not in the order which is now being suggested to the Commission. .

Nobody can deny that many of the dispositions and suggestions in the first four chapters of the Draft of the Charter are in direct connection with Chapter 5, which is as we know about commercial policy. We understand that this Conference should examine the various questions that are in connection with the bilateral agreements now being under discussion, but we believe also there is a direct connection between the first part of the Charter and the following chapters.

If we do not examine the first four chapters of the Charter just now I do not believe that we can get to a good result as far as Chapter 5 is concerned. For Chili and also for other countries it is of great importance that this Conference should examine with all the time at its disposal and in a logical way all the disposition of this Charter, starting with the first chapter of the Charter, and I wonder why we should now start with Chapter 5; and if we start on Chapter 5, why should we not see Article 14 of this Chapter before the following Articles, i.e. 15 - 23 and Article 37, as has just been suggested. We believe that Article 14 might be in harmony with the others, and this Article is especially important for countries with modest economy such as ours, and for this reason I am informing you right now that we, the Chilean Delegation and the Syrian and

Lebanese delegations have presented an amendment to this Article No. 14. This amendment will permit to countries of modest economy the right to be taken rather better into consideration in the Charter than is the case with the present Draft.

Our desire, therefore, to summarise what I have just said, is first of all to clear the point that Chili would prefer to examine the Draft Charter chapter by chapter, that is starting by Chapter 1 and the following before starting Chapter 5, and, if this should not be possible for the meeting - if it should be against this procedure - we would at least ask that Article 14 of Chapter 5 be examined before Articles 15, 16 and so forth, because as I said, in this Article we find elements which are of great importance for countries of modest economy.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder whether there is not a slight misunderstanding. We started a fortnight ago to start the revision of Articles 14 - 15 and 27, in order to bring them on a level with the rest of the Draft Charter, and that is what we are called together to do to-day. It is not here a question of establishing the absolute final text - to say our final and decisive word - it is in order to go through the work of the Drafting Committee in New York here in Geneva, so as to have a complete Charter text of the same value, and then we are going to take the whole Charter in such order as the Committee may then decide, including the second reading also of Articles 15 - 23 and Article 37. I think that should be satisfactory.

(Mr. GUTIERREZ):

THE DELEGATE OF CUBA: / Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, the Cuban Delegation is in accord with the suggestion made by the Delegation of the U.S. to postpone the discussion of Articles 15 - 23 inclusive, and Article 37 of the Draft Charter for an opportunity when all the members have had the time to study the different amendments; but there are two subjects that have been brought to the consideration of the committee by the Cuban Delegation. I am going to explain them very shortly, because we consider that they are of a nature to be solved previously. The first one has been almost clarified by the explanation of the Chairman, but the second one, in our opinion, is of the utmost importance in conducting the negotiations on tariff schedules that we are now working on. The matters for discussion, the Cuban Delegation considers that it is indispensable to determine as soon as possible the principles which should govern international trade and tariff negotiations. It does not see how, before clearly orienting the position of the economy of each country, it is possible in principle to limit the discussions to only a few articles of the Charter, leaving out of the discussion other articles just as important or essential as those selected. Neither does the Cuban Delegation understand why only the articles of the Charter are to be examined, without examining at the same time those which are concordant with them in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which it is desired to sign at this session, if, as is to be expected, the efforts are successful.

In consequence, the Cuban Delegation has the honour to submit to the consideration of the Executive Committee the following alteration in the order of work:

First, to extend to the entire text of Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the draft Charter the discussion contemplated of the aforementioned articles, without prejudice to beginning the discussion with those articles already mentioned; that is why our interpretation goes together with the interpretation of the Chairman.

But now, coming to what we consider is very important, not only for the Cuban Delegation but for all the Delegations here represented - the effects of the multilateral treaty on pre-existing bilateral treaties. The general agreement on Tariff and Trade is a Treaty which includes not only the tariff ^{status} of the signatory nations but also certain aspects of their foreign commerce. Nevertheless it does not contain a single precept or provision with respect to this action on the bilateral commercial agreements previously signed and in force on the date of the entry into force of the new multilateral agreement. This gives rise, in the opinion of the Cuban Delegation, to the following questions:

1. Does the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade replace completely the previous bilateral commercial agreements or not, leaving such bilateral agreements without force between the Nations signatories of the multilateral Treaty?

2. In case of inconsistencies between a Tariff situation or schedule of products or duties contemplated in the multilateral Treaty and that which exists in the bilateral agreements, does the text of the multilateral Treaty prevail over the text of the previous bilateral agreements or not?

3, If a product is not included in the schedule annexed to the multilateral Treaty, but that product is subject to a special system of preferences or tariff advantages governed by previous bilateral agreements - is it to be considered that the previous situation continues in force or not?

4. In case the previous preferential rates or tariff advantages continue in force, can a Member country claim for its products the same favourable treatment, although the product in question has been excluded from the present negotiations or is not included in the lists annexed to the multilateral Treaty?

The matter is of great importance for the tariff negotiations because a product which has not been included in one of the schedules annexed to the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade, in one case would be a free product without preferences or tariff concessions and in the other case would continue to enjoy the preferences or tariff advantages to which it was entitled by the previous bilateral Treaty.

Taking this into consideration, the Cuban Delegation proposes: that the Preparatory Committee shall draw up a paragraph for inclusion in Article 25 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade clearly defining the effect of the multilateral Treaty on the previous bilateral commercial agreements and the situation of those products not included in the former which have been subject to regulations by the latter agreements.

CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Cuba for his helpful attitude regarding the order in which we shall proceed with our discussions, and I hope that the Chilean delegate, ~~in~~ in the light of what I said before, and what his Cuban colleague has now said, will not object to Articles 15 and following being discussed, having always in mind that we are going to have a full discussion of the previous Articles.

As to the second point of the expose of the Cuban delegate, I, personally have also met that same question in tariff negotiations. I have not the slightest doubt as to the proper answer and as I am not entitled to impose my views upon the Committee, I would suggest that we ask the Secretariat, in consultation with the Cuban delegate and others who might signify a particular interest in it, to prepare a paper which we can then consider at one of our coming meetings and if we agree to it, then let that be the basis for a possible draft amendment in the Charter.

Mr. Oscar RYDER (United States): In regard to your suggestion, I think we might consider referring it to the Tariff Working Party with Cuba added to that Party.

CHAIRMAN: I have no objection in principle. I thought that we should try to keep the tariff discussion and the Charter discussion separate but

Mr. Oscar RYDER (United States): Just as you like. I don't want to insist upon that.

CHAIRMAN: And the Secretariat will, of course, keep in touch with the members of the Working Party.

Mr. Oscar RYDER (United States): That will be satisfactory to me.

CHAIRMAN: Then, I think we have still considerable time at our disposal and I would be sorry to miss an opportunity of clearing away, at any rate, some parts of the Charter. On Article 15 we have a number of very important amendments. I think it is so important that we should not pass it by this morning.

Dr. HOLLOWAY (South Africa): May I raise a point of order. It seems to me that we are not in accord as to what is the object for which this meeting was called, and I would like to call your attention to what happened at the Chairmen's Council where I was present. You will remember the question came up for discussion as to when we should have general discussions on the Charter. It was decided not to start before the 15th. It was suggested, however, that, in view of the intimate association of these Articles with the tariff discussions, we might have a preliminary discussion on that before the 15th. I immediately raised the question, is it the intention to amend the text of that and the immediate reply all round the Chairmen's Council was "No." So I am at a loss to understand why the question of examining changes in texts and adopting changes in texts comes up at this meeting. I think it is violently in conflict with the idea under which we set out, and if we go into details of texts now I think this meeting may spin itself out over a very long period, whereas if we come together here with the idea originally set, namely that we should find the general climate in which our tariff negotiations are to be carried out, then we shall discuss in this meeting purely the general principle and leave the drafting for later.

M. ANGEL RAIVOVICH (Chile) (Interpretation): I want to declare that we are in full agreement with the Delegate of Cuba when he said, that first of all we have to establish the principles themselves which will regulate and rule international trade agreements. I believe also that we should examine the first five chapters of the Draft Charter together because they represent the whole and should be examined together for this reason. However, our Chairman has told us that the work was fairly advanced on the first chapters and that therefore we might now attack chapter 5. I would say to this that I do not think, even for these reasons, which I recognise, we would advance our work very much. We would indeed have to go over again the chapters which we would be examining because we cannot take commitments now, and whatever we do now will have to be revised later on in the light of what will have been decided during the discussions which are now going to take place. Therefore, I do not think this would be of great advantage. On the other hand we cannot forget all the principles. We have to take these principles into account and we have to get them very clear before we can go ahead. Therefore we consider that it would be logical to study the Charter as a whole and not piecemeal, and we would insist, at least, that the Commission decides, if it wants to study part of the Charter, to examine first the amendments on Article 14 which we have submitted. We believe that we would like to have a decision taken by the Group; if this amendment is

- 12 -

going to be examined we consider it of the utmost importance.

H.E. FERREIRA BRAGA (Brazil) (Interpretation): The Brazilian delegation considers that this amendment needs more and further discussion, and in our opinion the general discussion should be postponed in order to accomplish the necessary studies .

RT.HON WALTER WASH (New Zealand): I think we can only do two things at this morning's meeting, that is, either discuss in particular the Articles which we have been called together to discuss, or follow the procedure that was suggested by South Africa, because that still keeps inside the order of reference. That will mean a general discussion of 15 (and including 14 because 15 is referred to there), up to 25 and 37 and then sometime or other we have got to get down to the way in which we want to express in words the principles that we have talked about. If it is decided to take a course other than one of these two courses, I think we must adjourn because we have not been called together here for other than one or both of these two courses.

We could however, I think, discuss the Cuban procedure, only as procedure, and then adjourn if it is determined that the principles that they want discussed shall be discussed, because it is quite possible the Delegations might have sent different persons here to discuss the whole of the principles of chapters 1 - 5, so I submit that the only thing we can do inside your ruling is to follow one of those two first courses and with the third say "all right we will discuss what Cuba proposes but not the

principle of the proposals only as a matter of procedure", and then adjourn.

We could have either of these three things and then adjourn or come back to what we have been called together for, articles 15 to 25 in general, as suggested by South Africa in particular, which some of us thought we were coming here to discuss.

CHAIRMAN: I am very grateful to the Delegate of New Zealand for his remarks, because he has expressed exactly the same view as I myself. I thought that, in order to bring our discussion of Articles 15 to 23 and Article 37 on a level with the rest of the Charter, we should, so to say, consider them en bloc and say we know the result of the work in New York, and as far as we can see, we have no objection of principle. We insert these Articles definitely in the Draft Charter and they will be examined in detail when their turn comes; but this morning we received, I think, something like 17 or 18 amendments.

I am very glad that we have got these amendments, because it gives us time to consider them, but I also had the feeling that, as they had been presented, I could not simply put them to one side and add them to the list of reservations inserted in the New York draft. I had to submit them and find out whether the Committee desired to go into them, but the proper solution, to my mind, would be that the Committee should say, "Well and good, we know something more about them; they will be considered in full when the time comes, but, generally speaking, we approve the work of the Drafting Committee, the continuation of the work of the London Technical Subcommittee, and we pass on to other discussions."

Having taken such a decision, we could then, if we have time for it, proceed to a general discussion on the purposes of the Charter as a whole, in accordance with the suggestions of the Cuban and Chilean Delegations.

DR. COOMBS (Australia) rose to speak.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Dr. Coombs, but I would like first to ask the Chairman of the Working Party, who took the initiative in asking for Article 15 and the following Articles to be discussed, whether he has any views on the procedure to be followed.

The Hon. L.D. WILGHESS (Canada): Mr. Chairman, we considered this question first of all in the Working Party and it seemed to us that these Articles 15 to 23 and Article 37 were of such a technical nature, - that was evidenced by the fact that they had been referred to a Technical Committee in London, - that a text of these Articles had not been established in London - they had been discussed in the Drafting Committee - but they had referred it to the Working Party for further consideration.

As these Articles have an important bearing on the tariff negotiations, and as they need to be brought up to the same status, you might say, as the other parts of the Draft Charter, the Working Party considered that it would be advantageous to take these Articles, one by one, prior to the general discussion of the Draft Charter, commencing on May 15. It was felt that in that way we would save time and be able to take up the whole of the Charter on May 15, with all Articles having the same status one to another.

DR. COOMBS (Australia): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the essence of the problem that faces us has been stated by you when you expressed the judgment that the purpose of our discussion was to bring these Articles to the same stage as the rest of the Charter. Therefore as I see it, this meeting corresponds to the final meeting of the First Session. Now, what would have happened at this stage is: the Technical Subcommittee have reached a text, the Committee in full would have considered that text, and possibly have approached it as it stands. If however, at that meeting a large number of amendments were put forward by Delegations because they were not satisfied with the work of the Technical Subcommittee, then it seems to me that what would probably have happened would have been that the Articles concerned, about which there was dissatisfaction, would have been referred back to the Technical Subcommittee, for them to take into account the proposed amendments and criticisms which were put forward in the full Session. Now, it seems to me that that indicates the way in which we should proceed here. We have before us a text submitted as a result of the work of the Drafting Committee in New York. If that text is satisfactory then we can, in largely a formal way, as we did at the final Session of the London Meeting, adopt the report of that Committee as the report of the Committee in full, and we then bring this particular text to the same stage as the rest of the Charter. But it is clear that on some of the Articles, at any rate, the Committee as a whole, or some Members of it, are not prepared to do that. Now, I would suggest for your consideration that, on the Articles where a number of amendments have been put forward on a scale which indicates serious disagreement with the present text, the simplest thing would be to refer those Articles, at any rate, back to the Technical Subcommittee, and for them to examine the proposed amendments--to take them into consideration and see whether a text can be put forward upon which we might be able to

reach agreement in a short time. Where no such amendments are put forward, then I presume it would be possible for us, after brief discussion here, to approve the report of the Drafting Committee in relation to these Articles as they stand. I think in that way we would be able to work in the way in which the full Committee can work, and at refer the problems which can be handled only by a technical committee to the Committee that we have for that purpose.

CHAIRMAN: The Delegate for the United States.

MR. OSCAR RYDER (United States): Mr. Chairman, a lot of amendments have been suggested and very obviously this Committee is not going to accept the New York draft in its present form. Now, I am agreeable to the suggestion that this be referred to a technical committee. The decision made by the Heads of Delegations was, as I understood it, to set up a Working Party on that, and I think that . . . probably, in all the circumstances, we had better go back to that idea.

MR. GUSTAVO GUTIERREZ (Cuba): Mr. Chairman, the Cuban Delegation thinks that this discussion has come to the moment when a decision should be arrived at, and we approve the first suggestion made by the Chair to establish discussion on Articles 15 -23 and 37, without prejudice to the start of the general discussion of the Charter, and revise, if necessary, Articles 15 -23 and 37; This discussion to be postponed because under Rule 24 we are not prepared to discuss a vote on papers we have not had twenty-four hours in our possession, to properly study. Therefore we are not prepared at this moment to go into the details of the discussion of the amendments to the Articles. So my first motion is to approve the suggestion of the Chair, and second to send to the Secretariat, as he also suggested, the Cuban proposals relating to the effects of the Treaty, for consultation with the Tariff Working Party and the Delegations interested in the matter, with regard to a proper document for consideration.

MR. S.L. HOLMES (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to add any more words to this discussion, especially as I think that the position is really quite clear. What we are getting back to, surely is the original suggestion that was made by the Tariff Working Party, that a Working Party, so-called, should be set up to work on these particular Articles 15 - 23 and 37, with a view rather, as Dr. Coombs has said, to putting them into the position into which they might have been, had we been able to deal with the matter of these Articles on the same basis as we did for the other Articles at Church House. But perhaps the mistake we have made--no doubt with the very best intentions--has been to promote or convert the proposed Working Party for this purpose into an Executive Session of the Preparatory Committee. I would, therefore, like strongly to support Mr. Ryder of the United States in suggesting that these Articles should be considered, and all the amendments that have been proposed taken into account by a Working Party--which was, really, I think, our original intention. Now, I don't think that it is possible to deal with them just on the basis of general principles. I think someone at some stage has got to take into account the various alternatives which emerge from the Drafting Committee in New York, and also the various further suggestions about the text of these Articles which have been made here in Geneva. I would only add this, that as regards future procedure for this body--or perhaps for any other body which may be established in connection with our present work--we should, so far as possible, try and adhere to the fairly well recognized convention that one is given at least twenty-four hours notice of proposals for consideration by a Committee, in order that one can at least read the papers before one comes to a meeting; and in this connection, I think it will be found that ⁱⁿ our own Rules of Procedure, Rule 24 on Page 45 of the Rep

of the First Session does actually provide for the distribution to Representatives, at least twenty-four hours before a meeting, of proposals which it is intended that that meeting should consider. And there is one other suggestion I might make, perhaps, as it is rather on the same point: that we should be told precisely what the Agenda is of a meeting in the notice of the meeting--that is to say, that we should know which Articles precisely we are going to take up before any meeting.

Mr. BRAGA (THE DELEGATE OF BRAZIL): Further to the suggestion made the Brazilian Delegation also thinks that the matter should be referred to a Sub-Committee.

CHAIRMAN : Well, I think there is general consent in the Committee that we decide to refer Articles 15 - 23 and 37 to a Technical Sub-Committee on which all the Delegations are entitled to be represented, and as it has been mentioned that it was perhaps a mistake to bring the matter at all before the Executive Committee, I would like to say that only the Executive Committee can appoint Sub-Committees; so I think it was really a realistic point of view, the previous procedure; and as to the question concerning the distribution of documents, I would remind you that when I opened this meeting I had just got in my hands eighteen amendments. It is a shock, and I do not think we can discuss them without having had the necessary time to consider them.

In conclusion I would suggest that the Technical Sub-Committee which I think we all agree to should meet to-morrow at 10.30 in a room the Secretariat will indicate, and then the Technical Sub-Committee will itself establish its order of procedure; but I think we are entitled to say that they should stick loyally to the discussion of Articles 15 - 23 and 37, with all the Amendments that may be presented.

MR. GUTIERREZ (CUBA): May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman? I would like to know whether the Cuban proposition concerning the revision of the Treaty goes to the Committee or the Secretariat.

CHAIRMAN : It has already been settled that the

- 21 -

Secretariat will get in touch with you and the Chairman of the Working Party and other interested delegations and establish a paper which will finally be submitted to us in the Executive Committee for approval. Thank you

MR. GUTIERREZ (CUBA): Thank you very much.

MR. NASH (NEW ZEALAND): You raised the question, Mr. Chairman, at the previous meeting in which this was discussed - these 15 to 23 - that it is not exclusively a technical matter; that there are some very vital political questions. Well, will the Technical Committee discuss and report on these political questions.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think so. I think the Delegation should be prepared to have the necessary staff to discuss all the aspects of the problems in these Articles. We cannot separate very closely between technical aspects and political aspects.

MR. RYDER (UNITED STATES): In view of that, we might as well call a Working Party rather than a Technical Sub-Committee.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I personally adhere to the expression of the feeling that it is not a Technical Sub-Committee - but the name does not do any harm.

The Right Hon. Walter NASH (New Zealand): Is each delegation a member of that Party and can they all go and discuss in the same way that we are discussing it here?

CHAIRMAN: When some of us meet again in the Working Party we will know that our Terms of Reference is a discussion of Articles 15 - 23 and 37 and nothing else. That is what we shall do as a Working Party.

Dr. A. van KLEFFENS (Netherlands): I suggest we call the Working Party together now.

CHAIRMAN: That is rather difficult as we do not get the papers before twenty-four hours. May I also add to what the delegate of the United Kingdom was kind enough to say, that I hope all the delegations will in the future do their utmost to present their written proposals or amendments as early as possible and try to avoid verbal proposals during the discussion.

Dr. A. van KLEFFENS (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to announce a nineteenth amendment.

Mr. S.L. HOLMES (United Kingdom): I wonder whether it would be in order to suggest that the work would be greatly facilitated if we could agree on a Chairman of the proposed Working Party and if we could also agree to ask you if you would kindly consent to take the chair yourself.

Mr. OSCAR RYDER (United States): I would like to second that.

Dr. A. van KLEEFENS (Netherlands): We would be very glad to have you as a Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: I think that the British delegate would be more qualified for that position than myself. He presided on exactly the same Working Party in New York so I feel a reluctance to pass him by.

The Right Hon. Walter NASH (New Zealand): I understood you to say that it was not a technical subject, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S.L. HOLMES (United Kingdom): My colleague, Mr. Chairman, said he would be very happy to stand down. Perhaps a change of Chairmanship would be quite salutary and as I said, we are getting away rather from regarding it either as merely a Drafting Committee or merely a Technical Committee.

CHAIRMAN: I am in the hands of the Committee and I have to bow to your decision, but I hope Mr. Shackle would be willing to be the Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

H.E. STANISLAV MINOVSKY (Czechoslovakia) (Interpretation): I would like to mention that the Czechoslovakian delegation will have several amendments to propose and I think we are not alone in this case. I understand that other delegations also will have some amendments to submit. In that case wouldn't it be better

since all amendments cannot be in the hands of the delegates tomorrow, to postpone the meeting of the Working Party for two or three days.

CHAIRMAN: What is the feeling of the Committee?

Mr. Oscar RYDER (United States): Would it be possible to put on the agenda one or two articles with one or two amendments for the session tomorrow?

CHAIRMAN: I thought of that, and I think we should send out this little paper giving an indication of the order in which some of the articles about Customs formalities and other things should appear, but we have not come to that yet and I think we should start the discussion on this tomorrow.

Mr. S.L. HOLMES (United Kingdom): It would be very helpful Mr. Chairman I think, if we could now know what the agenda for tomorrow is going to be. We have a lot of reading to do and then we could be a little more selective in our reading.

CHAIRMAN: I think we might take Article 16 "Freedom of Transit". We are only taking Articles 19, 20, 21 and not 22. Any other remarks? If possible I hope we shall get all these four articles tomorrow.

The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 12.10.
