

COMMITTEE ON ANTI-DUMPING PRACTICES

Draft Note on the Meeting of the
Committee on 29-30 September 1969

Attached hereto is a draft note on the meeting of the Committee on 29-30 September 1969. Delegations are invited to inform the secretariat (telephone 34 60 11, ext. 4452) by 2 February 1970 of any comments they may have on the text.

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

RESTRICTED

COM.AD/W/9

12 January 1970

Special Distribution

COMMITTEE ON ANTI-DUMPING PRACTICES

Note on the Meeting of the Committee on 29-30 September 1969

Chairman: Mr. A. LANGELAND (Norway)

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Subjects discussed:</u> A. General discussion	1
B. Examination of national legislation	3
C. Examination of reports submitted under Article 16 of the Agreement	10
D. Future reporting procedure	16
E. Report by the Committee to the CONTRACTING PARTIES	17
F. Other business	17

A. General discussion

1. The representative of Japan wished to make three brief remarks of a general character for consideration by the Committee. The first remark related to the acceptance of the Code by the contracting parties. He wished to draw the particular attention to the desirability that the Code should be accepted by as many countries as possible, so that anti-dumping legislations and practices of all contracting parties might eventually be on uniform basis. He recalled that a similar hope had been expressed at the February meeting of the Committee on Trade in Industrial Products. Against that background, he proposed that the Committee should recommend to the CONTRACTING PARTIES to invite all non-signatory countries to accept the Code at the earliest possible date.

2. The second remark by the representative of Japan related to the question of the compatibility of the anti-dumping legislations of the signatory countries with the provisions of the Code. On this very important question, he felt strongly that, if

it was found that there was a gap between the national legislation of a given country and the provisions of the Code, that country should be urged to make its utmost in order to ensure the conformity of its national legislation with the provisions of the Code.

3. The third remark related to the implementation or interpretation of the Code. The delegation of Japan was particularly interested in the administration and interpretation of the provisions of paragraph (f) of Article 2 of the Code, in which it was stipulated that due allowances should be made for differences of various kinds affecting price comparability. When a dumping margin was to be determined, due allowance should be made by any signatory country for the differences in conditions and terms of sale, for the differences in taxation, and for the other differences affecting price comparability, if they proved to be accurate and reasonable. It was clearly not the intention of the Code to allow any signatory country to limit unduly the extent of due allowances to be made. Such allowances should thus be made for the differences in various factors such as level of trade, time of the sale, quantity, advertising costs and servicing. In addition to those factors, due allowance should also be made for any other accurate and reasonable differences reflecting any special practices followed in connexion with the circulation of merchandise in a given exporting country.

4. The representative of the European Economic Community fully supported the views expressed by the representative of Japan. The representative of Canada suggested that the report to be submitted by the Committee to the CONTRACTING PARTIES should stress the importance of an early acceptance of the Code by as many contracting parties as possible. The representative of Sweden also shared the views of the representative of Japan concerning a wide acceptance of the Code.

5. The Chairman said that there seemed to be general agreement in the Committee with regard to the desirability of a wide and rapid acceptance of the Code. He suggested that the two other questions raised by the representative of Japan could be reverted to later in the course of the work of the Committee.

B. Examination of national legislation

Canada (L/3169 and addenda 1 and 2)

6. The Chairman pointed out that the Canadian Anti-Dumping Act had been thoroughly examined at the February meeting of the Committee (COM.AD/3, paragraphs 7-24). There remained, however, a couple of questions where it had been agreed that they would be discussed again at the present meeting.

7. The representative of Canada recalled that at the previous meeting of the Committee, the representative of the European Economic Community had expressed the view that there were provisions in Section 18, sub-sections 2(b) and 4(d) of the Canadian Anti-Dumping Act which seemed to open up the possibility for retroactive application of duties prior to the rules of the Anti-Dumping Code (COM.AD/3, paragraph 21). At that meeting the Canadian representative had not been in a position to reply fully to the representative of the Community but he had undertaken to revert to the matter. The representative of Canada now gave the following explanation: Section 18(2)(b) related exclusively to a re-determination of description or re-appraisal of normal value or export price of goods entered subsequent to the order or the finding by the tribunal, i.e. goods which were subject to anti-dumping duty at the time of entry into Canada. Accordingly the question of retroactivity did not arise. The final determination by the Deputy Minister of National Revenue (Customs and Excise) under Section 17(1) was subject to re-determination or re-appraisal within two years under Section 18(4)(d). Under Canadian Law, all goods described in the Deputy Minister's preliminary determination were deemed to be entered provisionally and were normally subject to provisional duties. Sections 4 and 5 of the Act limited retroactive assessment of anti-dumping duties as provided for in Article 11 of the Code and also provided that anti-dumping duty levied definitively might not exceed the provisional duty that had been applied between the date of the preliminary determination and the date of the tribunal's order or finding. In any event, the amount of the anti-dumping duties assessed might not exceed the actual margin of dumping. Accordingly, exporters and

importers were fully protected in regard to retroactivity. It might also be pointed out that as the Deputy Minister could not levy anti-dumping duties in larger amount than the provisional duty, if any had applied, or the actual margin of dumping, it was expected that Section 18(4)(d) would be of primary benefit to exporters and importers as it could be used to reduce the margin of dumping where warranted on the basis of new facts subsequent to final determination. This procedure was in keeping with the second sentence of paragraph (c) of Article 8 of the Code.

8. In reply to questions from the representative of the European Economic Community, the representative of Canada stressed that the aim of Section 18, sub-sections 2(b) and 4(d), was not to create possibilities for a retroactive assessment of anti-dumping duties; they were intended to cover situations such as refunds and to be used in cases such as where fraud was involved.

9. The representative of the European Economic Community said that, although the representative of Canada had confirmed that the Canadian Act would be applied in conformity with the spirit of the Code, there remained some doubts with regard to Section 18(2)(b) and (4)(d). The fact that the dumping margins could be re-appraised did not cause any concern to the extent that it was used in order to limit the amount of the duty imposed; the re-appraisal could, however, also be used to increase the amounts of duty imposed in a way that would be contrary to the Code provisions on retroactivity. He acknowledged that the intention was to use this possibility in the case of fraud, but the mere existence of the provisions in the Act was likely to cause uncertainty among traders.

10. The representative of Canada recalled that the representative of the European Economic Community had questioned at the previous meeting of the Committee whether the rules in Section 34 of the Canadian Act regarding failure to submit evidence relating to the normal value and the export price of goods would authorize the Deputy Minister to hinder the procedures of customs clearance inconsistently with Article 5(d) of the Code (COM.AD/3, paragraph 23).

The representative of Canada stressed that the aim of Section 34 was to offer the parties concerned another possibility - after a first refusal or failure - to submit necessary information regarding normal value and export price; the alternative would be to determine the price on the basis of the information available which would be more arbitrary. He did not consider that Article 5(d) of the Code was relevant in this connexion.

11. The representatives of the European Economic Community and the United Kingdom pointed out that the fact that an entry subsequent to a specified date would not be deemed to have been perfected, in accordance with Section 34(2), until certain conditions were fulfilled, could lead to a violation of the provisions on retro-activity in Article 11(iii) of the Code. The delegations concerned were not able to reach agreement on the conformity of Section 34 to the Code, but in view of the assurance given by the representative of Canada regarding the intention of his Government to apply the Canadian Act in consistency with the Code, it was agreed not to pursue the issue further.

12. The representative of the European Economic Community asked some questions regarding the interpretation of Section 9(2)(b) of the Canadian Act which stipulates that, if there is not a sufficient number of sales of like goods made by the exporter by reason of the fact that the exporter sells goods solely or primarily for export, but there are sales of like goods for home consumption in the country of export by other vendors, there shall be substituted for the exporter such one of any such vendors as the Deputy Minister might specify (cf. COM.AD/3, paragraphs 18-20).

13. In reply, the representative of Canada confirmed that when another vendor was substituted for the exporter, only products manufactured by the same producer - but sold through different channels - were taken into consideration.

14. The representative of the European Economic Community, referring to Article 2(f) of the Code according to which price comparisons should be made at the same level of trade, asked whether all relevant elements would be taken into consideration when computing the normal value under the Canadian Anti-Dumping Regulations.
15. The representative of Canada confirmed that the words "at the same or at substantially the same trade level" in Section 3 of the Regulations were intended to express the same conception as Article 2(f) of the Code.
16. The representative of Japan pointed out that Sections 4-11 of the Regulations enumerated various factors for which allowances should be made when prices were compared. He asked whether that enumeration was exhaustive or whether allowance could also be made for other factors, e.g. advertising costs.
17. The representative of Canada replied that the aim of the drafters of the Regulations had been to make a clear list of allowances. The list should not, however, be considered as final; if required, it could be amended administratively. He stressed that Canada - as had been made clear at the previous meeting of the Committee - had the intention to honour its obligations under the Code, although in some cases the wording of the Canadian Act or Regulations differed from the text of the Code.

European Economic Community (L/3033)

18. In reply to a question, the representative of the European Economic Community said that there had been no modifications in the text of the Community Regulation as reproduced in L/3033.

United Kingdom (L/3176/Add.1)

19. The representative of the United Kingdom stressed that the Customs Duties (Dumping and Subsidies) Act 1969 (document L/3176/Add.1) was a pure consolidation of the 1957 and 1968 Acts and did not make any changes in the previous legislation. The assurance given by Board of Trade Ministers in Parliament, when introducing the 1968 Act, on the intention of the Board of Trade to abide strictly by all the terms of the Code was thus still valid (cf. COM.AD/3, paragraph 45).

United States (L/3180)

20. The representatives of the European Economic Community and Canada expressed concern with the fact that the Government of the United States considered that anti-dumping cases the investigation of which had begun but had not been terminated at the entry into force of the Code should be dealt with throughout under the pre-Code procedure (cf. COM.4D/3, paragraphs 55-57). It was agreed to revert to this question under heading C below.

Denmark (L/3189)

21. The Committee noted that the text of the provisions of the Danish Customs Act relating to Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duties had been circulated in document L/3189 and that those provisions in the opinion of the Government of Denmark were in conformity with the Code.

22. The representative of Denmark said that it was the intention of his Government to apply the provisions of the Code also in cases where the Danish legislation did not contain specific regulations.

Norway (L/3204)

23. The Committee noted that the Norwegian legal texts relating to anti-dumping duties - rules included in paragraph 3 of the Introductory Provisions to the Norwegian Customs Tariff and an extract (paragraph 16) of the Law on the Customs Administration of 10 June 1966 - had been circulated in document L/3204 and that the legislation in the opinion of the Government of Norway was in conformity with the Code.

Sweden (L/3253)

24. The Committee noted that the text of the Royal Ordinance on Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duties had been circulated in document L/3253 and that the provisions of the Ordinance and the Swedish administrative practices for the handling of dumping matters were, in the opinion of the Swedish Government, in conformity with the Code.

25. The representatives of Czechoslovakia and the European Economic Community asked how the Swedish authorities, failing administrative regulations, envisaged ensuring that anti-dumping measures in Sweden were applied in conformity with the Code.

26. The representative of Sweden explained that the right of the King-in-Council to decide upon the levying of anti-dumping and countervailing duties was based on authorizations given by the Parliament. The Ordinance now in force was issued on 23 May 1969 and was valid until 30 June 1973. According to the Ordinance the King might decree, when necessary to counteract the injurious effect of dumping or of direct or indirect subsidization abroad, the levying of anti-dumping or countervailing duties on the importation of any product. In the Ordinance it was further stated that such a decree, when necessary, might be issued provisionally, pending further investigation. If the investigation did not lead to a definitive decree, the provisional measures should be cancelled and any provisional anti-dumping or countervailing duty paid, should be repaid without delay.

27. There had been no provisions promulgated governing the administrative procedure to be followed to detect whether or not conditions existed which would warrant resorting to anti-dumping and countervailing duties. The administrative practices were, however, carried out in accordance with the Code.

28. In reply to a question by the representative of the European Economic Community whether any other anti-dumping legislation remained in force in Sweden, the representative of Sweden replied that the 1969 Ordinance was the only valid legal text.

29. The representative of the European Economic Community said that it was of considerable importance for the creation of confidence in international trade that internal anti-dumping legislation of countries parties to the Code did really fulfil the Code requirements and that traders could appeal against administrative decisions which were not in conformity with the Code. He stressed that these observations were of a general nature and did not only relate to the Swedish legislation. The representative of Sweden said that the views expressed by the representative of the Community would be brought to the attention of the competent Swedish authorities.

Greece (L/3252)

30. The Committee noted that the text of the Act No. 4056/1960 concerning the application of anti-dumping duties and countervailing duties, as amended and supplemented by a 1964 Legislative Decree, had been circulated in document L/3252.

31. The representative of the European Economic Community said that there were certain requirements of the Code which were, in his opinion, not met by the Greek Act. Article 1 of the Act contained a general reference to an injury criterion, but in certain Articles which dealt with the procedure in anti-dumping cases, there was no requirement of existence of injury. He had in mind particularly Article 7 concerning applications for anti-dumping duties, Article 4:4 on criteria to be applied by the Ministries of Finance and of Industry when taking decisions, and Article 6:2 concerning opinions by the Advisory Committee. The representative of the Community also referred to Article 4:4, third paragraph, of the Greek Act where it was stipulated that a guarantee was required for customs clearance, when the actual price was 5 per cent or more lower than the normal value. He stressed that such a fixed limit was not in conformity with the provisions of the Code. He further pointed out that there was no limitation in the Act with regard to the duration of provisional measures, whereas the Code contained a ninety-day limit. He finally referred to the price comparisons foreseen in Article 2 of the Act and said that according to the Code, the domestic price in the exporting country should always be used as the basis for comparison, if available. The Greek Act did not establish any priority amongst the various ways of comparing the prices.

32. The representative of the Community said that, apart from the comments on deviations from the Code referred to in the previous paragraph, he had a couple of wishes concerning the conformity of the Greek Act with certain facultative provisions of the Code:

- (i) In Article 1 of the Act it was stated that, under certain conditions, an anti-dumping duty "shall be applied as circumstances require". The wording was not quite clear, but it seemed to indicate that the

imposition of a duty was obligatory. The Code, however, was based on the idea that the imposition should be permissive (Article 8(a)).

(ii) In Article 2:2 of the Act it was stipulated that the anti-dumping duty should be equal to the dumping margin. Article 8(a) of the Code said that it was desirable that the anti-dumping duty should be less than the margin, if such lesser duty would be adequate to counteract the injury to the domestic industry.

(iii) In Article 9 of the Act, reference was made to a Royal Decree. It would be appreciated if that Decree could be made available to the Committee.

33. The representative of the United Kingdom said that Article 2 of the Greek Anti-Dumping Act contained rules on price adjustments for differences in taxation. He asked whether allowance was also made for other differences affecting price comparability as established in Article 2(f) of the Code.

34. The representative of Greece said that all comments and questions by members of the Committee would be brought to the attention of the competent authorities in Greece. The Greek authorities were of the opinion that the differences between the Act and the Code were not essential, but they would be prepared to consider any proposals for modifications of the Act which members of the Committee might suggest.

C. Examination of reports submitted under Article 16 of the Agreement
(COM.D/4 and addenda)

(a) General comments on reports

35. The representative of the European Economic Community pointed out that in the statistical summaries submitted by the United States (COM.D/4/Add.1) and, to a certain extent, the United Kingdom (COM.D/4), no clear distinction was made between cases which had been initiated before the beginning of the period under review and cases initiated in the course of the period. It was agreed to take these observations into account when discussing the future reporting procedure.

36. The representative of Norway said that the two cases referred to in the Norwegian report (COM.AD/4/Add.2) had been terminated without any decisions, at the request of the complainants after discussions between the parties concerned.

37. The representative of the United Kingdom asked whether the decision to continue to levy an anti-dumping duty in the case referred to in the Swedish report (COM.AD/4/Add.3) had been re-examined. The representative of Sweden replied that the decision had been re-examined and that the basic price in that connexion had been reduced.

(b) Examination of concrete cases

(i) Imports into the United States of potash

38. The representative of Canada recalled that the case of potash imports into the United States had been discussed at the previous meeting of the Committee (COM.AD/3, paragraphs 55-57). He said that a finding of sales at less than fair market value had been made in August 1969 and the case had been then referred to the Tariff Commission for an injury investigation. The representative of Canada put three questions to the delegation of the United States and the Committee:

1. He wished to know whether the general conduct of the case was in conformity with the undertaking of the United States to act in the spirit of the Code. He added that he was aware of the difficulties for the authorities concerned to follow the Code rules in cases initiated before 1 July 1968.
2. He asked whether the criteria used for the finding of sales at less than fair market value were reasonable and equitable in view of the fact that the United States authorities had refused to accept the domestic sales prices applied by the largest producer in Canada and had instead used the corresponding price of the second producer. The largest producer might in the future have to fix his export prices to the United States on the basis of domestic prices by his Canadian competitors which might lead him into trouble with the Canadian Anti-Combine Law. The case was an example of an unwarranted extra-territorial application of the United States Anti-Trust Law.

3. He asked whether the reluctance or failure by the United States authorities to terminate the case did not show incompatibility between United States legislation and the Code. In the case of one exporter, the volume of sales was clearly insignificant and the case should have been dismissed under Article 5(c) of the Code. All the Canadian exporters had, furthermore, offered price undertakings which would have made it possible to terminate the cases under Article 7 of the Code. The failure to use those possibilities of terminating the case showed in the Canadian opinion that the United States Anti-Dumping Act was applied in a punitive spirit.

39. The representative of the United States gave the following replies to the questions put by the representative of Canada:

1. The general conduct of the case was in the United States opinion in line with the undertakings given by the United States. The withholding of appraisement decision had been taken a few weeks before the entry into force of the Code. At that time the United States Government was under no obligation to apply the Code rules. The Commissioner of Customs was under the law obliged to withhold appraisement if he was convinced that sales had taken place at less than fair value. It was true, on the other hand, that the time until the final determination had been made had been too long. Serious efforts to speed up the procedures were being made.
2. It was correct that the home market price of the second manufacturer in Canada had been used as the basis for comparison in the case of the largest manufacturer. The reason was that an application of the normal rules of the United States Regulations would have led to a situation where for the largest manufacturer - because of his trade pattern - the third country export price would have been used while for the other manufacturers the home market prices would have been used. The result of such comparisons would have been that in the case of the largest manufacturer, there would have been no dumping, while for the other

manufacturers - who were selling both at home and for export at virtually the same prices - there would have been dumping. Such a result would have been preposterous and in order to avoid it, the home market price of the second manufacturer had been used.

3. With regard to the price undertakings, the representative of the United States pointed out the first undertakings offered had been completely meaningless. In March 1969, nine months after the withholding of appraisement decision, limited price assurances had been given by some of the producers. If proper undertakings had been made from the beginning, the case would have been terminated. The fact that it was not, could thus not in any way be interpreted as due to a punitive spirit.

40. The representative of the European Economic Community made the following comments on the three points raised by the representative of Canada:

1. It was irregular and not in conformity with international practice that a case which had been initiated two weeks before the entry into force of the Code had been left in suspense for so long.
2. It seemed that the United States authorities were prisoners of rigid criteria. The 25 per cent rule gave peculiar results. The measures were taken against exporters, not against countries. It was therefore illogical to take measures against the largest producer on the basis of sales of another producer.
3. The authorities were obviously free to accept or refuse price undertakings. It was not clear, however, why the United States authorities had refused to accept the undertakings because they had been offered after the decision on provisional measures. In the opinion of the representative of the Community, such undertakings could be accepted even after decisions on definitive measures.

41. The representative of Canada agreed with the representative of the Community with regard to the acceptance of price undertakings after a decision on provisional measures. In the particular case under discussion, there was also a question of

the form of the undertaking; it seemed reasonable to accept temporarily offers to discuss precise price commitments. He was gratified that no punitive spirit was involved on the United States side. With regard to the 25 per cent rule, he referred to the Canadian statement in paragraph 19 of COM.D/3. The question was obviously what was meant by "a sufficient number of sales". It seemed to him that the fact that the largest producer had supplied up to half the Canadian market with a product which was identical to the one exported to the United States, should be considered as fulfilling the "sufficient number of sales" criterion. He added that the question was of great importance for Canada, particularly because it raised constitutional issues.

42. The representative of the United States said that the question of the form of the price undertakings must be seen against the background of the representation of the party concerned. If the representative was a very sophisticated lawyer, the authorities were justified in demanding an undertaking in a proper form from the very beginning. If the applicant, on the other hand, was a layman, the authorities would be prepared to enter into discussions on the basis of an informal offer. A price undertaking could, in any case, not be accepted if it was made at the very last moment of the investigation procedure.

43. In reply to the comments by the representative of Canada regarding the position in future dumping cases of the largest potash manufacturer in Canada, the representative of the United States said that the United States authorities were actively investigating the ways of finding a formula whereby he would not be subject to anti-dumping measures because of the price policy of his competitors.

44. He stressed that the number of cases, to which the pre-Code regulations were still applicable was very limited: only two or three cases, where the withholding of appraisement decision had been taken before 1 July 1968.

45. The Chairman noted that there was not full agreement between the Governments of the United States and Canada on all points concerning the potash case. He suggested that the two Governments should continue their discussions bilaterally and report to the next meeting of the Committee on the outcome of their discussions. It was so agreed.

46. The representative of France recalled that, apart from Canada, also France and Germany were affected by the anti-dumping measures taken by the United States. There would be a public hearing on 9 October 1969, and the Government of France reserved the right to revert to the matter when the decision of the Tariff Commission was known.

(ii) Imports of pig-iron into the United States

47. The representative of Czechoslovakia pointed out that in the report by the United States (COM.AD/4/Add.1) there was mentioned a case of anti-dumping duties imposed on pig-iron from Czechoslovakia in 1968. He said that investigations made in Czechoslovakia on account of the anti-dumping action had shown that the exports to the United States had taken place at uneconomical prices. As a result exports had been stopped.

(iii) Imports of asbestos cement water piping into Greece

48. The representative of Czechoslovakia said that the definitive anti-dumping measures against imports from countries of Eastern Europe of certain asbestos cement water piping, listed under I(d) in the report by Greece (COM.AD/4/Add.5) were an old case, dating back to 1966. It was meaningless in so far as Czechoslovakia was concerned, as there had been no such exports from his country to Greece.

49. The representative of Greece took note of the statement by the representative of Czechoslovakia and said that he would bring it to the attention of the Greek authorities.

(iv) Imports of metal cables into Greece

50. The representative of Czechoslovakia said that the case of temporary anti-dumping measures against imports of metal cables from Czechoslovakia, referred to under II(a) in the report by Greece (COM.AD/4/Add.5), was not previously known to him. He assumed that the action had been taken quite recently and reserved the right to revert to it at the next meeting of the Committee.

D. Future reporting procedure

51. Taking into account the discussion on the reports submitted in 1969, the Committee adopted a standard form for reports to be submitted in the future under Article 16 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement. It was thus agreed that the future reports should contain summaries of anti-dumping cases under the following headings:

1. Cases pending as of 1 July of the year before the report is submitted.
2. Investigations opened.
3. Cases on which provisional action taken.
4. Cases on which final decision reached:
 - (a) anti-dumping duties imposed;
 - (b) cases settled through price undertakings;
 - (c) cases dismissed.
5. Revocation of anti-dumping duties.
6. Cases pending as of 30 June of the year the report is submitted.

52. It was further agreed that the reports should cover the period 1 July-30 June and should be submitted before 1 August.

53. Under headings 2-6, the cases should be split up in two categories:

- (i) cases where the proceedings were initiated before the beginning of the period covered by the report, and
- (ii) cases where the proceedings were initiated in the course of the period covered by the report.

54. The Committee agreed that it was desirable that as much detail as possible should be given regarding the nature of the products concerned and their origin. Such detail should always be given for cases under headings 3, 4 and 5.

55. Some members of the Committee suggested that a heading "Applications received for anti-dumping action" should be added between headings 1 and 2 in the standard form. Other members pointed out that it would be technically difficult for them

to give information under such a heading in view of the difficulty to define what constituted an application. It was agreed not to include such a heading in the standard form for the 1970 reports but to revert to the question at the 1970 meeting of the Committee.

E. Report by the Committee to the CONTRACTING PARTIES

56. The Committee agreed that after each annual meeting, it should submit a report on its activities in the past year to the CONTRACTING PARTIES. With regard to cases examined, it was agreed that statistical summaries would be included in the reports but that in order not to disclose any confidential information there would not be any references to names of suppliers or descriptions of products.

57. The representative of Japan suggested that the report to be submitted to the CONTRACTING PARTIES in 1969 should stress the desirability of as many contracting parties as possible adhering to the Code. It was so agreed.

58. It was agreed that a draft of the report to the CONTRACTING PARTIES should be distributed to the members of the Committee for approval. If it appeared that there were differences of opinion concerning any aspect of the draft report, the report would be submitted on the Chairman's responsibility.

F. Other business

59. The Committee noted that the secretariat had printed the text of the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI in the form of a booklet. The Committee considered that it would be useful to have the texts of the national laws and regulations submitted by the members of the Committee also printed. It asked the secretariat to investigate the possibilities of having these texts printed in the form of a booklet. If, for budgetary reasons, this would not be possible, they should be reproduced in a consolidated roneoed document.

60. The Committee noted that memoranda on administrative procedures in anti-dumping cases, of the kind suggested by the United Kingdom at the February meeting of the Committee (COM.AD/3, paragraph 63), had only been submitted by the United Kingdom (L/3176), Canada (COM.AD/5) and Norway (COM.AD/6). The Committee invited other governments to submit similar memoranda and agreed to examine the memoranda then submitted at its 1970 meeting.