The statement by the representative of the United Kingdom should read:

"Miss Lough (United Kingdom) stated that the position of her delegation was the same as stated last year and on earlier occasions. The United Kingdom did not consider it timely for the CONTRACTING PARTIES to undertake further study of the possibility of instituting control of restrictive business practices in international trade. That was not to say that the GATT was not the right organization to initiate such a study when the time was ripe. Her Government still doubted whether the harm which such practices caused to international trade was, or was likely to be, as serious as some delegations had suggested; they found support for this view in the memorandum, which noted, inter alia, that most countries had adopted a pragmatic approach to restrictive practices and considered that their effects were not always harmful. Her Government also believed that it was not practicable at present to attempt to draw up an international code or rules for action, since national policies and experience varied so greatly. Here again the memorandum seemed to confirm the United Kingdom's doubts. It showed that most national legislation was of a recent nature. The Governments concerned, like the United Kingdom Government, would be unable to judge for some time precisely what the effect of their legislation would be. She thought that, until countries had the necessary experience of their own legislation, they could not be expected to agree whether international control was desirable, or, if it was, what the objectives and machinery for such control should be. As regards the new Norwegian proposal for setting up a group of experts rather than a working party, this seemed particularly unrealistic since the memorandum had shown the extent of studies in recent years and more theoretical studies would not take the CONTRACTING PARTIES any further forward. A group of experts acting on individual responsibility might well produce a theoretically perfect scheme, but one which would be unlikely to be acceptable to some countries without whose participation an international agreement would have no real value. Moreover, it had to be remembered that the CONTRACTING PARTIES were going to be extremely busy during the next year or so on matters which seemed to her delegation to be more urgent than this one. For all these reasons, she proposed that the CONTRACTING PARTIES should defer their consideration of this subject."
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In the third sentence of the statement by Mr. PAPPANO (United States) "CECA" should read "JSCSC".
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The speaker for the United States should read "Mr. PAPPANO".
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In the third sentence of the first paragraph the phrase "type and tenure of the insurance" should read: "type and terms of the insurance".