The statement of Dr. Van Blankenstein should read as follows:

"Dr. H. VAN BLANKENSTEIN (Netherlands) said that in view of the discussion he would no longer oppose the continuation of the Bulletin. On the contrary, his delegation would ensure that the Secretariat would receive all the necessary documentation so that in future unofficial sources of information need not be relied upon. However, as many countries adhering to the General Agreement were not English or French speaking, the Secretariat might have difficulty in utilizing original information usually written in languages other than these. He would, however, put forward the general principle that news should be taken from official sources".

The statement in paragraph 2 was made by Mr. Eurico PENTEADO (Brazil) and not by Mr. Castro MENÊZES (Brazil).

Line 12: Insert "in the name" after "...Proposals" and before "of the United States......"

Line 14: Insert "but on the whole they were in a positive form" after "...possible action," and before "and would contrast......"

The remarks of Mr. AHMAD should read as follows:

"Mr. AZIZ AHMAD (Pakistan) stated that his Delegation generally supported the views expressed by the various speakers who were not in favour of piecemeal adoption of Articles from the Havana Charter. He said that the adoption of Articles 3, 4 and 6, as proposed by the Norwegian delegation, was likely to cause unnecessary complications without serving any useful practical purpose. He drew attention to Article 6, which referred to "The Organisation", which did not exist. He pointed out that the machinery required for the administration of this Article was non-existent, and, moreover, Article 6 in itself referred to other Articles of the Charter, not all of which were to be found in the Articles of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In the circumstances, therefore, his Delegation did not favour the adoption of these three Articles at this stage, in the manner suggested".