

CONTRACTING PARTIES
Third Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING
CP.3/SR22 - II/28

Held at Hotel Verdun, Annecy

on Wednesday, 8 June 1949, at 3.15 p.m.

CHAIRMAN: Hon. L.D. WILGRESS (Canada)

Subjects discussed:

1. Report on the negotiations affecting Schedule III between Brazil and United Kingdom and United States of America. [NOT REPRODUCED BELOW]
2. Report of Working Party 2 on date of decision on proposal of the Government of Ceylon. [NOT REPRODUCED BELOW]
3. Request of the Government of Czechoslovakia for a decision under Article XXIII.

Request of the Government of Czechoslovakia for a decision under Article XXIII as to whether or not the Government of the United States of America has failed to carry out its obligations under the Agreement through its administration of the issue of export licences. (cf.

Mr.HERRERA-ARANGO (Cuba) supported the United States proposal. He said that his personal experience in dealing with the United States Government had convinced him that the difficulties referred to by the Czechoslovakian representative were due to the rigour of the officials and their stringent way of administrating the issue of licences. The officials might be tenacious in their quests for information and were often hard

PARTIES should not decide upon the request, but should try to bring about an understanding between the two parties which

A vote was put by roll-call, as requested by the representative of Czechoslovakia, with the following results:

<u>1 affirmative:</u>	<u>17 Negatives:</u>	<u>3 Abstentions:</u>	<u>2 Absent:</u>
Czechoslovakia	Australia	India	Burma
	Belgium	Lebanon	Luxembourg
	Brazil	Syria	
	Canada		
	Ceylon		
	Chile		
	China.		
	Cuba		
	France		
	Netherlands		
	New Zealand		
	Norway		
	Pakistan		
	S. Rhodesia		
	South Africa		
	United Kingdom		
	United States		

Mr. HASNIE (Pakistan) explained his vote by saying that it was necessary for him to vote against the charge because this was not proved by factual evidence, and according to the principles of common law innocence would have to be presumed unless it was proved otherwise.

Mr. AUGENTHALER (Czechoslovakia) stated on behalf of his Government that it could not consider that the CONTRACTING PARTIES had made a legally valid decision or correct interpretation of the General Agreement. In consequence, his Government would regard itself free to take any steps necessary to protect its national interests. He enquired whether the decision could not be communicated to all members of the Interim Commission for the International Trade Organization, so that they would be informed of the interpretation given by the CONTRACTING PARTIES of the provisions of

ARTICLE XXI

UNITED STATES EXPORT RESTRICTIONS¹

II/28

Decision of 8 June 1949

The CONTRACTING PARTIES decided to reject the