Governments call on US, EC and Japan to conclude the Round

Pointing to the poor health of the world economy that has led to high unemployment and protectionist pressures, 37 governments led by Argentina recently called on the United States, the European Community and Japan to accord the highest priority to an early and successful conclusion to the Uruguay Round.

The appeal was contained in a letter President Carlos Menem, on behalf of the 37 governments, sent on 11 March to US President Bill Clinton, the EC Commission President Jacques Delors, Denmark's Prime Minister Paul Nyrrup Rasmussen (head of the EC Council) and Japan's Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa.

The 37 - a cross-section of developing and industrialised states - said "the future of the Round - indeed of the entire multilateral trading system - rests largely in the hands of the major economies". In emphasising that the Round "can stimulate world trade growth and economic recovery", they asked the major countries to "display leadership at this critical time and to give the Round the priority it clearly deserves".

The GATT Director-General, Mr. Arthur Dunkel, hailed the initiative as underscoring "how essential the Round is in terms of growth and employment for countries at every level of development."

The governments involved are Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Korea, Chile, Cyprus, Cuba, El Salvador, the Philippines, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Hong Kong, Hungary, Indonesia, Iceland, Malaysia, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Dominican Republic, Romania, Senegal, ...
cast a heavy cloud of uncertainty over the Uruguay Round negotiations and the GATT. It said that "practically all of the most active trading countries in steel are today affected, billions of dollars are involved, flows of trade and commercial relations between markets and enterprises have already been disrupted". Brazil warned that the US actions would seriously impede the country's privatization and trade liberalization programmes.

The European Community said the anti-dumping action was only the latest move in a US assault on the world steel market, recalling that in 1982, together with other steel exporters, it had accepted voluntary restraint arrangements (VRAs) highly advantageous to US steel producers. It asked whether an initiation of more than 80 anti-dumping and countervailing cases would be considered normal application of trade laws, and whether such action was the right thing to do at a time of world-wide recession.

Canada said the recent US action was another chapter in a history of special protection for the US steel industry, which had included safeguard action, VRAs and "Buy American" regulations. From 1984 to 1992, a period when the VRAs were in effect, Canada said the share of imports in the US steel market declined from 26 per cent to 18 percent, which did not justify the US anti-dumping and the countervailing actions.

Japan said that the anti-dumping action, as one of the first steps by the new US Administration, had drawn concern in many countries as a signal indicating the possible direction of trade policy. It maintained that the US action was unjustified because Japan's steel exports to the United States had been declining.

Mexico complained that aside from the preliminary duties, the United States had recently imposed definitive anti-dumping duties on Mexican steel cable. It said that in contrast, its trade liberalization programme had led to unprecedented growth in US steel exports to Mexico.

A number of countries complained of being included in the US actions despite their small market shares. Australia said that it had gone through costly proceedings to defend some 700 tons of steel exports. Australia said one of its producers was affected despite having only one third of one per cent of the US steel market. Sweden and Finland asked how their respective shares of 1.6 and 1.5 per cent of the US steel market could cause injury to US producers.

In reply, the United States stressed that Article VI of the GATT and the Anti-Dumping and Subsidies Codes explicitly permitted the imposition of special duties to counter injurious dumping or subsidization. It maintained that the preliminary countervailing duty and anti-dumping duty decisions announced by the US Department of Commerce on 30 November 1992 and 27 January 1993 were fully consistent with the GATT and the Codes' requirements. They were made after fully transparent investigations that were conducted in response to petitions by the competing US industry. The United States emphasized that the decisions in question were only preliminary and could still be overturned.

The world market for steel was extremely soft, according to the United States. This was why many producers were dumping and why their competitors were petitioning their countries to take anti-dumping and countervailing actions. One example, the United States said, was a recent 45 per cent dumping duty imposed by Mexico on US steel. It said its decisions on preliminary dumping margins were comparable to recent determinations made by Canada.

The United States said that while anti-dumping and countervailing actions did provide individual remedies, it believed that the best long-term solution to this world-wide problem would be to complete the negotiations of a multilateral steel agreement. It believed this agreement would effectively discipline the use of government subsidies and other trade barriers in the steel sector.

Panel on EC banana regime

Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Venezuela have been pursuing two complaints in the GATT against the European Community. The first concerns import restrictions on the fruit currently maintained by individual EC members. The second is about a Community-wide import regime on bananas that is intended to come into effect in July, and which the five countries say would curtail significantly their banana exports to the EC.

At the Council meeting, Director-General Arthur Dunkel, informed about his "good offices" efforts to find a solution to the first complaint. He recalled that in September 1992, he had accepted the request by the Latin-American banana exporters to intervene after having received the assurance of the full cooperation of the Community. Mr. Dunkel said he had suggested at the beginning of December 1992 that the formal good offices be suspended until 15 January 1993 to facilitate progress. In the meantime, he consulted informally with the parties.

Swaziland becomes 106th GATT member

The Council welcomed Swaziland as the 106th contracting party to GATT. It became a GATT member on 8 February 1993 under Article XXVI:5(c) of the General Agreement, following a notification by its Government to the GATT Director-General.

The Council approved the terms of the Draft Protocols of Accession for the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic, respectively, and the text of the corresponding decisions, which were submitted to a vote by the contracting parties.

The required number of affirmative votes, two-thirds of the contracting parties or 71 votes, was reached on 19 February. The two Protocols would enter into force and the two countries would become contracting parties on the thirtieth day after their acceptance of the Protocols.

The Council granted observer status to the Azerbaijan Republic. In its request to the contracting parties, Azerbaijian said that observership in the GATT would facilitate and speed up the processes of its transition to a market economy and its integration into the world economy.

Mr. Dunkel said that following a decision by the EC Council of Ministers (17 December 1992) concerning a new Community-wide banana import system, the informal consultations were terminated on 13 January 1993 at the request of the complainants. The following day, the formal "good offices" process resumed, and under the procedures, it was due to end at midnight on 10 February. (Note: under a 1966 GATT Decision on disputes involving developing countries, a panel is established without delay days if no solution is found in the "good offices" process and has to submit its findings within a period of sixty days.)

Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Venezuela stressed that under GATT procedures, they now were entitled to a panel. They charged that the good offices exercise failed as a result of a unilateral decision by the EC Council of Ministers, on 17 December 1992, to adopt the foundations of a common banana regime that would enter into force in July this year. They said the scheme would impose differentiated tariffs of 25 per cent for bananas within a 2 million ton quota and 225 per cent for imports over the quota, which would mean an immediate 30 per cent loss from their current levels.
The Council established a working party to examine the trade provisions of the fourth Lomé Convention between the European Community and the 69 ACP states, which entered into force on 1 September 1991. The Community said Lomé IV was a logical sequence to the previous Lomé Conventions that had already been examined in GATT.

Another working party was established to examine the EFTA-Israel Free Trade Agreement, which was signed in September 1992 and entered into force at the beginning of this year. This agreement aims to abolish tariffs and other restrictions on substantially all trade between the EFTA members and Israel.

The United States noted that the ASEAN members, at their January 1992 Summit, had concluded the "Agreement on the Common Effective Preferential Tariff (CEPT) Scheme for the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA)". It urged the ASEAN members to notify the new programme to the Council.

Malaysia, on behalf of Indonesia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, replied that they had already notified the CEPT Scheme to the Committee on Trade and Development, and that the Council would be undertaking consultations soon on this issue. Malaysia pledged to provide full information to the CTD as soon as it was available.

Poland, also on behalf of the Czech Republic, Hungary and the Slovak Republic, reported that their trade ministers had signed the Central European Free Trade Agreement on 21 December 1992 in Krakow, Poland. This agreement was expected to take effect on 1 March 1993. It provided for the elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers over eight years to substantially all trade among the signatories. Poland said the agreement, upon ratification, would be duly notified to GATT.

Under "other business", Canada, Mexico and the United States informed the Council that their intensive negotiations for the establishment of the North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA) had culminated in the signing of the NAFTA agreement on 17 December 1992. They stressed that NAFTA was consistent with GATT provisions and promised to fully notify the agreement upon ratification. Many countries said they would participate actively in a future GATT examination of this trade arrangement.

New trade agreements

The United States supported the right of the Latin-American exporters to a panel on the EC regulations in force. It urged the Community to respect GATT rules in establishing the future EC banana regime.

At the end of the debate, the Council Chairman, Ambassador András Szepesi (Hungary), asked the EC whether it could agree to the establishment of a panel on the existing banana regime.

The Community said that strictly-speaking, the panel would have to be established at the next Council meeting. However, it was acutely aware of the need for the proper functioning of the GATT dispute-settlement mechanism, and would not stand in the way of a procedure that had a high degree of automatism. The EC added that while it could agree to the establishment of a panel in principle, more time would be needed for determining the panel's terms of reference and membership.

The Director-General then formally confirmed that after a number of consultations with the parties individually and collectively, he had, to his regret, no mutually satisfactory solution to propose.

The Council established a panel to examine the existing EC banana regime. It agreed to revert to the issue of the incoming EC regime at its next meeting.

US restraint on Brazilian suits

Brazil complained that the United States had not abided by recommendations of the Textiles Surveillance Body (TSB) with respect to their dispute over US quantitative restrictions on men's and boy's wool suits from Brazil imposed in April 1992. It said it had brought this dispute twice last year to the TSB, which had recommended on both occasions that Brazil should be "treated with equity" in relation to other suppliers of the products in question. Brazil said the United States had erroneously chosen to interpret "equity" in a general sense and thus had refused to lift the restraint on the Brazilian products. While Brazil's aim remained securing a mutually acceptable solution, it also wanted the Director-General, in an ex-officio capacity, to use his good offices to help find a solution to this dispute.

The United States said it had made four separate proposals to resolve the dispute but had received, so far, only one proposal from Brazil, and that was for the United States simply to rescind the measure. It suggested that the Council defer further discussion on the matter until the TSB had completed its review.

Noting Brazil's request, the Director-General agreed to consult with the two parties but first urged them to try to resolve the matter bilaterally.

Other matters

The Council also took up the following:

- **US agricultural waiver.** The United States presented its latest regular report on its support programmes for commodities covered by a GATT waiver granted in 1955. It said it remained ready to tarry its non-tariff barriers in the agriculture sector as part of the final Uruguay Round package.

- **Follow-up of panel reports.** The United States submitted a status report on its efforts to implement the panel report on US measures on beer. Canada said it expected the United States to comply with the panel's recommendations by the summer. Brazil again urged the United States to deal with a panel's conclusion that a US countervailing action did not provide for m.f.n. treatment.
on Brazilian non-rubber footwear.

• Report of the Working Party on German Unification. In an unusual roll-call vote in December 1990, the Contracting Parties granted the European Community a waiver to transitional trade measures related to the unification of Germany before establishing a working party to examine the measures (see Focus No. 77). After the presentation of the report by the chairman of the Working Party, Deputy Director-General Charles Carlisle, the EC indicated it might come back to the Council on this matter in the near future.

• EC's renegotiations of oilseeds concessions. Argentina complained about what it said was the unwillingness of the EC to conclude these negotiations. Canada, Uruguay, Brazil, India and Pakistan expressed similar concerns. The EC said it hoped to resume the negotiations soon.

• Derestriction of documents. The United States called for a Secretariat study on ways of streamlining GATT policy on this matter. It noted that the Council Chairman, at the 48th Session of the Contracting Parties, had pointed to rising demands by the press, business, academic institutions and the general public for current and more comprehensive information on the activities of GATT.

The following are excerpts from an address by GATT Deputy Director-General Charles R. Carlisle to the National Wildlife Federation's "Synergy '93" meeting on 26 January 1993 in Washington, D.C.:

There are several important questions on the issue of trade and the environment that need to be addressed by the international community:

First, should trade restrictions be used to inhibit "production pollution"? By "production pollution" I mean the pollution that arises from making something, as distinct from "consumption pollution", which arises from the use of a product.

The GATT allows trade restrictions on products whose use or very presence causes pollution. But there is nothing in the GATT or in the draft Uruguay Round text which permits trade restrictions based on production methods.

The following are excerpts from an address by GATT Deputy Director-General Charles R. Carlisle to the National Wildlife Federation's "Synergy '93" meeting on 26 January 1993 in Washington, D.C.:

Trade and the environment

There are several important questions on the issue of trade and the environment that need to be addressed by the international community:

First, should trade restrictions be used to inhibit "production pollution"? By "production pollution" I mean the pollution that arises from making something, as distinct from "consumption pollution", which arises from the use of a product.

The GATT allows trade restrictions on products whose use or very presence causes pollution. But there is nothing in the GATT or in the draft Uruguay Round text which permits trade restrictions based on production methods.

Second, if trade measures are to be used to enforce production pollution standards, who should set those standards? Individual governments, or the international community, acting through negotiated agreements?

If production and process standards are to be enforced by trade restrictions then those standards, I believe, will have to be agreed internationally. And GATT is not the organization in which those standards should be negotiated; that has to be done in international bodies possessing competence on environmental matters.

Third, to what extent should environmental standards be harmonized internationally? This question takes us of course to the level-playing-field argument. If environmental standards in country X are much more lenient than those in country Y, will not producers in X have a competitive advantage over those in Y, and will not producers in Y move plants to take advantage of less demanding regulations?

Perhaps some would argue for harmonization at the highest possible level, but both instinct and experience say that is not negotiable. Indeed, I noticed that the U.S. Vice President, in his best-seller, *Earth in the Balance*, speaking about "a new generation of international agreements", says, "these agreement must be especially sensitive to the vast differences of capability and need between developed and undeveloped nations".

Fourth, should the trade provisions of international environmental agreements be applied to non-signatories with GATT rights? These agreements have trade provisions for good reasons. Of course the signatories can agree to whatever they wish, but problems can arise when those trade provisions are applied to non-signatories.

Fifth, and finally, are trade restrictions the right way or the best way to enforce environmental standards? Many professional economists will argue that trade restrictions should not be used for such a purpose or used only rarely and as a last resort; money and the transfer of technology are, in their view, the preferred options.

All countries have a vital stake in strong environmental protection and thank heaven that organizations like yours are fighting hard for this goal. But it is also very much in the interest of the international community that the Uruguay Round end successfully.

The question, it seems to me, is not which interest is paramount but how can they be reconciled? What we need to do is to forge a constructive and mutually supporting alliance between trade liberalization on the one hand and environmental protection on the other. That will not be an easy task but if we talk and reason with each other, it can be done. •

**PEOPLE**

The Council welcomed three new representatives to the GATT: Ambassadors José Urrutia (Peru), Linda Bautista (the Philippines) and Augustin Karamage (Rwanda).

The Chairman announced the following appointments for 1993: Mr. Peter Witt (Germany) as Chairman of the Committee on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions; Amb. K. Kesavana (Singapore) as Chairman of the Committee on Budget, Finance and Administration; Amb. Ernesto Tironi Barrios (Chile) and Mr. Johannes Potocnik (Austria) as, respectively, Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Tariff Concessions.

The following designations were also announced: Amb. Christer Manhusen (Sweden) as Chairman of the Working Party on the Accession of Ecuador; and Amb. Jesús Seade (Mexico) as Chairman of the Working Party on the Free-Trade Agreements between Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and Finland.
The Council held its first two reviews for 1993, under the Trade Policy Review Mechanism (TPRM), on 11-12 January for Poland and on 16-17 February for the Philippines.

The following are excerpts from the Council Chairman’s summaries of the discussions. The complete TPRM reports on the two countries will be available from the GATT Secretariat soon.

**POLAND**

The representative of Poland recalled that his country had taken a “shock-therapy” road to reform. This had resulted in significant social costs, with initial high, corrective inflation, a deep recession and high unemployment. But it appeared that the corner was being turned, with industrial growth resuming in 1992 and other business indicators showing signs of improvement.

Foreign trade was vital in Poland’s transformation to a market economy. Policies pursued from the outset, based on the elimination of the State monopoly of foreign trade, convertibility of the zloty for current payments and liberalization of administrative barriers to trade, recognized that deficiencies in the system could be best identified if the economy was exposed to the full and unrestrained impact of external competition.

Poland believed that its trade framework should be firmly based in the GATT. It therefore sought a renegotiation of its Protocol of Accession which would be fully commensurate with GATT rules. Poland’s international integration efforts were also reflected in the conclusion of bilateral agreements with European partners. The association agreement with the European Community recognized Poland’s aim to become a member of the EC: free-trade agreements concluded with the EFTA countries and with the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia would soon come into effect. In this context, Poland was convinced that the trade creation effects of such agreements would dominate.

The establishment of the tariff as the main trade policy measure had shown the sensitivity of economic actors to market signals. During the transformation period, Poland sought to use the tariff flexibly, implying some adjustments on a limited number of rates as well as occasional use of partial, time-bound suspensions. However, Poland’s aim was to institute a stable, predictable tariff structure in the longer term. For balance-of-payments reasons, a surcharge of 6% on nearly all goods was imposed in December 1992, on a non-discriminatory basis. The rate was to decline to 3% in 1994, for elimination by the end of that year.

**Radical economic reforms**

All participants stated their appreciation for the radical economic reforms undertaken by Poland. Many of the basic institutions of a market economy had already been established and a substantial part of the economy was already functioning according to market principles. Basically sound macroeconomic policies were being complemented by deregulation, market opening and the first steps in implementation of a potentially far-reaching privatization programme. These measures had been undertaken despite an unfavourable international economic environment, including the virtual collapse of trade with the countries of the former CMEA.

Council members strongly commended the trade liberalization that had taken place in Poland. The State monopoly and direct regulation of trade had been eliminated, and the private sector already accounted for some 60 per cent of imports.

The tariff was now the main trade policy instrument; little use was made of import licensing, quotas or other measures.

Several members expressed concern about the move towards greater protection shown in the tariff changes made in August 1991 and February 1992; the import surcharge introduced in December 1992; increased coverage of import licensing; and the planned introduction of variable levies in agriculture. Poland was encouraged to conclude the renegotiation of its Protocol of Accession based on bound tariffs, which would increase the stability of its trade regime and confirm its intention to found its trade system firmly on the rules and principles of the GATT. In this connection, Poland was urged to submit its Uruguay Round market access offer, which would provide further evidence of its increasing integration into the world economy.

Participants generally regarded Poland’s recent conclusion of an Association agreement with the EC, and free-trade agreements with the EFTA countries and the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia, as positive developments: some members felt that the agreements could assist in the transformation of Poland’s economy. However,
there was concern that the agreements might lead to trade diversion.

Participants raised a number of specific questions and concerns:

- Frequent changes in tariffs and other trade-related policy instruments, together with the absence of bound tariffs, a lack of transparency in distributing import quotas and granting import licences, and the existence of a substantial trade bureaucracy were negatively affecting the stability, transparency and predictability of the trade régime;
- It was noted that the introduction of a minimum price system covering some agricultural products and the proposal to create a variable import levy system in agriculture - whose appropriateness could be questioned - could harm the interests of Poland's trade partners;
- concern about the zero-duty tariff quota established under the EC-Poland Interim Agreement for imports of cars, which they regarded as discriminatory and restrictive; and
- Poland was encouraged to increase the number of standards based on internationally accepted norms; to liberalize restrictive aspects of its type approval procedures in the pharmaceuticals and telecommunications sectors; and to join the Tokyo Round TBT and Government Procurement Codes.

Committed to market economy

In response, the representative of Poland said that Poland intended to conclude the renegotiation of its terms of accession to the GATT, and accept the remaining Tokyo Round agreements, in order to support the market-oriented evolution of its trade policies. Poland attached importance to the major GATT principles of predictability, transparency and non-discrimination in trade policies. The renegotiation of Poland's GATT Protocol of Accession, and its involvement in regional trading arrangements, contributed to its observance of these principles.

Readjustments in Poland's tariff in August 1991, and subsequent modest changes, should be seen in relation to the radical liberalization of trade policies undertaken in 1990 and the virtual non-existence of non-tariff barriers in Poland. The representative of Poland added that several measures had been taken in order to:

- reduce the number of natural calamities combined with political and economic uncertainties.

Conclusions

Members of the Council expressed their admiration for the scope and pace of the fundamental economic reforms undertaken to date by Poland, and its achievements so far in progress towards a market economy. Poland's sacrifice and determination appeared to be showing initial results in terms of resumption of economic growth and development. Members encouraged Poland to continue a consistent policy of macro- and microeconomic reform, to pursue open, stable non-discriminatory trade policies and to resist all protectionist pressures.

The agreements concluded by Poland with European trading partners were welcomed; at the same time, many felt that steps should be taken to minimize any trade-diverting effects vis-à-vis third parties. It was emphasized that Poland's Uruguay Round market access offer could make an important contribution to the predictability, stability and non-discriminatory nature of Poland's trade policy. It was also stressed that, for a successful transition to a market economy, a more supportive external environment was crucial; in this respect, a successful conclusion to the Uruguay Round would play a major rôle.

High tariff bindings urged

Participants welcomed the tariff reforms undertaken, under which the simple average had dropped significantly from 41 per cent in 1981 to some 25 per cent currently, falling further to 20 per cent by 1995, and the tariff structure had been simplified. However, the present level was still significant and peaks remained; tariff escalation remained substantial, and the traditional anti-export bias of previous trade policies would be only partially corrected by the scheduled tariff cuts. Questions were also raised concerning the reasons why 208 strategic items were not included in the Uruguay Round.

Members appreciated the Uruguay Round offer by the Philippines to raise its level of tariff bindings to 37 per cent, from the current 7 per cent of tariff lines, but urged that the level be increased further as a means of ensuring the stability and permanence of reforms. The publication of reports on Tariff Commission hearings would also increase transparency, both domestically and internationally.

Members commended the widespread
A heavy crane on the Manila docks: under an import liberalization programme, the Philippines has removed restrictions on some 2,700 products since 1981. (ILO Photo)

The liberalization of quantitative restrictions made by the Philippines since 1981, and the recent steps to tariffication of some remaining quantitative restrictions. Clarification was requested on the rationale for the maintenance of restrictions on 69 items as well as the timetable for liberalization of the other 66 items. Licensing procedures were described as cumbersome, and additional streamlining was urged. Concern was expressed over the increase in duties for beef and other meat products in connection with tariffication.

Participants welcomed the statement that the Home Consumption Value (HCV) method of import valuation was being reviewed and urged a rapid conclusion to the legislative process. The Philippines was the only contracting party now employing such a procedure. The HCV method, which established arbitrarily high and unpredictable customs values, should be rapidly replaced with procedures based on transaction value.

Details of the recent ASEAN CEPT agreement, signed in 1992, were requested by members, as well as schedules of specific tariff concessions and information on possible trade diversion effects. A number of participants sought notification of the CEPT, and of the ASEAN Free Trade Agreement, under the relevant provisions of the General Agreement, with a view to permitting a full examination by contracting parties.

On sectoral issues, questions were raised on the rationale for trade-balancing restrictions on coal; the justification for tariff peaks on imports of chemicals, machinery, footwear, furniture and other products; and the effects of recently introduced phytosanitary procedures affecting fresh fruit. Members also requested information on tariff and non-tariff measures applied to oilseeds, meats, live animals and processed foods. Questions were raised on the use of local content requirements in connection with the Car Development Programme, and a possible timetable for their elimination.

The Philippine reply

The representative of the Philippines noted that the existence of an anti-export bias could not be inferred only from the negative effective protection rates for exportable products, as present methodologies for such computations relied on a number of simplifying assumptions. The authorities were nonetheless continuously reviewing the tariff structure.

New legislation would be required to make any changes in the system of customs valuation and the use of Home Consumption Value. Importers, who believed that valuation had not been carried out properly, could seek redress from the Appeals Board. Two bills, currently with Congress, recommended a change in the valuation system.

The proposed increase in the scope of tariff bindings from 7 to 37 per cent constituted a significant undertaking for a developing country like the Philippines. The level of ceiling bindings was still being reviewed. Escalation in tariffs on manufacturing had been reduced; the number of items with a 50 per cent tariff would be cut to 208 agricultural and manufactured items by 1995.

Fertilizer imports had been liberalized. The only regulated items in agriculture were rice, corn, and pesticides. The prohibition of imports of onions, garlic, potatoes and cabbage, except for seedling purposes, was under review.

The domestic price of cars in the Philippines was one of the most competitive in the region, despite high taxes. The sector provided direct employment of around 9,000, and some 100,000 in the parts and other ancillary industries. There were no fiscal incentives under the Car Development Programme. Local content arrangements would be brought into conformity with the TRIMS agreement once the Uruguay Round was concluded.

The ASEAN Heads of Government, meeting in Singapore in 1992, had recognized that intra-ASEAN economic cooperation should be further enhanced. It was agreed that an ASEAN Free Trade Area, or AFTA, be established within 15 years to attain this objective. Although the CEPT or the AFTA might cause some trade diversion, it would also potentially lead to trade creation stemming from the high growth in the ASEAN region.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the Council welcomed the statements made by the delegation of the Philippines. It encouraged the authorities to pursue the process of trade reform and liberalization which had been underway for some time. The Philippines' active participation in GATT and the Uruguay Round was fully recognized; an open, dynamic multilateral trading system, and a successful outcome of the Round, were seen as crucial to the continuation of the reform process.

TPRM

The following is a tentative schedule of upcoming trade policy reviews in the GATT:

Bolivia . . . . 29-30 March
Mexico . . . . 19-20 April
European Community . . 17-18 April
South Africa . . 1-2 June
Kenya and Malaysia . . . 5-8 July
Uruguay Round
(Continued from page 1)

Singapore, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The following is the text of President Meném’s letter:

"On behalf of the (37 governments), I am writing to urge that the highest priority be accorded efforts to bring the Uruguay Round to an early and successful conclusion.

World leaders cannot but be concerned at the poor health of the global economy, which has led to continued high levels of unemployment and mounting protectionist pressures. A successful Uruguay Round can do much to help reverse these disturbing trends. By further reducing barriers to trade and strengthening and extending the coverage of multilateral disciplines, it will provide a much needed boost to business confidence, so vital to investment and the further growth of international trade. It will also encourage and stimulate the autonomous trade liberalisation underway in many countries, particularly in many developing countries and also in countries making the transition to market economies.

A successful Uruguay Round should also take into account the needs of developing countries, in particular the least developed among them, as embodied in the

Beef exports declining

Uncertain economic prospects and changing diets are exacting their toll on the world beef market. The total value of world beef exports decreased by 2 to 3% in 1992, due mainly to falling shipments from the EC and Argentina. For 1993, exporters face a similar decline.

These are among the conclusions of the International Markets for Meat 1992/1993 published by the GATT Secretariat in February (available in English, French or Spanish, SwF 25.). It examines trends in production, consumption and trade of beef and veal, and summarizes developments in pigmeat, poultry meat and sheepmeat.
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GATT CALENDAR

The following is a tentative schedule of meetings in the GATT:

On call Trade Negotiations Committee

APRIL

1-2 Textiles Surv. Body
Cttee. on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions (Poland and Turkey)

15-16 WP on Accession of Chinese Taipei

19-20 WP on Acc. of Honduras Council TPRM: Mexico

22-23 WP on Acc. of Slovenia

Week Cttee. on Anti-Dumping; of 26 Cttee. on Subsidies

MAY

5 Cttee. on Customs Valuation

11 Cttee. on Technical Barriers to Trade

12-13 GATT Council

17-18 Council TPRM: The EC

JUNE

1-2 TPRM: South Africa

16-17 GATT Council

18 Int’l Meat Council

In February, the GATT Secretariat organized a regional workshop in Bangkok for some 40 officials from 18 Asian countries. Financed by the Government of Japan, the workshop aimed at facilitating more effective participation of developing countries in the concluding phase of the Uruguay Round. Shown above are Miss Sukon Kanchanalai, Director-General of Business Economics, Ministry of Commerce of Thailand, and Mr. David Hartridge and Mr. Raymond Krommenacker of the GATT Secretariat.