

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
PREPARATORY COMMITTEE
of the
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND EMPLOYMENT

Verbatim Report
of the
ELEVENTH MEETING
of
COMMITTEE II
held in
The Convocation Hall
Church House, Westminster
on
Wednesday, 20th November, 1946
at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. H.C. COGIBS (Australia)

(From the shorthand notes of
W.B. GURNEY, SONS & FUNNELL,
58 Victoria Street,
Westminster, S.W.1.)

THE CHAIRMAN (Dr. Coombs): Before we commence our work on Article 10, members will recall that yesterday a question was raised as to whether the wording of paragraph 5 of Article 9 had been appropriately amended to accord with the changes which had been made by the Sub-Committee on Procedures, Tariffs and Preferences. That matter has been looked into by the Secretariat, and consultations have taken place with the Sub-Committee on Procedures, or with its Rapporteur, and I am advised that the wording of paragraph 5 has been amended to accord with the decisions of the Sub-Committee on Procedures, so we can adopt that without any further changes.

We pass now to Article 10 - Freedom of Transit. Unless any delegate indicates that he wishes to comment or submit suggestions, I will take it that the Article under discussion is approved. Is there any comment on Article 10? I take it, then, that that section of the Report dealing with Article 10 is approved.

Certain comments regarding paragraph 6 of Article 10 have been submitted by me in writing to the Secretariat, and will be distributed in a moment, so the fact that no objections have been raised verbally is not indicative of the fact that we have no objections.

In view of the form that the Report takes, and the fact that the views of other delegates are recorded in the Report, am I interpreting the wishes of the Committee correctly, in view of our decision yesterday, in saying that the comments submitted by the Australian delegation on Article 10, together with the comments submitted in writing by any other delegation on particular Articles, would be incorporated along with the views of other delegations in the Report and be forwarded in accordance with our decision yesterday to the Drafting Committee? Anything else on Article 10? Article 10 is adopted.

We now come to Article 11. The delegate of the Netherlands.

MR. VAN KLEFFENS (Netherlands): With reference to Article 25, paragraph 3 as now revised, we would like to invite the Drafting Committee to see whether, on that account, it would not be as well to add to paragraph 1 of Article 11 the words "including margins corresponding with subsidies granted in accordance with, or pursuant to Article 25 paragraph 3 of this Charter".

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you repeat that slowly so that delegates can write it down if they wish? Those words would be an addition to paragraph 1?

MR. VAN KLEFFENS (Netherlands): Yes, at the end of paragraph 1.

(The Netherlands delegate then re-read his proposed addition, and it was repeated, word for word, by the Chairman so that delegates could take it down.)

And the same applies, of course, to paragraph 2.

THE CHAIRMAN: You wish to add the same words to paragraph 2?

MR. VAN KLEFFENS (Netherlands): Yes, but, owing to the drafting, they will be slightly different, though the meaning is the same. It could read: "subsidies granted in accordance with or pursuant to Article 2 paragraph 3 of this Charter".

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it that it will be recorded that it is the view of the Netherlands delegation that the words read out by Mr. Van Kleffens - "including margins corresponding with subsidies granted in accordance with, or pursuant to article 25 paragraph 3 of this Charter" - should be added to paragraph 1, and that corresponding words should be added to paragraph 2. Does any other delegation wish to associate itself with the addition of those words? If not, I will ask the Secretariat to add those to the records so that they will be taken into account by the Drafting Committee. Is there any other comment? The delegate for France.

(Note: The apparatus broke down here and the English interpreter had some difficulty in hearing the opening words of the French delegate, so the following interpretation may not be complete.)

M. ROUX (France) (Interpretation): In a case where subsidies might be granted by one country, these are being considered as legitimate ones under the Charter. Would it, in a case like that, be possible to offset them by measures provided for in Article 11, that is, by countervailing duties? This question was asked in the Technical Sub-Committee and the representative of the United States answered in the affirmative. Even if the subsidy is a legitimate one, the country concerned may offset it by countervailing duties. Perhaps it was against this idea that Australia was protesting in suggesting the amendment which is to be found in 2 (d).

MR. VAN KLEFFENS (Netherlands): May I say a word in regard to what the French delegate has just said? Our suggestion is made only in connection with specific arrangements on commodity agreements, not as a general clause, but only insofar as there has been rigid specific agreement on a specific case.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments on this Article? The delegate of Brazil.

MR. RODRIGUES (Brazil): Our approval of the draft report of the Technical Sub-Committee does not mean that we have abandoned our views which are reported here. We give our approval but we maintain our reserve.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is quite clear. Is there any further comment on Article 11? If not, I take it that the report of the Technical Sub-Committee on the subject matter of Article 11 is adopted.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): With regard to paragraph 1 of Article 11, and New Zealand's attitude, heading (b) in that paragraph would not be acceptable to New Zealand as, in the absence of a domestic price, the power of assessment rests with the Minister of Customs. We work on an assessed domestic value in that case, we always have done so, and we are putting

in a note to the Secretariat to that effect - to add a new sub-paragraph elucidating our position. With regard to paragraph 2, we also have a case where our law provides that dumping or countervailing duties may be applied in respect of special concessions - railway shipping freights subsidy, special bounty rebate, or otherwise allowed, taken or granted having a prejudicial or injurious effect. We consider that some reference in the Report seems desirable respecting shipping or freight concessions which, according to the opening paragraph of C 2 48 would be dealt with by another Conference. That statement was made, but we would prefer some reference to it, and so we are putting in this note.

THE CHAIRMAN: The points raised by the delegate of New Zealand will be recorded and passed on with the rest of the Report to the Drafting Committee. I take it that that step would commend itself to the Committee? Then subject to the comments and additions that have been made in respect of Article 11, the report on this section of the draft Charter is adopted. Are there any comments on Article 12?

MR. MORTON (Australia): There appear to be a number of words left out of the present draft paragraph 2(c) of the Chapter at "until the elimination of dual or multiple". The original text said: "rates of exchange either one or more than one rate for each dual or multiple rate currency may be so fixed". I think the typist got caught up with herself in the process.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point has been noted and the correction will be made in due course. Are there any further comments on Article 12? May I take it that the report covering this section of the subject matter is adopted? Adopted. Article 13. - Customs Formalities. Is there any comment on Article 13?

MR. RHYDDERGH (U.K.): With regard to paragraph 3(c), it was mentioned at the last meeting that the expression "Australia and United Kingdom: Delete the second sentence" was not quite correct.

It was agreed by everybody, except the United States, that that second sentence should be deleted. I think the point has already been raised by the delegate for New Zealand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other point arising on this Article?

Then it is adopted. We pass now to Article 14 - Marks of Origin.

MR. MORTON (Australia): Sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 3 mentions that Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and others considered that the various customs authorities ought not to be required to submit to what might be serious inconvenience in order to make up for the failure of exporters to comply with regulations already well known to them. That was supported by the vast majority of those members present, and that fact ought to be recorded.

MR. LAURENCE (New Zealand): With regard to paragraph 3, our view was not quite so much of the serious inconvenience - although that was mentioned - but that it was more the case that in the United States position marking is permitted subsequent to importation, whereas Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and some other countries subscribe to the view that marks should be applied prior to importation. In connection with that, under paragraph 6, we also took it that several delegates expressed the view that failure to fix required marks of origin before importation, being either wilful or negligent disregard of existing laws, might well continue to be the subject of some penalty. Those two are really wrapped up one with the other - paragraph 3 giving permission for marking at the time of importation and paragraph 6 providing that penalties should not be imposed in certain cases - whereas, in many cases, the laws of countries may demand penalties at present if goods are imported without any required marking.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested that the record needs to be amended in regard to the note (a) to paragraph 3. It reads at present: "Australia, New Zealand and South Africa and others:" recorded certain views. Is it your view that, to be an

accurate record of the proceedings, it should read: "Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the majority of other delegates?"

MR. LUTENCE (New Zealand): It was here on the statement "serious inconvenience". It was certainly discussed in the light of what the American delegate said about the position obtaining in the U.S.A, but I think some of us were here concerned with our actual law.

THE CHAIRMAN: What change would you wish us to make in the record as it stands?

MR LAWRENCE (New Zealand): We are putting a statement in on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Would you wish any change to be made in the record?

MR MORTON (Australia): Only "the majority of other Delegates".

THE CHAIRMAN: The Delegate for Australia has suggested that there should be added to paragraph 3 (a) the words "the majority of other Delegates" after "and", deleting the word "others". Is there any comment on this proposed amendment? Then I take it that that amendment is agreed? (Agreed).

May I take it that, subject to that amendment and notes to be submitted by the Delegate of New Zealand and other Delegates affecting this article, the Report as submitted is adopted?

MR LAWRENCE (New Zealand): There is one other point, and that is on the additional remarks on pages 25 and 26 as to geographical or other marks of origin. Our views were that certain Delegations pointed out that Article 14 was not intended to cover the protection of registered trade marks or marks of origin, and we took the view that the Charter was not the place in which to deal with the matter of regional marks of origin, which could more properly be the subject of negotiation between individual countries.

THE CHAIRMAN: That view has not been recorded here.

MR RHYDDERCH (United Kingdom): In looking at the preamble on Article 14 on page 23, it says "that the complicated subject of exemptions from the requirements should be recommended for study by the ITO and that the particular interest of certain countries in protecting the regional or geographical marking of their distinctive products should also be considered by the Organisation". I think that meets the point of the Delegate from New Zealand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does that meet your point, the Delegate for New Zealand?

MR LAWRENCE (New Zealand): I do not know that it altogether covers the view that I took from the discussions that several countries were against this matter coming into the Article; but I think if we submit our statement that that will adequately cover the point in any case.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Then Article 15: "Publication and Administration of Trade Regulations".
Is there any comment on that Article? Then I take it that the report

covering Article 15 is adopted? (Agreed.)

Then Article 16: "Information, Statistics and Trade Terminology".

Is there any comment on Article 16? Then I take it that the report covering Article 16 is adopted, as presented? (Agreed.)

Article 17: "Boycotts".

MR TUNG (China): Mr Chairman, on page 32, the comment under paragraph (d) I wish to be withdrawn.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Delegate of China wishes to withdraw the comment under paragraph (d) on page 32. The comment under (d) is withdrawn.

MR DIMECHKIE (Lebanon): The objection I put is not put in the right way. I asked for the deletion of that article.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suggest that we might add to note (e), in which the view of the Delegate of Lebanon is expressed, something to the effect that "and therefore the Article should be deleted".

MR DIMECHKIE (Lebanon): No -- what I wanted to say was that this Article is not within the competence of this Conference. There are not any such things as boycotts in the abstract for commercial reasons. When a boycott is carried out by a Government, it is for political reasons, and once it is for political reasons it is no more within the competence of this Conference.

THE CHAIRMAN: How should we record your view?

MR DIMECHKIE (Lebanon): In this way, that boycotts are not usually carried out for economic reasons. If a country does boycott any other country, it does it for political reasons, and therefore this does not fall within the competence of this Conference.

THE CHAIRMAN: The views of the Delegate for Lebanon, as stated, will be recorded, and the Report amended accordingly.

MR SIM (Canada): I understood that the Delegate from the Lebanon wished to withdraw the comment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Delegate for Lebanon was not suggesting that he wished to withdraw that comment, but that he wanted it recorded accurately.

MR DIMECHKIE (Lebanon): No - I wished to change it. I want it to be made clear

that we are asking for the deletion of that Article.

THE CHAIRMAN: The record will be amended accordingly. Is there anything else on this Article?

Then Article 32: "General Exceptions to Chapter IV".

MR OPTEDAL (Norway): On page 33 it says: "This amendment was generally accepted, subject to later review of its precise wording". I just want to know whether this is the time to do any precise wording, or should that be left out?

THE CHAIRMAN: It should be left. Are there any other comments on Article 32?

If the Delegate for Norway wishes to submit a proposal in relation to wording, then the best thing to do would be to hand it into the Secretariat and it will be passed on to the Drafting Committee. Is there anything else on this Article? Then I take it that the Report covering this section is adopted?
(Agreed.)

There are certain concluding remarks which refer not to a particular request but to a number of requests. Is there any comment on that paragraph on page 36? If not, I take it that that part of the report is adopted also? (Agreed).

MR VIDELA (Chile): I would like to thank the Committee and particularly the Chairman and say that the work of the Technical Sub-Committee has been approved and that we are always at your disposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. This report has now been adopted, and it remains only for us to thank the Technical Sub-Committee, its Chairman and its various Rapporteurs and the Secretariat for the very valuable work which they have done. It is quite clear that the material with which they have had to labour has been difficult and complex, and I think we should be grateful to them for the progress that they have been able to achieve.

MR VIDELA (Chile) Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourn this meeting, a message has now been received from the Joint Committee on Industrial Development. The message reads as follows: "In the light of recommendations regarding industrial and general economic development which the Joint Committee is making to the Preparatory Committee, the Joint Committee requests Committee II to make a provision in Article 18 of the chapter dealing with commercial policy, so that the

Organisation and other members should, when considering the contribution which a Member can make to a reduction in tariffs, take into account the height of the tariff of that Member and the need, if any, of that Member to use protective measures in order to promote industrial and general economic development. The Joint Committee also requests that in Article 20 a provision should be made to cover the position of a Member who, as a result of its plans for industrial development or reconstruction, anticipates that its accruing international monetary resources will be inadequate to finance the needed imports of goods, for example capital goods for the carrying out of such plans unless it imposes regulations restricting the import of certain classes of goods, for example consumer goods".

As members are probably aware, the fact that the Joint Committee would probably send us a message of this sort has been known to us for some time, and I have taken the liberty of informing the Drafting Sub-Committee dealing with Tariffs and Procedures and also the Drafting Sub-Committee dealing with Quantitative Restrictions to take these two messages into account provisionally in their work, so that if and when we did receive the message officially, it would be relatively easy to meet the wishes of the Joint Committee on Industrial Development, without seriously impairing their previous work. That, I understand, has been done, or is in process of being done, by the two Drafting Sub-Committees concerned; but I think, to put this matter in order, it is necessary, now that we have officially received the message, to refer the ^{two} parts of that message to the two Drafting Sub-Committees who are working on the subject matters concerned, and to request them to take this message into account in their work and to report back to the full Committee on the action which they have taken to give effect to this request. I would be grateful, therefore, if the Committee would agree that we should refer paragraph 1 of this message, which deals with the suggested provision so that the Organisation and other Members should, when considering the contribution which a Member can make to a reduction in tariffs, take certain things into account; that this paragraph should be referred to the Drafting Sub-Committee dealing with Tariffs and

Procedures, with a request that they report back to the full Committee on the action that they have taken to give effect to the request of the Joint Committee. Is that agreed?

MR NEHRU (India): I merely wish to know whether the method of determining the height of a tariff has been suggested. It seems to me that, unless the method is defined and agreed upon, the phrase is quite meaningless. The height of a tariff must be determined with reference to a large number of factors.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those are matters which would properly be dealt with by our Drafting Sub-Committee, and if you wish I will ask the Secretariat to draw their attention to the particular point that you have raised. Can I take it that this reference to the Drafting Committee on Tariffs and Procedures is approved? (Agreed).

Regarding the second paragraph of the message, I shall be glad if the Committee will approve that that paragraph should be referred to the Drafting Sub-Committee dealing with Quantitative Restrictions with a request that they report back to this Committee on the action that they have taken to give effect to the request. Is that agreed? (Agreed) Thank you.

MR KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia): Mr Chairman, I wanted to ask you if you could tell me which measures you intend to take, that the Committee should be able to discuss very soon and very quickly the reports that we have not had yet. I have the following point in mind: We have got now, very probably unofficially, the report of the Drafting Committee on Procedures. This is very important, and very probably it is a document that will have to be discussed for quite a long time and adopted at this meeting. Now I am informed that this Drafting Committee, having produced this report, still is about to have long discussions on specific points about which, more or less, you all know that they are not able to agree. My suggestion is that, in view of the very short time we have at our disposal, and in view of the importance of this subject, you should take the necessary steps for the draft to now be taken out of the hands of this Drafting Committee and be put at the disposal of this Committee for it to discuss as soon as possible.

E/PC/T/C.II/IV/11

THE CHAIRMAN: To be quite clear, is your suggestion merely that the Draft Report should be circulated for the consideration of members or that we should then wait for the Drafting Committee to approve its Report, or that we should bring the Draft Report for consideration by the full Committee without further consideration by the Drafting Sub-Committee?

MR KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia): That is my suggestion, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is the second proposal that you wish to be carried into effect?

MR KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia): Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do Delegates understand the proposal that has just been put forward by the Delegate of Czechoslovakia, and would anybody like to comment on it here? I would have liked to have the Chairman of the Drafting Sub-Committee here when a proposition of this sort was put forward. It is obviously a matter of some importance to know precisely how far the work of the Drafting Sub-Committee has gone. Mr Speekenbrink does not appear to be here. I do not know whether he is in the building. (after a pause): I am told he is engaged in a meeting at present. I will ask Mr Speekenbrink and Mr Hawkins to come down.

MR KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia): May I explain a bit more in the meantime my suggestion?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps it might be as well for you to wait for Mr Speekenbrink, for him to understand your reasons for putting forward your proposal.

MR VIDELA (Chile): While we are awaiting the arrival of the Chairman of the Procedures Sub-Committee, may I mention another matter? This morning we were discussing in the Procedures Sub-Committee a recommendation to have a truce in regard to tariffs, and I suggested that we should also make a similar recommendation in connection with quantitative restrictions, but the Sub-Committee on Procedures could not advance in this matter because that matter is outside its scope, and therefore I was advised to raise this point here in the main Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it would be competent to raise that matter here, but I think it should be, if it is to be dealt with at all, dealt with in the

first instance by the Drafting Committee dealing with quantitative restrictions. However, I take it that you would wish to make the suggestion to the Committee that there be a truce pending the completion of the Charter to the establishment of new quantitative restrictions. It would appear to me to be reasonable to suggest that the Drafting Committee on Quantitative Restrictions should be asked to give consideration to that proposal.

MR VIDELA (Chile): I made a reservation to that effect this morning, and I may add that if the Quantitative Restrictions Sub-Committee or the main Committee should make a similar recommendation I will withdraw my reservation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed, then, that we should ask the Sub-Committee dealing with quantitative restrictions to give consideration to the proposal put forward by the Chilean Delegate for a truce to quantitative restrictions? An expression of approval of that, of course, does not commit you either to approval or disapproval of the proposal itself, but merely to a request that it should be considered by the Sub-Committee in the first place.

MR NEHRU (India): Mr Chairman, I presume that the word "truce" suggests that only such quantitative restrictions and other measures which are used as instruments of warfare would be covered by this proposal, not for development and other purposes?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we will have to leave that. I think the meaning of the word, as I understand the Delegate of Chile, was that no new quantitative restrictions should be applied between this date and the date on which the Charter will come into operation. However, as I say, we are seeking the views of Delegates here, not on the proposal itself, but merely on the request of the Chilean Delegate that the matter be considered by the appropriate Sub-Committee, and that would appear to me to be a reasonable request. I take it that that is agreed? (Agreed.)

(At this point Mr Speckenbrink (Netherlands) and Mr Hawkins

(USA) joined the Committee.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Speckenbrink, I thought perhaps it would be as well that you should be here. The Czechoslovak Delegate has suggested that in view

E/PC/T/C.II/PV/11

of the shortness of the time ahead of us and of the very important matters which are covered by the Draft Report on Tariffs and Procedures, it would be advisable, at this stage, to bring the Report back in its present draft form for consideration by the full Committee rather than proceed, as we had previously intended, to a consideration of that Draft Report to the stage of finality by the Drafting Committee itself, and then to bring that completed Report before the full Committee. I thought it would be of assistance to Delegates if, as Chairman of the Drafting Committee on Procedures and Tariffs, you could report in general terms to the Committee on the present stage of your work.

MR SPEEKENBRINK (Netherlands): Mr Chairman, at this moment we are discussing our Memorandum of Procedures in regard to tariff negotiations, and, as decided at the Heads of Delegations Meeting and also announced in the Journal, several Delegations have sent members of their Delegations to our meeting, and although they are there in the capacity more or less of observers at this moment, they are putting questions, and we try to explain the Memorandum to them, simply with a view to facilitate the further proceedings of this Committee. If we were now to adopt the suggestion that we should stop in the other room and come here, because I understand that every Delegation has got a copy of our Memorandum on Procedures and is in possession at the moment of the facts, then the question is whether Delegations can spare certain people to follow our discussions while Committee II is still sitting now, dealing with the other parts of the Report it has to discuss; but I am otherwise afraid that it might retard the finishing of the work of Committee II.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the Czechoslovak Delegate wished to explain the reasons for putting forward his proposal in particular detail.

MR KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia): Mr Chairman, I would not like to be misunderstood. My reason is - and I have seen the document - that this Report is a very important and quite a large Report. Now this document - and I am sure Mr Speekenbrink will agree with me - has been prepared by a very limited number of Delegates in the Drafting Committee. I have seen the draft; we have only got one copy, and consequently only one

person can look at it at one time, but, as I say, I have seen that draft, and there are really quite a few matters on which very probably those Delegates who have not had any time to take part in the discussions would have quite a lot of things to say. Now that part of our work is perhaps one of the most important; it is very definitely the most pressing and the most urgent part of our work. Some Delegations will have to leave, or at least some members of Delegations will have to leave, and this is the reason why I feel it would be extremely important that those parts of this Report which are available should be put at the disposal of this Committee, so that the Committee could then proceed to examine this very large document and get to the end of it. Even if you say as from today that some Delegations are able to send observers to your meetings, it is quite clear that they are not there as members of Delegations but merely as observers, and therefore they are not able to put forward their views as full members. Now I feel that you have finished more or less the draft, that you are polishing it, and are trying to reconcile certain opposing views, and my feeling is that it would assist in the speeding up of our work if you could present the document so far as you have finished it for the consideration of this Committee. I do not know at what stage your work is now, but if you feel that the remaining part of the work consists more or less of further efforts to attain a reconciliation of views, this work perhaps would be much more usefully done in the full Committee than in your Sub-Committee, because I think that we shall get the Report, at least those Delegations who are not members of your Drafting Committee, and for those Delegations anyhow it is a Report that will have to be fully discussed in this Committee, even if you wanted to give information to some of our members of what the different chapters of this draft mean. So that I should like to ask you, Mr Chairman, to consider my suggestion exclusively from this point of view, that we consider the document as a very important document, that at the same time we bear in mind the fact that many Delegations have not had any opportunity of taking part in the work of the Drafting Sub-Committee, which I very much

E/PC/T/C.II/PV/11

regret, and that consequently it would be best if we could start the discussion on this draft as soon as possible.

(After a short interval):

THE CHAIRMAN: I feel that the point raised by the Czechoslovak Delegate is of considerable importance, and I think we are all agreed that there is very real merit in his suggestion. It should be examined very carefully. Therefore I suggest we adjourn now and reassemble at a quarter to 5, and by that time we may be able to make some progress.

(The meeting rose at 4.17 p.m.)

(Adjourned till 4.45 p.m.)

The Committee resumed at 4.45 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, during the adjournment we have gone into the question raised by the Czechoslovak delegate, and it was agreed with the Chairman of the Drafting Committee on Tariffs and Procedures that there was a real danger that, at the present rate of progress, matters might come before the full Committee after they had completed their labours with inadequate time for this Committee to give consideration to important questions which would be embodied in those reports. It was, however, felt that it would be unwise to bring the reports in their draft form before the Committee if that could be avoided, since it appears likely that fairly substantial changes will be made in those drafts - in fact, are in process of being made at the present time.

It has been suggested, therefore, that we attempt to overcome the difficulty - and I understand that this might be an acceptable arrangement - by setting a dead line for the completion of the work of the Drafting Committee on Tariffs and Procedures sufficiently early to enable adequate consideration to be given to their reports here. The work of the Sub-Committee on Tariffs and Procedures will be in two parts. The first will be a report on the section of the subject matter of the draft Articles which were referred to it; the second will be a memorandum of procedure related to the tariff and other negotiations to be conducted at the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee next year. The memorandum of procedure is under discussion in the Sub-Committee this afternoon, and I am advised that it will be completed this afternoon - at any rate, the Sub-Committee have been instructed so to complete it. That will be duplicated tonight and circulated to all delegations tomorrow. The draft report on the subject matter referred to the Sub-Committee has now been prepared by the Rapporteur, and a certain number of copies have been distributed for the information

of delegates. In order that they should be able to study the draft report adequately, arrangements have now been made to increase the number of copies of that draft, and a large number will be available early this evening. That document is numbered E/EC/T/C.II/57, and will be available in the Documents Section at 7.30 this evening. That Rapporteur's draft will be considered tomorrow morning by the Drafting Sub-Committee, with a direction that they should complete their work by mid-day tomorrow. The Report, as amended, will then be distributed, and it is proposed that this Committee should meet on Friday at 10.30 and at such other times of the day as are necessary to consider these two documents fully. It will probably be necessary to have three sessions on Friday.

I commend this arrangement to delegates. It is recognised that it is not entirely satisfactory, but I believe that it is the best that is practicable in the circumstances. Will this arrangement be acceptable to the delegate of Czechoslovakia?

MR. KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia): Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will it be acceptable to other delegates? Thank you.

In the circumstances, the meeting is adjourned and, unless you are notified to the contrary in the Journal, the next meeting will be on Friday at 10.30.

The meeting rose at 5.2 p.m.