1. Opening the debate, the Chairman said that, as stated in the airgram concerning the meeting, the texts which had emerged in the negotiations, including alternative texts, as well as the summing-ups by the Chairmen of Groups and Sub-Groups at their latest meetings were before the Committee. For a check list of documents before the Committee, see MTN/W/40. The texts of the summing-ups are contained in Annex I to the present document.

2. The Chairman went on to refer to five general points relating to the final provisions in a number of texts on which the Chairmen of the relevant Groups and Sub-Groups had asked the Chairman of the Trade Negotiations Committee to hold informal consultations. These related to:

   (a) acceptance of instruments by governments having provisionally acceded to the GATT;
   (b) accession to instruments by non-contracting parties;
   (c) acceptance of instruments in respect of territories for which contracting parties have international responsibility;
   (d) the proposal that the words "after adoption by the Trade Negotiations Committee" be inserted in the paragraph on acceptance, and
   (e) the proposal that instruments should enter into force when two thirds of the participants in the MTN have accepted them.

The Chairman said that, after consultations with delegations, he was able to make suggestions with regard to the first three of these points but that his consultations on the other two points had not produced generally acceptable suggestions. He added that delegations might wish to speak on these two points in their statements (see also paragraphs 18 to 22 below).

3. The Chairman suggested that point (a) above might be dealt with through the insertion of a sub-paragraph in the Final Provisions of each Agreement as follows:
"This Agreement shall be open for acceptance by signature or otherwise by governments having provisionally acceded to the GATT, on terms related to the effective application of rights and obligations under this Agreement, which take into account rights and obligations in the instruments providing for their provisional accession."

and that this sub-paragraph might be incorporated in the final texts of the Agreements as a rectification of a purely formal character.

4. The Chairman also suggested that the following statement on point (b) above might be included in the record of the present meeting:

"The relevant articles in the Final Provisions of each Agreement provide that the Agreement will be open to accession by a government which is not a contracting party on terms related to the effective application of rights and obligations under the Agreement to be agreed between that government and the Parties to the Agreement. It is understood that the purpose or aim of the negotiations on terms would be to secure an overall parity of rights and obligations as between Parties to the Agreement which are contracting parties to the GATT and those that are not, taking into account the particular situation of individual countries as relevant, for example, to their development, financial and trade needs. Thus the basis of the negotiations would be that a Party which is not a contracting party to the GATT shall not directly or indirectly nullify or impair advantages which accrue to other Parties under the Agreement by taking action which, had it been a contracting party to the GATT, it would have been debarred from taking by virtue of its GATT obligations. Likewise, a Party which is a contracting party to the GATT shall not directly or indirectly nullify or impair advantages which accrue to other Parties under the Agreement by taking action which it would be debarred from taking by virtue of its GATT obligations, had the other Parties in question been contracting parties to the GATT."

5. With regard to point (c) above, the Chairman suggested that, as part of the process for dealing with formal rectification of the texts, the paragraph on dependent territories be deleted in each of the Agreements in which it occurred and be replaced by the following text:

"In regard to acceptance, the provisions of Article XXVI:5(a) and (b) of the General Agreement would be applicable."

6. The statements made by delegations during the general debate or received in writing for inclusion in the present document are reproduced in Annex II:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual points

7. One delegation made the following specific proposals:

(a) that the Committee recommend to participants to make advance implementa-
tion of tariff concessions for products of export interest to all
developing countries as an exception to the general rule for the
staging of reductions;

(b) that it be understood that all offers of tariff concessions made by
11 April 1979 in respect of products of interest to developing
countries could not be withdrawn in the continuation of the tariff
negotiations after that date; and

(c) that the Valuation Code with the amendments contained in
MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1 should be the document to be attached to
the Procès-Verbal since it had the support of a large majority.
8. During the discussion that followed, a number of delegations of developing countries expressed their support for these proposals. Delegations of some developed countries stated that they would be prepared to examine the first two proposals sympathetically and endeavour to work to implement them. One delegation said that it had been ready to negotiate the most rapid implementation possible under its legislation, where adequate contributions had been forthcoming. The discussion on the third proposal is reflected in paragraphs 12-17 below.

9. The Chairman concluded that delegations were satisfied to deal with points (a), (b) and (c) set out in paragraph 2 above as suggested in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5. One delegation said that they would submit a written statement setting out their position regarding point (c). This statement is reproduced in Annex II.

10. The Chairman noted that there were two texts on anti-dumping. Some delegations said that the texts before the Committee should not be considered as final and that negotiations should continue on this subject. Other delegations took the view that work should continue in the Anti-Dumping Committee, which should be open to non-signatories for this purpose. After a short discussion, it was left that both texts should be annexed to the Procès-Verbal and that talks should continue in order to find a solution which would be mutually acceptable.

11. The Chairman noted that there were also two texts of the Dairy Arrangement, one of which still contained square brackets and reservations. The Chairman said that the secretariat would examine, in consultation with delegations maintaining proposals or reservations, how the difficulties in the text of Annex C of MTN/DP/8 arising out of the existence of brackets or alternative proposals could best be dealt with.

12. The Chairman noted that two texts had emerged from the negotiations on customs valuation.

13. Some delegations suggested that both the text contained in MTN/NTM/W/229/Rev.1 and that text as amended by MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1 be annexed to the Procès-Verbal. Some delegations reiterated the suggestion made during the general debate that only the text contained in MTN/NTM/W/229/Rev.1 should be annexed to the Procès-Verbal and that outstanding proposals on this text should be referred to the Valuation Committee to be set up under the agreement for examination during the major review to be held four years after the agreement comes into affect, bearing in mind that developing countries may delay the application of the provisions of the Agreement for up to five years. Some delegations repeated the proposal set out in paragraph 7(c) above that only the second of the texts be annexed, some delegations adding that this text might be given a four-year trial. Some delegations suggested that neither text be annexed but that a decision should be taken to pursue the negotiations in this area.
14. During the discussion, the question was raised as to how a decision should be taken on this issue. Some delegations said that the Trade Negotiations Committee could only proceed on the basis of consensus. Some delegations said that the MTN was not a general diplomatic conference, that no agreement was being forced on any government but that on the other hand the Committee could not prevent a number of countries from entering into an agreement if they wished to, unless the provisions of the agreement were contrary to the GATT. Some countries stated that the CONTRACTING PARTIES would have to examine the consistency of the agreements with the General Agreement.

15. A number of more general points were also made. For example, some delegations said that in their view the negotiations in certain key areas of interest to them could not be considered as concluded.

16. Towards the end of the discussion one delegation made it clear that it would not wish to be associated with a decision to annex two texts on customs valuation to the Procès-Verbal. It was pointed out by another delegation that a situation in which two agreements came into operation would be an improvement on the present situation in which a larger number of different valuation systems were in use.

17. Summing up, the Chairman noted that two texts had emerged from the negotiations and that, in recognition of this fact, they would both be annexed to the Procès-Verbal on an equal footing. He said that this would not mean that efforts to find a solution to outstanding problems would stop, noting that governments would have time to pursue their efforts to avoid a less than satisfactory outcome in this area since the date for entry into force in both texts was 1 January 1981.

18. The Chairman then asked if delegations wished to make further statements on the proposal that the words after adoption by the Trade Negotiations Committee be inserted in the final provisions of agreements before the Committee. The Chairman also reverted to the proposal that the agreements should enter into force when accepted by two thirds of the participants in the negotiations.

19. Some delegations spoke in support of these proposals. Several other delegations opposed the proposals. Some delegations took the view that governments wishing to enter into the agreements were not imposing anything on other governments but simply moving to higher levels of discipline. Some delegations stressed that no government's existing rights under the General Agreement would be affected by the entry into force of the agreements. Some delegations while not supporting the specific proposal stressed that the widest possible number of countries should accept the agreements. Some delegations said that any group of countries could have annexed to the Procès-Verbal agreements reached among themselves as long as these agreements were not inconsistent with the General Agreement. This line of argument was not accepted by some delegations who said that two countries could make a bilateral agreement but that this should not be regarded as a part of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations. Some delegations took the view that such agreements formed part of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations to the extent that they built upon the GATT.
20. One delegation said that, while important concerns had been raised, it was difficult to discuss the question in general terms since each agreement was different, going on to suggest that the question of the entry into force of each of the agreements must be discussed at some point and that this could be done at the level of the CONTRACTING PARTIES.

21. In conclusion, the Chairman noted that there were divergent views and that delegations would have taken note of the questions which had been raised and the different opinions which had been expressed and would reflect on them for the future.

22. The Chairman then asked if there were other points which delegations wished to raise. Delegations from least developed countries stated that the objectives of paragraph 6 of the Tokyo Declaration had not been fulfilled and referred to the specific proposals made earlier in the present meeting of the Committee (See page 117 et seq). The Chairman said that every point would be followed up in all appropriate fora, giving examples of points which were already being taken up.

23. The Chairman then placed the text of the Procès-Verbal contained in MTN/28 and Corr.1 before the Committee. Having ascertained that this text created no difficulties, the Chairman said that it would be available in the GATT Council Room from 11 a.m. on 12 April 1979, without time-limit.

24. In answer to a question the Chairman said that reservations on the texts could be expressed either then or later.
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2. It invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend this session of the Sub-Group as an observer.

3. In the same way as its last session, it invited the Central Secretariat of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the Central Office of the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) to attend this session of the Sub-Group in an expert capacity.

4. The Sub-Group noted document MTN/NTM/W/226 on the results of the Second International Conference on Recognition of National Programs for Testing Laboratories (ILAC/78) and agreed that once the text of the Agreement became public it might be communicated to ILAC.

5. The Sub-Group considered the revised text of the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade in MTN/NTM/W/192/Rev.4 and Corr.1.

6. Some delegations made points on a number of specific provisions in the text. One delegation stated, with reference to Articles 7.2 and 9.3, that it was their understanding that access relating to the use of any "standard mark" may be subject to the condition that the government of the suppliers' country accepts the responsibility for preventing the misuse of the standard mark.

7. The Sub-Group noted that any grant of technical assistance under Article 11 of the Agreement could include financial implications.

8. The Sub-Group discussed the provisions in the Agreement relating to non-contracting parties. The Chairman made a statement based on informal consultations with a number of delegations from developed and developing countries, on the aim of
the negotiations foreseen in Article 15.2 and on a possible basis for these negotiations. At the request of the Sub-Group this statement is issued in MTN/NTM/W/230. The Sub-Group noted that the matters dealt with in this statement might be pursued in informal consultations.

9. The Sub-Group agreed to insert a number of amendments in the text of the Agreement. A revision of the text, which is issued on the responsibility of the Chairman and which incorporates the agreed amendments, is contained in MTN/NTM/W/192/Rev.5.

10. Delegations reserved the right to propose amendments to the French and Spanish texts in order to bring these into line with the English text.

11. Many delegations welcomed the text and a number of delegations stressed that it would form an important part of the global package in the negotiations. Many delegations stated that the text formed a reasonable compromise and a balanced whole. Many delegations stated that, taken as a whole, the text represented the most that could be achieved by way of a negotiated solution in this area and that the Sub-Group had carried the work on it as far as it could.

12. It was noted that the only remaining differences of view on the text in the Sub-Group, which related to procedural questions raised by certain paragraphs in the Final Provisions, were of a general nature and not specifically related to technical barriers to trade. Some delegations proposed that Article 15.1 be amended by the insertion of "after being adopted by the Trade Negotiations Committee" after "This Agreement shall." Some delegations proposed that, in Article 15.1, the words "and by governments having provisionally acceded" be inserted after "hereinafter referred to as 'the GATT'." Many delegations said that it would be desirable for the largest possible number of governments to join the Agreement. One delegation proposed that, in Article 15.5, the words "provided that by such date no less than two thirds of the total number of States parties to the Multilateral Trade Negotiations have accepted or acceded to the Agreement" be inserted after "1 January 1980". The Chairman stated that these differences of views would be drawn to the attention of the Chairman of the Trade Negotiations Committee, the body responsible for the overall conduct of the negotiations, with the suggestion that he consider, in consultation with delegations, how these matters could best be dealt with.

13. The Chairman concluded that the Sub-Group had taken its work on the text as far as it could and that it had therefore fulfilled the mandate which had been given to it.
Summing-up by the Chairman

1. The Sub-Group met on 30 March 1979.

2. It invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend this session of the Sub-Group as an observer.


4. The Sub-Group took note of a note by the Chairman which set out additional proposals under consideration by several delegations for inclusion in MTN/NTM/W/220/Rev.1. This note was circulated on the understanding that upon confirmation from national authorities, these proposals would be incorporated in the next revision of this document.

5. Some delegations made points on a number of specific provisions in the text. With regard to item (h) of the Annex, one delegation explained its position as set out in document MTN/NTM/W/227. With reference to item (i) of the Annex, one delegation stated that it interpreted the term "physically incorporated", in conformity with its law, as to cover catalysts which have entered into the production of an exported product. Other delegations saw a bias against countries applying certain tax and levy systems in the way these items were structured. One delegation expressed its concern and reserved its position on certain provisions of Article 15 concerning the use of domestic prices in the importing country for price comparisons.

6. Delegations who had prepared the Agreement were aware of special difficulties that some developing countries had with certain items, including items (h) and (i), on the Illustrative List of Export Subsidies. The view was expressed that such difficulties, where they involved particular situations in individual developing countries, could be resolved through a reservation to be made by such a country upon its accession or in connexion with its entering into a commitment under Article 14:5.
7. Several delegations expressed some reservations or concern on certain provisions of the text and said that, given its recent circulation, they were not in a position to take a definitive stand on it and reserved the rights to come back to the text.

8. Many delegations welcomed the text and a number of delegations stressed that it formed a reasonable compromise and a balanced whole. The hope was expressed that as many governments as possible would find themselves in a position to adhere to the Agreement. In this connexion the view was expressed that Article 14:5 of the text provided a basis for the accession of developing countries. Some other delegations indicated that they did not consider the aim of the paragraph to be the stipulation of conditions for the accession of developing countries.

9. Some delegations expressed the view that the Agreement did not provide for a sufficient discipline as far as subsidies in the field of agriculture were concerned.

10. In relation to the Final Provisions some delegations proposed that Article 19:2(a) be amended by the insertion of "after being adopted by the Trade Negotiations Committee" after "This Agreement shall".

Some delegations proposed that in Article 19:2(a), the words "and by governments having provisionally acceded" be inserted at the end of this paragraph. A question was also raised regarding the provisions for accession to the Agreement by other governments not contracting parties to the General Agreement. The view was expressed that such governments should not be put in a less favourable position than contracting parties. Some delegations proposed that in Article 19:4, the words "provided that by such date no less than two thirds of the total number of States parties to the Multilateral Trade Negotiations have accepted or acceded to the Agreement" be inserted after "1 January 1980".

11. It was noted that these differences of view on the procedural questions were of a general nature and not specifically related to this Agreement. The Chairman stated that these differences would be drawn to the attention of the Chairman of the Trade Negotiations Committee, the body responsible for the overall conduct of the negotiations, with the suggestion that he consider, in consultation with delegations, how these matters could best be dealt with.

12. The Chairman said that the revised text, as soon as it would be available, would be transmitted to the Trade Negotiations Committee.
Multilateral Trade Negotiations

Group "Non-Tariff Measures"
Sub-Group "Customs Matters"

MEETING OF 3 APRIL 1979

Chairman's Summing-Up

1. The Sub-Group met on 3 April 1979. It invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend this meeting of the Sub-Group. It also invited a representative of the Customs Co-operation Council to attend this meeting of the Sub-Group in an expert capacity. At the end of the meeting and on his own responsibility, the Chairman made the following summing-up.

2. The Sub-Group had before it the revised text of an Agreement on Implementation of Article VII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (MTN/HTM/W/229 and Corr.1) circulated at the request of a number of delegations, and a text from several developing countries containing amendments to the draft Agreement (MTN/HTM/W/222/Rev.1).

3. Delegations from developed countries welcomed the text contained in MTN/HTM/W/229 and Corr.1 and stressed that its adoption would form an important part of the global package in the negotiations. They stated that in their view the text represented a fair, neutral and reasonable compromise between the importers and exporters and a balanced whole. They emphasized that the provisions of the Code were not designed to favour one class of traders against another. They also referred to the provisions regarding special and differential treatment for developing countries. These delegations said that it would be desirable for the largest possible number of governments to join the Agreement, particular problems which developing countries might face could be overcome under the reservations clause of Article 23 on an interim basis. Any difficulties in the operation of the Agreement could also be reviewed in the light of experience. These delegations finally stated that the text represented the best that could be achieved by way of a multilateral solution in the area of customs valuation and that they were ready to recommend to their governments the acceptance of this text.
Delegations from developing countries referred to document MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1 which had been circulated at their request. They reiterated that in their view the text of MTN/NTM/W/229 and Corr.1 was not neutral between related and non-related trailers, on a number of points favoured firms and enterprises of developed countries, did not deal adequately with the problem of price reductions not freely available and with the question of sole agent or distributor. It, furthermore, did not provide sufficient recognition of the position of developing countries with respect to specific provisions having regard to their trade, financial and development needs. These delegations considered that serious prejudice would be caused to their export and import interests if any agreement adopted in this area did not contain the points in MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1. They concluded that under these circumstances and unless the points raised in MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1 were included in MTN/NTM/W/229 and Corr.1, they saw themselves unable to accept the draft Agreement in its present form and requested that document MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1 should be forwarded to the Trade Negotiations Committee on an equal footing with MTN/NTM/W/229 and Corr.1.

Several procedural questions related to the Final Provisions in MTN/NTM/W/229 and Corr.1 were raised. Some delegations proposed that Article 22.1 be amended by insertion of "after being adopted by the Trade Negotiations Committee" after "This Agreement shall". A question was also raised regarding the provisions for accession to the Agreement by governments which are not contracting parties to the GATT or which have provisionally acceded to GATT. Some delegations proposed that in Article 24, the words "provided that by such date no less than two-thirds of the total number of States parties to the Multilateral Trade Negotiations have accepted or acceded to the Agreement" be inserted after "1 January 1981" and that the words "for the governments which have accepted or acceded to it by that date" in the same Article, be deleted.

It was noted that these differences of view on the procedural questions were of a general nature and not specifically related to the work of this Sub-Group. The Chairman stated that these differences would be drawn to the attention of the Chairman of the Trade Negotiations Committee, the body responsible for the overall conduct of the negotiations, with the suggestion that he consider, in consultation with delegations, how these matters could best be dealt with.

While noting the view of some delegations that there may be scope for further consultations in this area, the Chairman concluded that the Sub-Group had taken its work on customs valuation as far as it could and that he would transmit this summary, together with the texts of MTN/NTM/W/229 and Corr.1 and MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1, to the Trade Negotiations Committee.
8. Some delegations referred to the work undertaken in the Customs Co-operation Council on trade facilitation (Kyoto Convention), the harmonized commodity description system and the tariff nomenclature of the CCC. These delegations expressed their appreciation of the progress made in these fields and welcomed the CCC's contribution to the facilitation of international trade and encouraged governments to continue to actively participate in this work.
Multilateral Trade Negotiations

Group "Non-Tariff Measures"
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MEETING OF 5 APRIL 1979

Summing-Up by the Acting Chairman

1. The Sub-Group met on 5 April 1979.

2. It was agreed that the secretariat should act as Chairman for the present meeting.

3. The Sub-Group invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend the meeting as an observer.

4. At the end of the meeting, the Acting Chairman, on his own responsibility, made the following summing-up.

A. QUANTITATIVE RESTRICTIONS

5. The Sub-Group took note of the situation in respect of the negotiations on quantitative restrictions.

6. Many delegations expressed disappointment at the meagre results achieved in the negotiations in this area, which in the view of some delegations had been carried out mainly on a bilateral basis. Some delegations referred in particular to the lack of progress in dealing with quantitative restrictions not consistent with the GATT as well as restrictions of a discriminatory character. Reference was also made to pending proposals for a standstill against the establishment of new restrictions. Some delegations stated that the negotiations in this area were still continuing.

7. Several delegations referred to proposals put forward by them earlier for the development of multilateral solutions in the area of quantitative restrictions, including proposals for special and differential treatment for developing countries.

8. There was very broad support for a proposal put forward by one delegation that the CONTRACTING PARTIES should be invited to develop a multilateral solution in the field of quantitative import restrictions, and that they address themselves to this task as one of the priority issues to be taken up after the Multilateral Trade Negotiations were concluded. Some delegations referred to the need for
priority being given to action on quantitative restrictions affecting developing countries. On the other hand, some delegations, noting that negotiations in this area were still continuing, stated that their governments would wish to consider after the conclusion of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations how further progress might best be made in this area. One delegation expressed preference for bilateral procedures.

9. The Acting Chairman concluded that the Sub-Group had carried its work on quantitative restrictions as far as it could. The statements and discussion on the subject as reflected in this summing-up would be brought to the notice of the Trade Negotiations Committee.

B. IMPORT LICENSING PROCEDURES

10. The Sub-Group had before it the revised text of a draft Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures (MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.1) circulated at the request of a number of delegations, as well as other proposals and documents listed in the airgram convening the meeting.

11. Delegations from a number of countries welcomed the revised text contained in MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.1 as a compromise which provided a balanced solution for problems in this area. These delegations noted that the instrument was designed to deal with procedures rather than with measures, and was aimed at ensuring that licensing procedures would be neutral, transparent and equitable. They also stated that the Agreement contained provisions designed to make it easier for developing countries to become parties to it. They indicated that they were ready to forward the text of the Agreement to their governments for consideration, and expressed the hope that other delegations would be in a position to support the Agreement.

12. One delegation expressed the view that its import certificate and associated security system was covered by the footnote on page 5 of MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.1, and was therefore to be considered as automatic. Other delegations expressed reservations in this regard, on the ground that the Agreement dealt specifically with procedures and not with import measures.

13. The Sub-Group noted the understanding stated by delegations that the provisions of the Agreement, and in particular paragraph 3 thereof, did not in any way modify obligations of contracting parties under Article I of the General Agreement in relation to administrative procedures. Paragraph 3 of the Agreement in MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.1 should be interpreted in this context. In this connexion some delegations also stated that this Agreement, being limited to procedures, did not modify the application of the provisions of the General Agreement.
14. One delegation from a developing country explained the usage of the expression "automatic licences" in its import régime, and stated that it considered that such licences would be governed by the provisions of paragraph 14 of the Agreement.

15. The representative of one developing country stated that his authorities considered that the Agreement would not limit his country in the appropriate use of samples requirements. He also said that in cases where an export agreement was in operation, imports should be allowed on the basis of export licences, visas or permits issued by the exporting country where the export restraint agreement so provided. Some delegations, while expressing support for this concept, pointed out that the Agreement concerned only procedures on import licensing.

16. Some delegations from developing countries referred to specific proposals which they had sought to be included in MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.1. One representative, while reserving his position on that text, referred to his proposal in MTN/NTM/W/233. He and some other delegations expressed the hope that an appropriate solution would be found in the course of further consultations.

17. Some delegations expressed reservations in respect of the provisions of paragraph 9 of the Agreement. Some delegations expressed doubt about the need for establishing a Committee on Import Licensing under the Agreement.

18. Some delegations expressed their readiness to continue to seek appropriate solutions for the difficulties that have been mentioned, in further bilateral consultations.

19. Several procedural questions related to the Final Provisions in MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.1 were raised. Some delegations proposed that paragraph 17(a) be amended by insertion of "after being adopted by the Trade Negotiations Committee" after "This Agreement shall". A question was also raised regarding the provisions for accession to the Agreement by governments which are not contracting parties to the GATT or which have provisionally acceded to GATT. Some delegations proposed that in paragraph 19 the words "provided that by such date no less than two-thirds of the total number of States parties to the Multilateral Trade Negotiations have accepted or acceded to the Agreement" be inserted after "1 January 1980 and that the words "for the governments which have accepted or acceded to it by that date", in the same paragraph, be deleted.

20. It was noted that these differences of view on the procedural questions were of a general nature and not specifically related to the work of the Sub-Group. The Acting Chairman stated that these differences would be drawn to the attention of the Chairman of the Trade Negotiations Committee, the body responsible for the overall conduct of the negotiations, with the suggestion that he consider, in consultation with delegations, how these matters could best be dealt with.
21. Some delegations reserved the right to examine the French and Spanish language versions of the text in order to ensure their alignment with the English language version.

22. While noting the view of some delegations that there might be scope for further consultations in this area, the Acting Chairman concluded that the Sub-Group had taken its work as far as it could, and that he would transmit this summing-up, together with the text of MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.1, to the Trade Negotiations Committee.
Multilateral Trade Negotiations
Group "Non-Tariff Measures"
Sub-Group "Government Procurement"

MEETING OF APRIL 1979

Summing-Up by the Chairman

1. The Sub-Group met on 6 April 1979.

2. It invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend this session of the Sub-Group as an observer.

3. The Sub-Group considered the Agreement on Government Procurement circulated in document MTN/NTM/W/211/Rev.1.

4. Some delegations made points on a number of specific provisions in the text. Some delegations stated that they understood the expression "rules of origin applied in the normal course of trade" in paragraph 3 of Part II to include rules of origin applied under preferential schemes for developing countries. One delegation also stated its country's expectation that rules of origin would apply in a manner taking fully into account the interests of all parties to the Agreement. With regard to the level of the threshold set out in Part I of the Agreement, one delegation expressed the hope that in the course of the review of the Agreement provided for in paragraph 6 of Part IX, favourable consideration could be given to reducing the threshold level so as to give small and medium-sized suppliers in developing countries the possibility of greater participation in the procurement process under the Agreement. One delegation stated its understanding that in terms of the Agreement, no compensatory adjustments would be required in the event of a developing country seeking modifications of its schedule of entities on account of balance-of-payments difficulties. One delegation reserved its right to revert to matters concerning single tendering dealt with in Part V, paragraph 15(b) and (e) should this matter arise in the major review three years after implementation of the Agreement and to raise the question of reciprocity should the question also arise in the major review.

5. Some delegations expressed concern with regard to certain of the provisions relating to the least-developed countries and felt that they could have been strengthened. Other delegations stated that this section reflected a careful balance resulting from detailed negotiations on the matter.
6. Many delegations welcomed the text and a number of delegations stressed that it formed an important part of the global package in the negotiations. Many delegations stated that the text was a carefully negotiated instrument basically reflecting the objectives set by the Sub-Group and represented the most that could be achieved in this area of the MTNs. One delegation stated that it was not in a position to take a definite stand on the text at the present time. One other delegation stated that it would find it practically impossible to recommend this Agreement to its authorities.

7. The Sub-Group noted that the reservation on the sub-paragraph of paragraph 4 of Part V had been lifted and the footnote could thus be removed from the text.

8. The suggestion was made by some delegations that in connexion with the sub-paragraph of paragraph 4 of Part V, Spanish, as one of the languages in which the Agreement was authentic, should also be utilized for the purposes stated therein.

9. The Sub-Group noted that following negotiations, one delegation expected to forward its list of entities for incorporation in Annex I in the next few days, and some other delegations expected to be in the same position shortly.

10. A number of delegations expressed the hope that the maximum number of countries would find it possible to accept this Agreement over the next few months and thus become initial signatories to it.

11. It was noted that in addition to those countries whose lists of entities were reflected in Annex I of the Agreement, a number of others had expressed interest in becoming parties to the Agreement. For this purpose interested delegations should address a communication to the secretariat; reference could also be made to the procedures for negotiations on procurement entities circulated in GATT/AIR/1466 dated June 1978. The Sub-Group noted that Part III of the Agreement provided a useful reference point for the participation of developing countries including the least-developed among them.

12. In relation to Part IX "Final Provisions", some delegations proposed that paragraph 1(a) be amended by the insertion of "after being adopted by the Trade Negotiations Committee" after "This Agreement shall". Some delegations proposed that in paragraph 1(b) the words "and any government having provisionally acceded to the GATT" be inserted after "Any government contracting party to the GATT". While there was no discussion of the substance of the matter, one delegation raised a question concerning paragraph 1(d) of Part IX and reserved the right to revert to it in the Trade Negotiations Committee.
13. It was noted that differences of view on procedural questions were not specifically related to government procurement. The Chairman stated that the points raised would be drawn to the attention of the Chairman of the Trade Negotiations Committee, the body responsible for the overall conduct of the negotiations, with the suggestion that he consider, in consultation with delegations, how these matters could best be dealt with.

14. The Chairman said that the revised text would be transmitted to the Trade Negotiations Committee.
Multilateral Trade Negotiations
Group "Agriculture"

MEETING OF APRIL 1979

Summing-Up by the Chairman


2. It invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend this session of the Group as an observer.

3. The Group had before it document MTN/INF/43, headed "Multilateral Agricultural Framework".

4. The Group recalled that at its previous meeting it had reached broad consensus on the issues raised in the document; that it had agreed that they merited further examination in depth and that it would revert to the matter (MTN/AG/9, paragraphs 10 and 11).

5. The Group noted that a good deal of progress had been made in consultations among delegations. However, in view of certain differences which still existed, the Chairman proposed a text which he considered might reflect the views of the Group.

6. A number of points were made as regards the issues in document MTN/INF/43 and as regards the proposed text.

7. The text as agreed by the Group is annexed hereto.

8. The Chairman concluded that the Group had taken its work as far as it could.
ANNEX

MULTILATERAL AGRICULTURAL FRAMEWORK

Group "Agriculture" proposes that the Trade Negotiations Committee recommend to the CONTRACTING PARTIES further to develop active co-operation in the agricultural sector within an appropriate consultative framework.

Group "Agriculture" therefore proposes that the Trade Negotiations Committee recommend to the CONTRACTING PARTIES that the definition of this framework and its tasks be worked out as soon as possible.
Multilateral Trade Negotiations

Group "Agriculture"

Sub-Group on Meat

MEETING OF 2 APRIL 1979

Chairman's Summing-Up

At the end of the meeting and under his own responsibility, the Chairman summed-up the discussions as follows:


2. It invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend the meeting as an observer.

3. The Sub-Group had before it the revised text of the Arrangement Regarding Bovine Meat (document MTN/ME/W/24/Rev.9).

4. The Sub-Group examined the points still outstanding in this text of the Arrangement.

5. The Sub-Group has agreed on a final text of the Arrangement Regarding Bovine Meat which is annexed hereto.*

6. Some delegations have stated that this Arrangement should be adopted by the Trade Negotiations Committee.

7. It is my assessment that the Sub-Group has fulfilled the mandate which it was given.

* The annex is not reproduced in the present document.
Multilateral Trade Negotiations
Group "Agriculture"
Sub-Group on Dairy Products

MEETING OF 27 MARCH 1979

Chairman's Summing-Up

At the end of the meeting and under his own responsibility, the Chairman summed up the discussions as follows.


2. It invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend the meeting as an observer.

3. The Sub-Group had before it the revised text of the International Dairy Arrangement (documents MTN/DP/W/27/Rev.9 and MTN/DP/W/27/Rev.9/Add.1). A communication by the Nordic countries and a communication by Austria had been circulated as documents MTN/DP/W/46 and MTN/DP/W/47 respectively.

4. The Sub-Group examined the points still outstanding in the text of the Arrangement.

5. Many members of the Sub-Group have agreed on a text annexed hereto (Annex A)* which, in my judgement, represents the maximum result that it was possible to achieve with a view to a negotiated solution in this area.

6. The Sub-Group took note of the interpretative statements made by certain delegations regarding that text. Those statements are reproduced in the annex hereto (Annex B).*

7. Certain amendments and proposals by some members of the Sub-Group have not been accepted by other members. The text, including such amendments and proposals, is also annexed (Annex C).*

8. The Sub-Group as such has not finally agreed on any text.

9. It is my assessment that the Sub-Group has taken its work on the text as far as it could and that it had therefore fulfilled the mandate which had been given to it.

* The Annex is not reproduced in the present document.
Multilateral Trade Negotiations

Group "Agriculture"
Sub-Group on Grains

MEETING OF APRIL 1979

Summing-Up by the Chairman

At the end of the meeting the Chairman on his own responsibility summed-up as follows:

1. The Sub-Group held its sixth session on 9 April 1979. It invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, or his representative, to attend this session of the Sub-Group as an observer.

2. It was recalled that when Group "Agriculture" had established the Sub-Group on Grains it had been stated that the Sub-Group should at the appropriate time consider how best to integrate into its work any results of the work going on within the framework of the International Wheat Council (MTN/AG/1, paragraph 5(a)). At its fifth meeting, in May 1976, the Sub-Group considered that it was still premature to consider the matter, but agreed to revert to it at its next meeting. It was left to the Chairman to set the date of the next meeting in consultation with delegations (MTN/GR/5, paragraphs 9 and 11).

3. Accordingly, the Chairman had been in frequent consultations with delegations. The consultations had clearly shown that, until now, delegations had considered it neither desirable nor useful for the Sub-Group to reconvene.

4. At its present session, the Sub-Group took note that negotiations had taken place in the United Nations Conference to Negotiate an International Arrangement to Replace the International Wheat Agreement, 1971, as Extended. It further took note of the Decision adopted by the Conference on 14 February 1979, by which the Conference, inter alia, decides to adjourn and requests the International Wheat Council, once it is satisfied that the necessary conditions exist for a resumption of the negotiations, to request the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to fix a date for the reconvening of the Conference.

5. The Sub-Group regretted that it had not been possible for the Conference to come to a successful conclusion so far, but expressed the hope that a fruitful and mutually satisfactory agreement in this area would be reached soon.

6. The Sub-Group also noted that the International Wheat Council had decided to extend the International Wheat Agreement until 30 June 1981.

7. The Chairman concluded that the Sub-Group had taken its work as far as it could.
Multilateral Trade Negotiations

Group "Safeguards"

MEETING OF APRIL 1979

Summing-Up by the Chairman

1. The Group reconvened on 9 April 1979. It invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend the meeting of the Sub-Group as an observer.

2. At the end of the meeting, the Chairman summed up on his own responsibility as follows.

3. The Group took stock of the negotiations on safeguards and agreed that despite the considerable progress made, it had not proved possible at this time to conclude the work referred to in paragraph 3(d) of the Tokyo Declaration. The Group agreed that work should be continued within the framework and in terms of the Tokyo Declaration as a matter of urgency, taking into account the work already done, with the objective of reaching agreement before 15 July 1979. On the basis of statements made, it is the Chairman's expectation that until such time as agreement is reached, contracting parties will continue to abide by the obligations of Article XIX. The Group also noted statements which expressed concern and regret that it had not been possible to reach agreement on an essential element in the total N/M package, in spite of considerable concessions which had been made by developing countries. In these statements it was stressed that contracting parties should continue to adhere to the agreed interpretation of Article XIX and the manner in which it had been used so far.

4. The Group invited the secretariat to prepare, on its own responsibility, a working document which might be taken as a basis for further consultations and negotiations.
Multilateral Trade Negotiations

Group "Tropical Products"

MEETING OF 9 APRIL 1979

Summing-Up by the Chairman

1. The Group held its tenth meeting on 9 April 1979.

2. The Group invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend the meeting as an observer.

3. The Group reviewed the situation with regard to tropical products having regard to overall developments in the negotiations.

4. The Group took note of the situation regarding negotiations on tropical products as reflected in document MTN/TP(SECRET)2/Rev.3 and Addendum 1. In this respect, a number of developed country participants stated that they had already implemented tropical product concessions and contributions resulting from the first stage of the negotiations and this represented a maximum effort in this sector. One participant noted that as a consequence the tariff concessions for tropical products had been implemented in advance. It was understood that bilateral negotiations with regard to tropical products among interested participants were continuing in the context of overall tariff negotiations.

5. Developing country delegations expressed disappointment at the results of the tropical products negotiations noting that notwithstanding the provisions of the Tokyo Declaration concerning these products, no adequate concessions had been made in certain areas of essential interest to them. It was their view that tariff escalation and the erosion of the generalized systems of preferences were some of the aspects which had not been resolved satisfactorily up to this point in time. Developing country delegations expressed the hope that the new concessions resulting from the negotiations would also be implemented for developing countries without staging.

6. Developing country delegations stressed likewise that the results of the negotiations with respect to non-tariff measures which affected tropical products had been limited and further efforts were needed in this area.
7. Developing country delegations expressed the hope that negotiations on tropical products would continue with a view to achieving further improvements until such time as all tariff schedules had been completely finalized. Some of these delegations suggested that the Group "Tropical Products" should continue its work.

8. One developed country participant referred to the significant additional results achieved by his delegation in response to tropical products requests in the course of bilateral negotiations since the last meeting of the Group. While noting that the negotiations on tropical products should be regarded as being completed within the multilateral framework over the next few days, some delegations expressed their readiness to continue discussions or negotiations in a bilateral or other contexts.

9. The Chairman stated that the situation reached, as reflected in the comments made by delegations, would be brought to the attention of the Trade Negotiations Committee.
Multilateral Trade Negotiations

Group "Framework"

MEETING OF APRIL 1979

Summing-up by the Acting Chairman


2. It invited the Secretary General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend this session of the Group as an observer.

3. The Sub-Group considered the text contained in MTN/FR/W/20/Rev.2.

4. The members of the Group agreed that the substance of MTN/FR/W/20/Rev.2 was acceptable as it stood. The Group agreed to transmit this document to the Trade Negotiations Committee.

5. A number of statements were made relating to specific points in the text. The text of the statement made by India and supported by a number of delegations will be circulated as MTN/FR/W/23. The Group noted documents MTN/FR/W/20/Add.2, MTN/FR/W/21 and MTN/FR/W/22 circulated at the request of certain delegations.

6. Delegations reserved the right to propose amendments to the French and Spanish texts in order to bring them into line with the English text.

7. It was understood that the question of the legal form of the different parts of MTN/FR/W/20/Rev.2 should be taken up in due course.

8. The Acting Chairman concluded that the Group had taken its work as far as it could and that it had therefore fulfilled the mandate which had been given to it.
Multilateral Trade Negotiations

Group "Sector Approach"

MEETING OF 9 APRIL 1979

Summing-Up by the Chairman

1. The Group met on 9 April 1979. It invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or his representative to attend the meeting as an observer.

2. In recalling the objectives of the Group as set out in Paragraph 3(e) of the Tokyo Declaration, the Chairman referred to the considerable amount of technical information which had been provided to delegations by the secretariats as background material on specific sectors, including a number of sectors of particular interest to developing countries.

3. One member of the Group stressed the importance his government had attached to the sector approach as a means of dealing with measures affecting trade in certain resource-based sectors. He regretted that, although some of the objectives sought by his government in relation to tariffs, non-tariff measures and other areas including consultation and dispute settlement had been achieved under other headings of the negotiations, the aims it had hoped for in sector negotiations had not been attained. This had adversely affected the possibility of his country offering concessions in certain areas, particularly in relation to export measures. He believed that the sector approach should be kept in mind for any possible future negotiations on trade in resource-based products as an effective way of achieving positive results.

4. The Chairman considered that the Group "Sector Approach" had carried its work as far as it could and he would report to the Trade Negotiations Committee accordingly.
ANNEX II

Statements by Delegations

This Annex reproduces the statements made by delegations during the general debate or received in writing for inclusion in the present document. An index to these statements will be found in paragraph 6 above.

JAPAN (Ambassador M. Sawaki)

Five and a half years ago Japan had the honour to host the Ministerial Meeting which launched the Tokyo Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations. The then Foreign Minister, who presided over the meeting, Mr. Masayoshi Ohira, now as Prime Minister of Japan, wishes me to convey to you his sense of elation at the prospects of our bringing to a successful end the historic undertaking that began in Tokyo.

The Tokyo Round of comprehensive trade negotiations relates to our future trading system in the 1980s and thereafter. We have negotiated in a wide scope of areas comprising tariffs, various non-tariff measures, agricultural products as well as industrial products. Never before in any round of trade negotiations has so wide a range of subjects been covered, nor have there been so many participants. Naturally it was not an easy negotiation. Its long and arduous process was fraught, at every step, with agonizing technical details, and with delicate and highly sensitive policy considerations.

It would be in the nature of things for me to say that we did not achieve all that we wanted to gain. This in no sense could take away nor lessen the important and very substantial results of this negotiation which in its breadth, width and depth far surpasses the substantial and considerable achievements of the Kennedy Round. My delegation is about to consummate a deal on Technical Barriers to Trade, Government Procurement, Subsidies and Countervailing Duties, Arrangements on Bovine Meat and on Dairy Products, Customs Valuation and Import Licensing and an understanding on the multilateral GATT framework as well as a possible future consultative framework in the area of agriculture. All of these taken together would provide us with improved and more detailed rules in the conduct of international trade and commerce, and thus greater discipline and protection as well as expanded trading opportunities and benefits for all participants, whether developing or developed.
It is regrettable that we have not been able to come to an understanding in one of the major areas of this negotiation, i.e. Safeguards. We stand ready to continue as a matter of urgency to aim for an operational but well disciplined code in this area. Until such an agreement is entered into and becomes effective, we pledge ourselves to continue to abide by our obligations under the provisions of the GATT and we expect our partners to do likewise.

We have also in the context of the Tokyo Round negotiated in the area of Anti-Dumping Measures and an Agreement on Trade in Civil Aircraft. While problems still remain, to facilitate a substantial agreement on the MTN package, I take this opportunity to withdraw Japan's reservation on the Aircraft Agreement and express our intention to participate on the understanding that Japanese concerns expressed in the course of negotiations will be fully taken into consideration in the operation and implementation of this Agreement.

These agreements and understandings represent for us a very substantial and major result which in our judgement was the maximum possible and politically achievable at this time. In addition, we have been able to come to a very substantial negotiated agreement in the area of tariffs which in itself would exceed the achievement of the Kennedy Round. We are at a virtual close-out situation with our major trading partners including the United States, the Community, Australia, Canada, Finland, Norway, Sweden and our host Switzerland, and with a number of developing countries. We intend to rapidly exchange verification documents with these delegations. With those others who have not negotiated with us or were not available in the last minutes of this negotiation to finalize, we shall through you, Mr. Director-General, provide our entire offers for their appraisal in due course. Our offers in this area cover many items in agriculture and, in respect of industrial tariffs, a weighted average depth-of-cut in Japanese tariffs on a global basis far exceeding the 40 per cent we have aimed for, in fact very close to 50 per cent from our present bound tariffs in the GATT. In all of these areas, my delegation consider the negotiations to be completed in substance, except for the required legal redactions and corrections of inadvertent errors.

Reserving my right to respond where necessary at a later stage, I would wish to conclude by expressing our appreciation for the co-operation, courtesy and patience on the part of my negotiating partners.
YUGOSLAVIA (Dr. P. Tomic', on behalf of developing countries participating in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations)

Substantial work has been done during the Multilateral Trade Negotiations in which problems of international trade were identified and possible solutions were considered. Some of them have found solutions in this Round but many of them are still outstanding. When seeking solutions in the future this work might be an appreciable contribution.

When the results of these negotiations begin to apply, we are convinced that we shall face quite another GATT than the one we have been accustomed to until now, involving probably better discipline and order, improved conditions for international trade and some reductions in tariff and non-tariff measures within a readapted framework for the conduct of international trade - obviously very modest in scope but important in its modesty. We believe that this achievement in the Tokyo Round could be advantageous for the international trade of all participants if the wording, as well as the spirit behind it, could be properly implemented. Many other results are left to be desired. Many problems were not solved in these negotiations. We are still faced with a number of outstanding issues particularly of major interest to developing countries and the least-developed among them. Equality of all participants and equity in solutions have been partially achieved in spite of differences between countries in negotiating strength. We are convinced that this relationship shall be reinforced in future negotiations on trade matters.

And just because of these outstanding issues, we regret that the Multilateral Trade Negotiations have failed to achieve greater results in substance as well as in scope for the trade of the developing countries given the objectives and principles set out in the Tokyo Declaration. At this stage we are not able to assess results because negotiations are not completed on tariff and some non-tariff measures and it will take time to have a complete picture of results in relation to the objectives for developing countries' trade set out in the Tokyo Declaration.

In spite of the fact that at some stages of the negotiations the developing countries were not invited, and that transparencies were often absent, we could not assume that proposals and requests submitted by the developing countries were not known. It is regrettable that many of them were ignored and that little care was taken in spite of the clearly stated objectives of the Tokyo Declaration, and of those which were formulated in so many resolutions, declarations and decisions taken at UN sessions and UNCTAD meetings, to mention only these two fora of the greatest international importance. The frequent absence of political will in these negotiations to meet the requests of developing countries and the persistence in a conservative approach have substantially reduced the grounds for the solutions which we hope would be beneficial for the expansion of reciprocal trade between the developed and developing countries on the basis of long-term stability of conditions and security in performance.
In the application of the results of this Round, there might be more transparencies, more consultations, many institutions of control and surveillance, as well as many disputes and panels. To what degree this technocratic approach will stimulate international trade expansion is an important question to be answered. At this stage, we estimate that the tendencies of protectionism could continue to find a good soil for their seedlings in the absence of any commitments or mechanism in respect of adjustment policy, and that the developing countries could continue to suffer more substantially than any among the affluent countries. In all these new bodies of an institutional character we are expecting to see a balanced composition between developed and developing countries, as a guarantee of the fair representation of all interests.

The additional benefits for the trade of the developing countries can hardly be identified. Even in the tariff reductions, following the minimizing of reductions or their elimination, in textiles, leather goods and other areas of interest to the developing countries, we estimate that the reduction for the developing countries' trade amounts to less than the figure for the overall reduction of, on the average, between 30 and 35 per cent. Very little has been done in reducing tariff escalation affecting the export of manufactures, where developing countries dispose of natural primary products such as, for instance, non-ferrous metals. The GSP system has been very modestly improved, there are still many products excluded from the scheme and practically nothing has been introduced to improve the effective utilization of the scheme by developing countries which, in the majority of donor countries, is somewhere around 60 per cent.

We regret very much the complete failure in the most important sector in these negotiations to achieve results in order that more discipline and order may be introduced in the safeguard system. Instead, we were faced with unacceptable discrimination and departures from the concept set down in Article XIX of the General Agreement. We are particularly concerned with the quantitative restrictions where the developed countries by procedural manoeuvering have avoided any solution in this field and where so many illegalities with respect to the General Agreement have occurred.

The results on tropical products of the greatest interest for the majority of the developing countries are very limited, and as concerns agricultural products of the temperate zone, results are practically non-existent, except for the cathedral shaped recommendations and consultations with respect to bovine meat, which is not a novelty in the GATT. Besides, in this field developing countries have to suffer from export subsidies on powerful affluent partners' exports to third markets.
Differential and more favourable treatment, where it exists is poor and not made precise with the possibilities of many ambiguous interpretations. Results within the framework of improving international trade are modest; we just tinkered with it and as such, the solution is overcharged with many qualifications. Many questions that were left aside did not take advantage of the opportunity given and we have failed to achieve significant steps forward towards a new international economic order that would be of benefit to all those involved.

All efforts made on behalf of the developing countries to find a way to improve the Anti-Dumping Code in the interest of the developing countries have failed due to the resistance of a few conservative forces which are gearing the present Code in accordance with their own interests under the cover of GATT.

The Government Procurement Code is formulated in such a way that a number of developing countries are not able to accede to it and it will as such be limited to few of them because of the absolute requirement that the market be opened to competition coming from abroad.

The application of paragraph 6 of the Tokyo Declaration regarding the interests of least-developing countries has practically been completely absent and this situation is not only of deep regret and concern to those countries but to all other developing countries. Least-developed countries hope that by unilateral decisions developed countries shall allow free access to their markets for the exports of least-developed countries.

We consider as of the utmost urgency the need to continue to seek solutions on the outstanding questions whatever the form chosen, particularly on a priority basis for safeguards, quantitative restrictions, further improvement in the framework for the conduct of international trade, improvements in tariffs and GSP, new adaptation of the Anti-Dumping Code in the interest of developing countries and beneficial measures for least-developed countries.

Creating a new international order in trade matters is a long process. What we have achieved now is a first step, not large enough, but on the way to becoming more important in the future and beneficial to the international community as a whole. In this respect we hope to have the understanding and goodwill of all countries in the world where interdependence is directing us to intensive co-operation advantageous to everyone.
Brazil (Ambassador G.A. Maciel)

First of all I wish to support entirely what Dr. Tomic of Yugoslavia has said in his statement.

At this present stage of the MTN, I only wish to make a few brief remarks with regard to the texts which we have before us.

Among the texts before us there is one conspicuous absence: that of a draft agreement on safeguard measures. The effective disciplining of safeguard action is considered by Brazil as one of the major objectives of the MTN, and the fact that we have failed to produce a text to serve as a basis for final agreement on this subject certainly brings a heavy negative weight to the balance of work done so far. We take note of the commitment of participants to proceed with negotiations on safeguards with a view to reaching a conclusion as soon as possible, by July I hope. We fully support this. A successful outcome of these negotiations will be crucial to our final assessment of the Trade Negotiations as a whole.

I would also like to point out that two of the texts before us - those dealing with civil aircraft and anti-dumping - are new to my Delegation, and are of a particular nature, distinct from other texts. I consequently must express a special reservation of the Brazilian Delegation in their respect.

The remaining documents, in varying degrees, are, in our view, unsatisfactory to the basic interests of a developing country such as Brazil. Nevertheless, my Delegation is prepared to submit a number of these texts to the consideration of the Brazilian Government. Before my authorities take a final decision on the draft agreements embodied in such documents, it will be necessary to complete a detailed examination of (a) the specific difficulties which Brazil might find in relation to certain provisions of certain texts, (b) the balance between new obligations and additional benefits to be expected from these negotiations, and (c) the extent to which the proposed agreements will affect our rights and obligations under the General Agreement, particularly our rights under Article I and Part IV of GATT.

Indeed, to the extent that draft Agreements and recommendations proposed in the MTN will affect the GATT, the CONTRACTING PARTIES to the General Agreement shall have to collectively examine the compatibility of such texts with the General Agreement and corresponding adjustments may prove necessary.

If I may, I would still add the following brief remarks in relation to specific texts before us.

1. Framework

Brazil had the privilege of proposing the establishment of a Group "Framework" under the TNC, to carry out a reform of GATT provisions affecting the trade interests of developing countries. Needless to say,
the results which we have before us today fall considerably short of our minimum expectations. We consequently consider that the necessary changes to trade rules, to better equate them with the needs of developing countries, have not been completed, and we reserve our right to return to this issue in the future - in GATT or elsewhere.

2. Subsidies and countervailing measures

Although the text of an Agreement on Interpretation and Application of Articles VI, XVI and XXIII of the General Agreement falls short of our expectations in this area of the Negotiations, we are prepared to accept this text in its present form. I wish to point out that my country has made a most significant contribution to the MTN in this area of negotiations, which we trust will be duly taken into account by our trading partners.

3. Customs valuation

As to customs valuation, I must point out that the Agreement on the Implementation of Article VII, as it appears in the draft negotiated among a certain number of developed countries, does not include some important points which the Brazilian Delegation has been proposing for quite a long time. In this context, I must refer specifically to the provisions in Articles 4 and 5:2 in document MTN/NTM/W/229/Rev.1 whereby an importer is given the option between more than one method of valuation. Such options, as has often been mentioned, create serious difficulties to my country. I should also point out that Brazil has circulated, some months ago, documents MTN/22 and MTN/23, containing two important contributions by my country to the MTNs, in the field of customs valuation. These two contributions, I trust, will be duly borne in mind by our partners in the consultations we hope to carry out to solve the remaining problems we still face in the area of customs valuation.

4. Import licensing procedures

The draft text on Import Licensing Procedures presents serious difficulties for the Brazilian authorities. These difficulties are limited in number but nonetheless substantial in so far as they would preclude administrative procedures - that are part and parcel of our administrative structure, and do not prejudice the flow of imports - from being covered by such an Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures, should its text remain unchanged.

Accordingly, my Delegation reserves its position as regards the draft Agreement circulated in document MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.1, and wishes to call the attention of the TNC to the proposals we recently circulated in document MTN/NTM/W/233. This reservation reflects the present stage of discussions and, of course, does not prevent that a solution be sought. We are open for further discussions on this matter.
5. **Multilateral agricultural framework**

My Delegation was not closely associated with negotiations in this area. We agree, however, to recommend that the CONTRACTING PARTIES to GATT take this matter up in the near future. It is our opinion that any consultative mechanism to be established in GATT on agriculture should fully reflect the particular interests of developing countries and, in this respect, we may present specific proposals at the appropriate time.
ARGENTINA (Ambassador G. Martinez)

As regards the results that the multilateral trade negotiations seem to have achieved so far, according to the summaries presented by the Chairmen of the negotiating groups and sub-groups which are subsidiary bodies of this Trade Negotiations Committee, the Argentine delegation, while associating itself with the considerations expressed by Dr. Tomic on behalf of the developing countries, wishes to state its position as follows:

1. With respect to the multilateral agreements or codes proposed to this Committee, Argentina could only accept the text on customs valuation (MTN/NTM/W/229/Rev.1) if the amendments and additions proposed by the developing countries in document MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1 are included in it. As regards subsidies and countervailing duties, our acceptance of the text proposed in document MTN/NTM/W/236 might be subject to certain reservations in respect of the provisions applicable to agricultural products. We must also express certain reservations on the agreement concerning government procurement (MTN/NTM/W/211/Rev.2). All our reservations and interpretations as to coverage will be communicated in writing to the secretariat for formal distribution, in the hope that they can be accepted by the other signatories in accordance with the article on reservations included in each of the agreements, thus allowing our participation in those agreements, to which my delegation attaches significant importance.

2. The Argentine delegation is in agreement with the "texts" proposed by the Group "Framework" which we hope will be adopted shortly and in the appropriate form by the CONTRACTING PARTIES. My delegation also concurs with the texts of the agreement on technical barriers to trade (MTN/NTM/W/192/Rev.5), the Agreement regarding Bovine Meat (MTN/ME/8), the International Dairy Arrangement (MTN/DP/8) and the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures (MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.2). As regards the multilateral agricultural framework, my delegation will participate actively with the CONTRACTING PARTIES in seeking such a framework and the relevant tasks, as recommended in document MTN/AG/10.

3. In the tariff area of these negotiations, Argentina has entered into significant undertakings with some participants and hopes to be able to do likewise with others as soon as possible and within the time-limits set. Similarly, the Argentine delegation intends to continue to participate actively in the work on a multilateral agreement on safeguards.

4. With reference to the paragraph of the final provisions that the Chairman will announce to replace the text that was included in the final provisions of all the multilateral agreements, the Argentine delegation will express its position in a short text that it will present to the secretariat, for inclusion
in the record of this meeting of the Trade Negotiations Committee, as part of this statement.

Written statement by the representative of Argentina on point (c) in paragraph 2 above of the Proceedings of the Session and referred to in paragraph 9.

With reference to the paragraph contained in the final provisions of each one of the multilateral agreements which relates to the applicability of Article XXVI:5(a) and (b) of the General Agreement, the Argentine delegation wishes to clearly register that: 'any acceptance of the present Agreement that might eventually be intended by a third State in the name of the Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur and Sandwich del Sur, is firmly objected to by the Argentine Republic, on the grounds that those islands form an integral part of its territory'.

\[1\] See also document MTN/P/5/Add.1.
A. Statement

We are met today to authenticate the texts and the provisional lists of tariff commitments which have emerged from this long negotiation and to indicate to our authorities that we will recommend approval of this package. The fact that we are able to meet today to do so is a fateful and encouraging event and I should like to make some brief observations on the implications this will have for the trading world of the 1980's. But before I do that perhaps I could do two things. One is to indicate to the Committee some of the points to which our Council of Ministers attached particular importance when it considered this package a few days ago, and secondly to touch briefly on some of the main areas of the negotiation in turn. Insofar as the package as a whole is concerned I would like to make only four points. The first, - this will be no surprise to our negotiating partners - we have been asked specifically to affirm by our Council, is that at the end of the stage of tariff reductions extending over five years the Community will examine whether it is able to move onto the second stage having regard to the economic, social and monetary situation and the implementation by partners of various undertakings entered into in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations and I would ask that this understanding be recorded in the minutes.

The second point we have been asked to make is to point to the importance which we attach to the enabling legislation in the main developed countries where legislation of this kind is necessary, being a faithful and accurate reflection of the stipulations and the various agreements and codes to be concluded. This we think is a reasonable and important stipulation and clearly the Community's attitude towards the final adoption in due course of the complete outcome of the negotiations will need to take account of this factor.

Then it is our view that we would not implement all our concessions until such time as all the developed countries had completed their necessary parliamentary procedures and were able to implement their concessions, in other words that the enabling legislation referred to above had proved to be satisfactory and that the measures to implement the conclusions of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations had been taken in practice and to good effect.

And finally I make a point which is a traditional one, which is that we need to look carefully at the translations of the texts negotiated, particularly translations into French of English texts. If any adjustments of a semantic kind are necessary we shall need to come back to these.
Now some brief comments on some of the main sectors of the negotiations. In relation to tariffs, our contribution to the industrial tariff cutting exercise as it stands today would reduce the Common Customs Tariff on dutiable items from just under 10 per cent to 7.3 per cent, in fact to something like 7 per cent if the aircraft sector is included. Only 17 per cent of our dutiable m.f.n. imports will be subject to duties above 10 per cent, only 2.1 per cent to duties above 15 and only one product above 20. This we think is a pretty reasonable track record at the end of these negotiations.

Insofar as the tariff negotiations generally are concerned, we consider that they have been substantively concluded in the sense that final adjustment of reciprocal offers is still in process with a number of partners, but no further new concessions can be expected. We are still prepared to consider possibilities of more rapid staging of concessions which might be of interest to developing countries. And there are still some problems in relation to the achievement of a final satisfactory balancing out in tariffs when one considers both direct and indirect concessions both in the overall and bilateral balance in particular in the agriculture and the textiles sector. These difficulties are not such that they will interfere with the ceremony we have to accomplish tomorrow. But we need before the fateful date of 30 June when the tariff schedules are finally committed to the archives to sort out these problems in a mutually satisfactory manner.

Now, in relation to the non-tariff barriers sector we are encouraged by the conclusion of the various agreements here. On standards we would like to make one point, that on the question of access to certification of this agreement we have been very concerned that there should be full reciprocity between signatories. Our intentions and expectations in this regard are set out in the declaration which has been circulated in the course of this meeting. I will not therefore read it out, but it is a declaration which seems to us to embody a sensible and reasonable view and one to which we attach some importance.

On government procurement, our partners will be aware of the difficulty we had on certain aspects of ex-post information or transparency. We were finally able to accept the present text on the understanding that paragraphs 4 and 6 of Part VI are covered by the provisions of paragraph 8 of that same part. We have also throughout this negotiation attached importance to the concept of a standstill on any extension of the Buy-American Act, or similar preferential provisions in regard to areas outside the scope of the agreement. Our objectives here have not been met in the text of the agreement but we reached some measure of clarification of respective intentions in this regard with some of our partners and we are also concerned that there should be adequate balance in reciprocity in the coverage of this agreement. We reserve our right to come back to this question in the light of possible developments in this area.
On subsidies and countervailing duties, the Agreement represents one of the most difficult and complex areas of the negotiations and one of the most important in its results. We consider that the acceptance by the United States of procedures for taking countervailing action subject to a test of material injury is the absolute minimum requirement for any code in this field. And this Agreement brings a major trading nation in line with the GATT rules. Our Council of Ministers will be closely scrutinizing the implementing legislation on this part of the Agreement and we hope that the injury test and related procedures which are complicated but important will be faithfully carried into American domestic law. The provisions on subsidies provide a more specific remedy for countries who consider that such practices cause serious prejudice to their trade. Export subsidies apart, these provisions are less mandatory in character but this is only natural given the wide range of perfectly legitimate government intervention which takes place in modern economies to achieve economic and social objectives which are often some way removed from international trade. We have accepted these provisions and we intend to apply them. And we think that the provisions for dispute settlement here will in time show that in this complex area there is a need for a flexible approach and a full understanding of the issues involved in every case.

On customs valuation we recognize that a number of developing countries have got concerns about certain provisions in this Agreement and therefore have led them to make proposals to amend Part III of the Agreement. But it is our view that the Agreement is well balanced and that the fears of certain developing countries will be found to be largely unjustified in practice. So we do not think it is therefore sensible to agree to these proposed amendments at this point in time. But we are not putting the developing countries' proposals as far as we are concerned on one side so that they are completely lost sight of. We think that the most appropriate course would be for these proposals to be referred by the TNC to the Valuation Committee which is to be set up under the Agreement and for this Committee to make a major review of the operation of the Agreement four years after it comes into affect. In the course of this review the developing country concerns as well as their specific needs as developing countries could be examined in the light of practical experience. Any necessary measures could be taken and we certainly would not rule out the possibility of further amendments to Part III of the Agreement if this were shown to be necessary at this stage. If urgent problems arise in practice, for example relating to Article I.2(b)(iv) which prejudice the interests of developing countries they can of course be examined by the Valuation Committee before the major review I suggested.

I should also make the point that if a number of the concerns of certain developing countries were found to be justified in practice then clearly substantive parts of the agreement would require to be modified.
We think that given that the developing countries which signed the Agreement will be allowed automatically to defer applying it until 1 January 1986, that the solution we suggest is reasonable. Developing countries who signed the Agreement will be able to participate in its management and will be able to raise in the Valuation Committee matters of particular concern to them and they will have the right to technical assistance furthermore without being bound by any of the Agreements' disciplines until that date of 1 January 1986. Before that date the problems they foresee at present can be examined in the light of experience and solved if they are found to exist. And if major problems remain and cannot be solved before the date of 1 January 1986 developing countries will have the same rights as other signatories to withdraw from the Agreement.

I think that these few words show that we have gone a long way to accommodate developing countries in the course of the negotiation on customs valuation and we think that this is the maximum reasonable direction that we can go.

In relation to counterfeit we think like a number of other delegations that commercial counterfeiting prejudices the interests of legitimate traders and of consumers alike and that the selling of counterfeit goods in international trade should be discouraged. Proposals for an agreement on treatment on counterfeit goods were introduced rather late. So we have not been able to finish the negotiations. But we are quite prepared to continue work on the subject with other interested delegations with the hope of reaching agreement which can be included among the final results. One further remark on this general complex relates to the Kyoto Convention. We think that the work of the Customs Co-operation Council on the Kyoto Convention and the harmonized system of description and coding of goods should be given formal recognition by participants in these negotiations and that the countries involved in the MTNs should give the maximum support to these activities as proposed in the relevant document before us.

On anti-dumping I would only say that there seems to be a satisfactory updating of the first Code in the GATT.

On import licensing procedures we would say that the Agreement which applies to automatic and non-automatic procedures contains a balanced compromise for the problems in this area. It is important to note that this Agreement deals with procedures and not with measures. The aim is that of simplifying and bringing transparency to these procedures which are considered to be neutral. We have made particular efforts to ensure that this Agreement contains provisions which make it easier for developing countries to become parties to this Agreement. I would mention in particular that the Agreement contains a temporary derogation of two years for those developing countries which have particular difficulties to comply with some important
obligations with regard to applications for automatic licensing and we think that adherence to this Agreement would represent an encouraging contribution by developing countries to the MTNs.

On the Aircraft Agreement I will be brief and say - and I note with a sense of encouragement the comment by our Japanese colleague - that the present figures of world trade in civil aircraft are of the order of $20 billion, that signatories and non-signatories alike will get the benefit of duty-free treatment on aircraft and a wide range of parts and that the agreement contains certain non-tariff disciplines, for example on subsidies. Non-signatories will not be required to undertake any obligations and if anyone says that they have been excluded from the negotiation of this Agreement not only is that point not valid but we gave notice of our intent some time back in July of last year, for example in the Framework of Understanding of July 1978 of our intention to negotiate an agreement in this area. But some delegations understandably have not manifested a great deal of interest in the negotiation of such an understanding.

There is one important area before I leave non-tariff barriers which several delegations have so far mentioned, and that is safeguards. And this is an area where we all know no agreement has yet proved possible. But we have decided to continue this work as a matter of urgency. We want to try and reach an agreement which can still form part of the overall MTN package. This means in practical terms that we have got two or three months. We for our part are ready to make a further effort and we would regard an overall package without a satisfactory safeguards clause as a package whose value was substantially diminished. Now, this is not the time to rehearse the many arguments on this. I would only like to say that we have always had as the Community objective an agreement which would permit - under a procedure which would be realistic and fully operational - action on a selective basis where appropriate. We have made some progress on the question of the circumstances which would be appropriate. What remains to be resolved is the precise rôle to be played by the Committee in reviewing such actions and proposed actions and in reaching conclusions or findings as to their consistency with the Agreement. We have always been prepared to accept a fair degree of surveillance, control and discipline. What we cannot accept is that any action would be subordinated to authorization by the Committee whether this notion is explicit or implicit in the text. We are not yet, I am afraid, at the stage of world government. It seems to us there is still room to find a solution though this will be difficult. And we still find, I am afraid to say, substantial problems in the latest available draft text. But we shall continue and hope that some mutually satisfactory arrangement can be reached in the next two or three months.

Then a word on a very important area of our negotiations. One of the most important; it relates to the developing countries. In a well-known European paper in April a journalist who was very badly informed said that
the third world had been superbly forgotten in the Tokyo Round. I think myself that this is not only a superb exaggeration but in fact precisely the opposite of the truth. Let us take for example the whole series of codes where some substantial and long-standing efforts have been made to include in these provisions which would be of use to developing countries. Take licensing, customs valuation, standards or the adoption for example by one of the main negotiating partners of the concept of material injury. This represents some very considerable advantages for our developing country friends. If one tries to find a precise evaluation in terms of figures this is more difficult. More difficult partly because of the generalized preference scheme. But we can refer to 1 January 1977 when the Community, without asking for any reciprocity, put into effect reductions on tropical products. In its first year of application this offer covered a volume of imports into the Community from the countries which benefited of the order of $4.8 billion.

In the industrial tariff field the generalized preference scheme does as I said complicate the picture but the concessions we have made cover a volume of imports from the countries which will benefit of the order of again $4.8 billion in 1976. And there is of course the difficulty here that some reductions in tariffs we have considered and offered are at times in conflict with the benefits conferred by the generalized preference scheme. But we have pursued the improvement of the generalized preference scheme particularly in relation to the poorest developing countries.

I would also say a word - because it needs to be said - on the other side of the medal. We have been happy to receive notifications presented by certain developing countries, for example India, South Korea, Brazil and Mexico, of important measures of liberalization and of customs simplification. While encouraging these are not, of course, quite in the same category as bound tariff reductions. But we would point to the fact that at the present time only a limited number of developing countries have given us offers of tariff bindings. We would still express the hope that the relatively advanced developing countries will be able to seize this last occasion to make contributions to these negotiations commensurate with their economic development.

On agriculture, Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that we note with pleasure the agreements reached on dairy products and meat. We regret the failure of the negotiations on grains though they will be continued. And we also note that after long negotiation a series of satisfactory bilateral arrangements have been reached on particular agricultural tariff concessions.

In conclusion I would simply say that the successful close which is now at hand of the most ambitious trade negotiation since the war is, I said at the outset, a fateful event. It was difficult enough to attain the major
tariff concessions which we now can count on. But an even bigger achievement in our view was the success which we now can point to, in arriving at a whole series of arrangements in the non-tariff barrier field. What has emerged in sum is a major tariff liberalization programme extending over the 1960s, which will give businessmen throughout the trading world confidence that the trade liberalization process which was set on foot in 1947 will continue and in addition to that a major strengthening and updating of the GATT with a series of important codes and with committees of signatories to administer them in some of the most important areas of international business activity. Mr. Chairman, in 1973 in Tokyo when this enterprise was officially launched and when I was then in the employ of the United Kingdom we sent a telegram from Tokyo which said that the show was on the road. It has been a long road. But the end of the road is in sight. There are still some details to be cleared up but we can now be confident that we shall soon be at the end of the journey. And I think historians will say that the two major achievements of this negotiation have not only been the impressive results before us but that these have been achieved in the light of the worst recession that the world has known for over forty years. It was said when the last negotiation was concluded, here in 1967, that the real test of the GATT was not what it had achieved up till then but what could be achieved and how the line would be held when the economic weather turned bad. Not only has the line been held throughout the trading world, but this major success is now very nearly with us. It compels me in conclusion to pay our tribute to the patience and skill of our negotiating partners.

B. Declaration on the Code on Technical Barriers to Trade (original English and French)

The Community notes that this Code has been designed to afford members mutual and reciprocal economic advantages and that this must entail a genuine balance between members' rights and obligations. This principle must be maintained particularly as regards the application of sections 5 (Determination of conformity to technical regulations and to standards by the institutions of the central government) and 6 (Determination of conformity to technical regulations and to standards by local public institutions and non-government bodies), and more specifically as regards the acceptance of test results and certificates or marks of conformity issued by responsible bodies within the territorial competence of other members.

The Community therefore states that such acceptance can only be given provided that it has obtained effective and mutually advantageous reciprocity following discussions with the partners concerned. Likewise, as regards access to the certification systems (sections 7, 8 and 9 of the Code) of suppliers of products originating in the territory of other Parties, the Community reserves the right to enter into a discussion with possible partners to arrive at mutually satisfactory arrangements ensuring that the suppliers of the various parties are really able to fulfil the obligations imposed by the certification systems and that their products may therefore have access to the territory of the various participants in these systems under conditions of total reciprocity.
FINLAND (Ambassador Kaarlehto)

Speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries - Finland, Norway and Sweden I wish to make the following statement.

The Declaration approved by Ministers in Tokyo on 14 September, 1973, defined as the objectives of the MTN to achieve the expansion and ever-greater liberalization of world trade and improvement in the standard of living and welfare of the peoples of the world, objectives which could be achieved, inter alia, through the progressive dismantling of obstacles to trade and the improvement of the international framework for the conduct of world trade.

For reasons which need not be specified the negotiations have been delayed and in the meantime protectionistic pressures have increased in the world. These developments have affected the negotiations and made it even more necessary to bring the MTN to a successful conclusion. In this connexion the Nordic countries wish to acknowledge with appreciation that our major trading partners in spite of the difficult circumstances have been able to pursue the negotiations vigorously and successfully.

In the Nordic statement in December last year we noted that the negotiations had resulted in broad agreement on most of the major issues although provisional and in some cases conditional. We emphasized that our efforts should be concentrated on cementing the results into a firm and successful conclusion of the MTN taking into account the interests of developed as well as developing countries. That objective has in our view been substantially achieved.

The Tokyo Declaration also aims at securing additional benefits for the international trade of developing countries so as to achieve a substantial increase in their foreign exchange earnings, the diversification of their exports, the acceleration of the rate of growth of their trade, taking into account their development needs.

The Nordic countries have made every effort to accommodate these objectives by negotiating provisions for differential and more favourable measures for the developing countries including in particular the least developed among them.

The Nordic countries consider that the results in the field of non-tariff measures constitute a major achievement. International agreements in the fields of technical barriers to trade, import licensing procedures, subsidies and countervailing measures, customs valuation, government procurement, anti-dumping, as well as the work on nomenclature harmonization, will contribute to international trade for decades. These solutions do not only amount to removing a very important part of the non-tariff obstacles to international trade, but above all to encouraging world trade by ensuring additional discipline in governments' activities in these important fields.
The significance of these agreements will to a large degree depend on their effective implementation both in terms of national legislation and internationally.

It goes without saying that the results achieved must be secured. Any reservations will have to be agreed in accordance with the procedures under the various agreements.

The Nordic countries welcome as important achievements the results that have now been reached with respect to the improvement of the international framework for the conduct of world trade. What we wanted was to give the GATT a more active rôle in promoting the expansion of trade between developed and developing countries, allowing the latter a greater participation in the trading system.

A formulation of a clause designed to provide a standing legal basis in the GATT for special and differential treatment in favour of developing countries was proposed by the Nordic countries. We consider that on this particular point the essential requirements of developing countries have been met. It has in this context been significant for the Nordic countries to provide for special treatment in favour of the least developed among developing countries, and it is particularly important that the enabling clause has fully met this requirement.

The Nordic countries regard this text, as well as the other texts agreed in Group "Framework" as important and timely adaptations of the GATT to present requirements of the world trading system. We expect that these texts will contribute to paving the way for increased co-operation between developed and developing countries in the GATT in the years ahead.

It is clear that the negotiations on tropical and other agricultural products have been of major importance to developing countries.

The negotiations on tropical products proper were quite appropriately given a special status as a priority sector, and the Nordic countries gave serious consideration to each and every request they received from LDC's, and implemented their concessions and contributions already on 1 January, 1977.

The Nordic countries stand ready to continue to consider requests put forward on agricultural products until such time as the new tariff schedules will be established.

The Nordic countries regret that no results have yet been achieved in the grains conference in spite of continuous efforts to come to compromise solutions. We are, on the other hand, by and large satisfied with the arrangements that have been worked out for dairy products and meat. The new
rules and mechanisms thus established will hopefully contribute towards more stable market conditions for these product categories, and the Nordic countries believe this will be beneficial to all countries trading in those products, whether importers or exporters, developed or developing.

The tariff negotiations have so far resulted in commitments between a number of delegations to reduce tariffs significantly. The Nordic countries have reached agreement with some of their important trading partners while negotiations are still being pursued with some others. The overall results already achieved in the industrial sector seem to equal the general level of reductions in the Kennedy Round. Special importance must be attached to the fact that the principal trading nations are prepared to cut their tariffs substantially even in a time of pressures on the world trading system. The psychological impact of these traditional liberalizing measures on the business climate should not be underestimated. In this regard I should like to stress, Mr. Chairman, the importance of securing full implementation of the tariff reductions offered.

We agree that the work on safeguards should continue with a view to achieving an operative, effective and generally acceptable agreement before 15 July this year.

Having dealt with our main business for today, I should like to take this opportunity to make a brief announcement.

The Nordic countries have jointly decided to undertake the financial sponsorship of two trade policy courses with emphasis on the expected results of the MTN in order to enable, in particular, the least developed countries to assess the benefits stemming from these negotiations. We regard this initiative as a contribution to realizing the objective embodied in the Tokyo Declaration to give special consideration to the problems of the least developed among the developing countries.

The Nordic countries have asked the secretariat in co-operation with the ITC to arrange during 1980 two special trade policy courses, with 25-30 participants each, primarily reserved for government officials from the least developed countries. Each course would last three weeks and would include a series of lectures entrusted to experts from inside and outside the GATT secretariat, including officials of other international organizations. The courses would cover an introduction to GATT, the results of the Tokyo Round in different fields and in particular the codes of conduct adopted during the MTN with emphasis on their implication for the countries participating in the courses.

The Nordic countries have attempted to explore constructively all possibilities of differential treatment in the MTN and regard the initiative that I have just presented as complementary to what has been achieved in the negotiations. Additional action is no doubt required, in
particular as regards the least developed countries. We have in mind in particular the need for increased and broadened support for the International Trade Centre on the basis of international effort-sharing.

This negotiation has not been easy for any participating delegation. An enormous amount of work has been done. These efforts are now coming to a successful end and we may look forward with optimism and confidence to the continuation of free trade.

The Nordic delegations are prepared to sign the Procès-Verbal thus indicating their intention to submit the relevant texts or legal instruments for the consideration of their respective authorities with a view to seeking their approval.
ICELAND (Ambassador Kröyer)

Iceland's participation in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations has to a large extent been participation by proxy, through the intermediary of the very able negotiators of the other Nordic countries, Finland, Norway and Sweden.

In the course of the practice adopted by the Nordic group, to speak with one voice, the Nordic spokesman has at various stages of the MTN spoken also on behalf of Iceland. It is a fact, however, that during the last phase of the negotiations the other three Nordic countries have progressed further in their negotiations than Iceland has been able to. For that reason, my delegation felt that it would not be quite appropriate to include Iceland in the statement just made on behalf of the other three Nordic countries. The authorities of my Government have not yet been able to consider fully the various texts that will now be authenticated. For that reason, my Government has furthermore decided that it would not be appropriate that the representative of Iceland should sign the Procès Verbal now. The intention is, however, to sign it as soon as possible, when our authorities have had the opportunity to study the various texts.

Having explained this, I wish to assure you and this meeting that the general observations made by Ambassador Kaarlehto on behalf of the other three Nordic countries reflect views which are fully shared and endorsed by the Government of Iceland.
ISRAEL (Dr. I. Eliashiv)

We have marched a long way in the Tokyo Round for its completion; the avenue is still open for appropriate solutions to some outstanding issues in the spirit of the objectives and principles of the Tokyo Declaration, in particular, in favour of the developing countries.

The draft agreements and other new documents are still being examined by my Government which will take, in due course, its decision on each and every code as well as on other issues. Some of our views are well reflected in the summings-up and other documents before us.

In conclusion, we reserve the right to present in writing our position in detail to be circulated by the secretariat.
SWEDEN (Mr. M. Lemmel, on behalf of some countries)

I would like to make a brief statement concerning the question of Anti-Dumping.

There have been discussions recently between some developing and developed countries on the revision of the Anti-Dumping Code. A considerable amount of progress has been made but time has not permitted the discussions to be finalized. These countries have therefore agreed, while some of them will initial the new code, nevertheless to continue their efforts to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution in this field.
This is a proud day for us all. We meet to take a truly historic step in the history of international trade relations – a step that moves us significantly toward a more liberal and certainly a fairer trading system.

This long trek, which began more than five years ago in Tokyo in a far simpler economic environment, has been continually beset by obstacles. Many diversions along the way appeared for a time to spell doom for the Tokyo Round. Throughout our work we have been buffeted by serious economic shocks, growing protectionism and self-destructing pessimism.

Each person here today has represented his Government’s position with skill and persistence under trying circumstances. It has been a great personal privilege for me to be associated in this endeavour with such a dedicated group of public servants.

In the course of these negotiations we have made compromises and we have had to be pragmatic. The Tokyo Round was no theoretical exercise. It was a diligent search for the most important step forward that the world economic system could accept and absorb at this critical point in history.

None of us has obtained all that we wanted or struggled to obtain. We have gradually had to accept compromises in recognizing that a mutually balanced result is the only acceptable conclusion. But we need to make no apologies – none of us. We have far exceeded the expectations of most of us and our constituents. We assemble today with an accomplishment before us that represents the most comprehensive and significant result produced by any trade negotiations up to this time.

As Ambassador Robert S. Strauss is repeatedly emphasizing to our Congress and to the American people, we all need to concentrate on the two thirds of the glass that is full, not on the one third that is empty.

Let us consider for a moment the wider significance of what we have accomplished:

- The trading system has been saved from a threatened collapse.

- The major trading countries will not underline not be turning inward, but will be opening further their markets to trade expansion.

- We have an impressive agreement between developed and developing countries resulting from the work of the Group on Framework as well as numerous bilateral agreements between developed and developing countries.

- We have spelled out special and differential treatment for developing countries in a number of concrete ways.
- We have produced the most important agricultural results ever.
- We have provided our producers with significant new opportunities to expand profitable export activities.
- We have helped assure our consumers that they will be the ultimate beneficiaries of the trading system in the form of lower prices, better selection and higher quality products.
- And, finally, we have reinforced the GATT and thereby the trading system itself. In doing so, we have also established a spirit of collaboration and consultation that sets a proper tone for a new era of development and harmony in trade relationships.

The United States delegation is grateful for the time and attention given by all of you to our multilateral as well as our bilateral negotiations. Naturally, we were pleased to complete successfully our discussions with our developed country colleagues who represent the largest proportion of our trade flow. But we were in the Tokyo Round particularly pleased that to date we have also signed ad referendum agreements with nineteen individual developing countries. This is a remarkable result. It could serve as a major step forward to bring these countries closer into the arena of more active participation and benefits from the international trading system. In total the United States has reached bilateral understandings to date with forty-one countries.

I will not describe further the package in detail. Excellent summaries have been prepared by the GATT, by my Government, and by others.

I would like, however, to state our determination to complete work as quickly as possible on a safeguards code and an understanding on commercial counterfeiting. It is our hope that these items can be completed in time to be included among the final results of the Tokyo Round.

In concluding, I would simply like to remark that our representative national authorities and the citizens of our individual countries are deeply interested, and rightfully so, in the implications of the Tokyo Round Agreements on each of our economies. I believe we can all return to our capitals with the message that the implications are overwhelmingly positive. Our achievement is potentially the most significant development in international trade since the establishment of the GATT itself over thirty years ago. It will be up to us and to the national authorities who succeed us to turn that potential into solid, long-term benefits.
Thus, the United States supports the results of the Tokyo Round. These results, achieved under the most adverse circumstances, represent a testimony to political will - by all participants. I am particularly pleased with the leadership responsibility assumed by President Carter at the London summit and pursued without pause by him and his able special trade representative, Ambassador Robert S. Strauss. Without their dedication to the success of the Tokyo Round, we could well have faltered. The United States will sign this comprehensive trade package. We hope all other countries interested in the positive future of international trade will join us. Furthermore, on behalf of President Carter and Ambassador Strauss, I pledge to you that our full energies are now and will be aimed at securing our congressional approval for this memorable trade package at the earliest possible date.
MALAYSIA (Mr. Yee Che Fong)

Let me at the outset indicate to this gathering of top trade-negotiators that my delegation endorses the statement that was made by the distinguished representative of Yugoslavia on behalf of the developing countries participants of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations.

After nearly six years of negotiations in Geneva and elsewhere, multilaterally, bilaterally and plurilaterally we are coming to the end of the Tokyo Round in which our Ministers had aimed inter alia to "secure additional benefits for the international trade of developing countries . . . . , achieve a substantial increase in their foreign exchange earnings, the diversification of their exports, the acceleration of the rate of growth of their trade . . . . , an improvement in the possibilities for these countries to participate in the expansion of world trade and a better balance as between developed and developing countries in the sharing of the advantages resulting from this expansion, through . . . . a substantial improvement in the conditions of access for the products of interest to the developing countries . . . .".

These are famous words from paragraph 2 of the Tokyo Declaration and which have been emphasized over and over again by various delegations. If we critically examine each of the documents which we have before us purporting to be results of the negotiations under the MTN, we will find that hardly any one of them had or could give effect to paragraph 2 of the Tokyo Declaration. What has been more lacking is the fact that paragraph 6 of the Tokyo Declaration in which our Ministers recognize that the particular situation and problems of the least developed among the developing countries shall be given special attention has almost been totally neglected except perhaps in the Agreement on Government Procurement.

Today we note the presentation of a series of documents purporting to be Agreements. On these I must say that the texts contained therein do not take sufficiently into account the objectives of our Ministers. More so, these documents largely do not reflect the position of developing countries and particularly their need for development and consistency with the New International Economic Order. As evident in the summings-up of the Chairmen of the various Groups, my delegation together with other developing countries has made various proposals on the various Agreements. It is our expectation that these proposals would be considered at this Trade Negotiations Committee meeting. It is our expectation that these Agreements should be brought into effect consistent with international practice as evidenced in Agreements and Codes negotiated under the United Nations family.

Some of these proposals especially on the final provisions of the Agreements need not have appeared if the Trade Negotiations Committee had met more regularly and had addressed itself to the question of procedures. Paragraph 10 of the Tokyo Declaration charges the Trade Negotiations Committee with authority inter alia,

"to elaborate and put into effect detailed trade negotiating plans and to establish appropriate negotiating procedures, including special procedures for the negotiations between developed and developing countries."
The situation which we find ourselves to be in today only testifies that the Trade Negotiations Committee has failed to discharge its tasks properly. The developing countries had many months ago called for proper rules of procedure to be laid out both for the Trade Negotiations Committee and for the various Groups and Sub-Groups but the matter was not taken up. In July 1978, at a meeting of the Trade Negotiations Committee, the developing countries had stated that no document emerging from the negotiations could be considered adopted unless it were accepted by the large majority of the participants in the MTN. My delegation continues to subscribe to this view.

If you check through the records of the Trade Negotiations Committee, you will no doubt realise that developing country delegations including mine, have constantly pointed out the need for transparency in the negotiations. Yet today we find texts of Agreements which have been negotiated amongst a few developed countries on subjects like Trade in Civil Aircraft of which an overwhelming majority of participants in the MTN were not aware until 7 April 1979. My country and many other developing countries are sizeable customers for civil aircraft and yet we have been kept out of the negotiations of this Agreement. What is most intriguing is the fact that this Agreement has not come under the aegis of any Group. This is an entirely unsatisfactory state of affairs. A precedent is now set for various groups of countries to put up Agreements amongst themselves and to seek the umbrella of the MTN.

The so-called Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of GATT is another document that has surfaced at the final hour. This document like the one on Trade in Civil Aircraft is proposed by a number of delegations. On the question of anti-dumping it must be recalled that developing countries had at various meetings of the Group on NTM's advocated for the creation of a Sub-Group on anti-dumping but had been tenaciously resisted by the developed countries particularly those who are members of the Anti-Dumping Code. Today we find a so-called Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of GATT proposed largely by those who had resisted the creation of the sub-group. The problems and special needs of the developing countries on the question of anti-dumping cannot be said to have been taken into account.

Paragraph 8 of the Tokyo Declaration says that "the negotiations shall be considered as one undertaking, the various elements of which shall move forward together". It is the view of my delegation that at this point of time the various elements have not moved forward together. We have yet to find a solution to problems which developing countries face in the arbitrary and discriminatory manner under which GATT Article XIX action is taken by the developed countries. Work that is called for in pursuance of paragraph 3(d) of the Tokyo Declaration is far from completed despite the considerable concessions made by developing countries. We hope to see some positive results on this matter by July 1979.
In addition to safeguards, the tariff negotiations are still not yet complete. What is more disturbing is the fact that many requests in tropical products, a special and priority sector in our negotiations, have not met with response. It will be recalled that when the Group "Tropical Products" was established by the Trade Negotiations Committee in February 1975, it was widely understood that the Group would be concerned with all restrictions affecting trade in this sector, tariff and non-tariff alike. This understanding was reaffirmed at the first meeting of the Group. In pursuance of this understanding, the request lists submitted by my country and other developing countries contained requests for both tariff and non-tariff concessions. Whilst there have been responses from the developed countries on tariffs, the overwhelming majority of requests submitted by the developing countries with regard to non-tariff measures affecting trade in tropical products have not been taken up in the context of the negotiations to date. Work in the "Tropical Products" Group must therefore continue to resolve the unfinished business.

The text in the Agreement on Implementation of Article VII of GATT (Customs Valuation) appearing as MTN/NTM/W/229/Rev.1 seriously prejudices the interests of the developing countries. The Agreement does not provide for correct assessment of duties. It permits prices to be manipulated and above all it will not enable the customs authorities to discharge their functions satisfactorily. The amendments proposed by the developing countries as contained in document MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1 must be incorporated in the Agreement in order to take into account some of the problems and needs of developing countries.

My delegation notes the texts that have been proposed by the Group "Framework". Right from the beginning my delegation together with many other countries had expressed reservation on some of the items that were dealt with by this Group. On the question of export restrictions and charges it is the view of my delegation that the "security of supply" problems arose from the lack of liberal economic policies in importing countries. It is also the view of my delegation that any consideration or examination of the subject of export restrictions should be undertaken within the context of United Nations Resolution 3201 (S-VI) which emphasizes the full permanent sovereignty of every State over its natural resources and all economic activities. Further, such consideration or examination should be undertaken with a view to giving effect to United Nations Resolution 3202 (S-VI) which states that all efforts should be made "to take measures to promote the processing of raw materials in the producer developing countries".

It has been said that one of the most important causes of our current crisis challenging the trading system is the weakness of the international institutional framework for the trading system. It is believed that some of the Agreements and texts before us today would help to improve the situation. But many problems of the developing countries remain unattended to. It is doubtful that what we see before us today would accommodate the changing relationship between countries and between groups of countries as well as between different economic systems. Moreover, no question is ever settled until it is settled right.
We are on the point of putting our signatures to texts which express in terms of words, figures, percentages and tariff headings the results of the most complex and most extensive negotiations ever held under the auspices of GATT. The time has come, therefore, to appreciate also the political implications of this act, which is not an end in itself, but above all a starting point. Indeed the commitments entered into today, and that we shall still have to formalize, will be valid only by the manner in which they are implemented individually and collectively. In this connexion, I should like to underline that we consider them as a confirmation of the will of the participants to consolidate and improve the open system of international trade relations, of which the General Agreement is the foundation; a system that also reflects the concern for strict observance of disciplines that are essential for the maintenance of equitable conditions of competition; a system, lastly, that must allow developing countries, thanks to the special and differential treatment provided for them, to take an increasingly active part in international trade and progressively to associate themselves, as their economies become inured, with the general regime established by GATT.

The fact that the Tokyo Round is close to completion at the very time when the world economy is in a phase of sluggish growth and latent disequilibrium implies refusal to seek the necessary remedies in withdrawal and isolation. That is why we hope that the largest possible number of countries, be they developed or developing, will participate in implementing the agreements concluded under the Tokyo Declaration.

In expressing this hope I should like to underline that if, as representative of Switzerland, I am in a position to sign the Procès-Verbal now before us, that does not necessarily imply that the texts attached thereto are in every respect consistent with the objectives that we had set ourselves, nor that they correspond fully to what we consider as being our essential interests. We believe, nevertheless, that these agreements constitute the best possible result and that accordingly the time has come to conclude, bringing into play the spirit of compromise without which no negotiation can succeed.

Among the texts presented to us, there is nevertheless one that has been put before us by a few delegations and concerns trade in the field of civil aviation, regarding which I must still leave open the position of my authorities. May I add forthwith that it is essentially for lack of time that I am not today in a position to indicate a definitive position regarding that agreement.

Similarly, it is for reasons of a practical nature that negotiations are still proceeding between my delegation and one or two developed countries, and with Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, the Ivory Coast, South Korea, Egypt,
India, Jamaica, Mexico, Nigeria and the Philippines. Immediately after the Easter break we shall be pursuing the negotiations with those countries and with any other developing countries, including the least developed among them which have only just presented certain requests to us.

In the area of tariff negotiations, we shall present our schedule as foreseen and in the conditions fixed by the Procès-Verbal which is before us for signature. In doing so, we consider that nothing is yet established at this stage in regard to the staging of the reductions, the rate at which these will take place, negotiating rights, etc. We are convinced, nevertheless, that decisions on these aspects can be taken within a very short time.

One last remark, concerning the problem of safeguard clauses under Article XIX. Without coming back to the vicissitudes of the negotiations on this particularly complex issue, I should like to underline that in our view nothing would be more disquieting for the future of international trade than a situation of disagreement as to the interpretation of that Article. I should like to conclude, therefore, with an appeal to seek a balanced compromise within the time-limits established.
A. Statement

It is apparent that unless we are all going to have breakfast together, some of us must make our remarks fairly brief.

Tomorrow, if we conclude this meeting, our Deputy Prime Minister, who chairs the Committee of the Canadian Cabinet which gives me my instructions, will make a sufficiently detailed public statement concerning our view of the outcome of the negotiations. I do not propose, therefore, to repeat what he is already planning to say. In any event, we consider that from the Canadian point of view these negotiations with our principal trading partners are broadly successful. We have not got everything we have asked for and we have not given everything that was asked of us. Nonetheless, I think we all ought to recognize that we are enabled by this process of negotiations to agree to changes in our commercial policy systems which are in our own national self-interest. We are none of us, I think, doing things which are against our self-interest, and that is a point which in the months ahead should be brought forcefully to the attention of legislators.

In broad terms, it is perfectly clear that the results of these negotiations as they are brought into effect will provide an element of stability in the international economic order and that they will provide the necessary revised rules for the orderly development of world trade.

From the point of view of my delegation, there are certain matters which remain to be done.

First, there are two agreements - one on trade in dairy products and one on customs valuation about which I wish to make statements (reproduced under B and C below).

As regards safeguards, I think that in the months ahead we should keep in mind that this is not a negotiation between two groups. There is a wide variety of interests and my delegation shares many of the preoccupations expressed by certain delegations of developing countries in this matter. We will be prepared to devote considerable energy to the evolution of an agreement within the time-period specified.

It is clear that as far as we are concerned we have fallen behind other larger delegations in the conduct of negotiations with developing countries. So in the remaining weeks before 30 June, we will intensify our efforts to conclude product-related discussions with the delegations of developing countries.
There are quite a lot of details to be sorted out - but they are matters of detail - with our principal trading partners, and - a matter which is not just detail - there is the problem of translations. Many of these documents have been negotiated in only one language and for those of us where two languages are equally authentic in national terms, we must give attention to the translations.

A final point I would like to make is that I do not accept the procedural proposals advanced by the representative of Malaysia.

B. Written statement on MTN Dairy Arrangement

Regarding my signature of the Procès-Verbal in relation to the Dairy Arrangement (MTN/DP/8, Annexes A and B), I wish to make clear that the Canadian Government will consider accepting the Milk Powder Protocol of the Arrangement only when other parties are in a position to agree to arrangements which would enable Canada to be competitive as regards skim milk powder exports to Mexico and other Caribbean rim markets.

C. Written statement on Customs Valuation

1. Other participants in the negotiations are well aware of the difficulties which the proposed Agreement on implementation of Article VII of the GATT (customs valuation) poses for Canada. Our present system of customs valuation differs more fundamentally from the provisions of the proposed Agreement than that of most other participants. Our present system deals with a number of trading situations which the Agreement does not. Moreover, adoption of the Valuation Agreement by the Canadian Government would lead to a substantial decline in the valuation base on which ad valorem duties are levied.

2. At an earlier stage in the negotiations, the Canadian delegation had sought to persuade others to agree to changes in the provisions of the Valuation Agreement to accommodate our concerns. These have not been forthcoming. However, in light of the importance which our major trading partners attach to acceptance of the Agreement by the Canadian Government, we have made serious efforts in recent months to work out with our trading partners a series of understandings that would enable our Government to accept the Agreement. These understandings concerned measures which we could take to offset any significant loss of protection that might result if we were to change our valuation system and the necessity for our authorities to have sufficient time to make the change to the new valuation system. Full agreement has not yet been reached on these necessary understandings.

3. In the circumstances, I will sign the Procès-Verbal in relation to the text of this Agreement and will submit it to my Government. I am instructed to advise the Trade Negotiations Committee that approval and acceptance of
this Agreement by the Government of Canada will be considered only when it is accepted that:

1. Canada would be expected to implement the Valuation Agreement within four years from the date of its implementation by the United States, the EEC and Japan;

2. In cases where it is determined that the Canadian level of tariff protection would be reduced through implementation of the new valuation system, Canada would, in accordance with the relevant procedures of the GATT, be able to adjust its tariff rates so as to rectify such loss of tariff protection as a matter of right and without being expected to pay compensation. It is recognized that the rights of other Contracting Parties to seek redress under the GATT would continue to be available should any such adjustment appear to be in excess of that required to rectify the loss of protection;

3. Canada could take reasonable and appropriate measures to deal with:

   (a) unfair and predatory trading practices insofar as imports are concerned, and

   (b) the so-called special cases (such as used goods, off-quality goods, etc.) identified by the Canadian delegation in discussions of the Valuation Agreement.

   It is understood that, in regard to measures under sub-paragraph (b), it would not be Canada's intention to provide protection greater than that now provided, and with regard to both sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), any measures would be taken in a manner consistent with Canada's international obligations.

4. In the event that it develops that other participants are prepared to accept the Agreement only with explicit reservations, my Government might have to consider doing likewise, especially if the undertakings received from our main trading partners are not sufficiently firm as regards the points set out above.
Now that we are at the end of a long exercise of patience, effort, conciliation and compromise imposed on us by these multilateral trade negotiations, I should like in the name of the Republic of Zaire to make the following comments and remarks, which I would request the secretariat to include in the record of our discussions today.

First of all, I wish to express my country’s support for the very lucid statement made by Dr. Tomic as spokesman of the developing countries; that statement reflects our point of view and we adhere to it fully.

Indeed, we find with regret that the multilateral trade negotiations, which some of our partners would like to see us conclude today by signing the Procès-Verbal that is before us, have not taken place in the spirit of the Tokyo Declaration in regard to the additional benefits that they were supposed to secure for our economies. Under paragraph 5 of the Tokyo Declaration, our developed-country partners in the negotiations had accepted and declared, inter alia, that they did not expect reciprocity for commitments made by them in these trade negotiations to reduce or remove tariff and other barriers to the trade of developing countries. Now, these same countries, when presented with requests for concessions on products of trade interest to us, carefully presented to us requests for contributions in exchange for their offers of concessions, some of which nevertheless seem of little significance in regard to the extent of the reduction and consequently their impact on the development of our exports. Others, having received our requests for concessions, have replied that they could not take them into consideration on the pretext that we were neither a principal supplier nor a major supplier, thus disregarding the importance for our economy of the products in respect of which we had made requests for concessions.

Thus, in addition to the slowness of discussions, which was still excusable, the limited progress made on essential problems and issues of major importance for the developing countries, we have encountered ingenious delaying tactics, a lack of real political will on the part of some of our developed-country partners, as if in actual fact one was seeking to bring into question the essential basis of the commitments taken in favour of the developing countries, both in the General Agreement and in the Tokyo Declaration, in respect to the differential and more favourable treatment to be granted to them.

On the one hand, our developed-country partners ask us to contribute to the liberalization of international trade and exchanges - something we accept - while on the other hand, they show reluctance to grant, in response to our requests to them, major concessions that could have secured for us a few comparative advantages likely to boost our exports and increase our share
of world trade. This attitude stems from a return to the old demon of protectionism, at a time when we speak of expansion of international trade, of integration of developing countries in a renovated world trade system and in the context of a new international economic order. If we were to accede entirely to their requests, we would be trapped in the very practices and mechanisms that we are denouncing. Everything happens as if the desire was to restrict us to the rôle of suppliers of raw materials and to discourage us in our efforts toward industrialization and transformation of our economies, although we are predisposed to such efforts by reason of our abundant natural resources.

In regard to non-tariff measures, we are obliged to recognize that not only has very little progress been made toward dismantling or easing them, but indeed they have become more subtle, more insidious, and have thus taken on much more importance than tariffs. Each such measure rivals in ingenuity with the others. The mechanisms and procedures for controlling international trade take very little account of the legitimate concerns of the developing countries. Generally speaking, the codes and other legal instruments concerning non-tariff measures and the legal framework have, in many cases, been negotiated under procedures that have not always been conducive to full participation by the developing countries in the various consultations. The consequence is that the results presented to us today constitute, in the case of many of the codes, compromise solutions reached rather between developed partners than between developed and developing partners. This is the case in particular for the code on trade in civil aircraft, the code on customs valuation where the draft amendment proposed by the developing countries was not included by the other developed-country partners, and so forth. The case of the code on safeguard measures is highly discouraging. We hope that between now and 15 July we can arrive at a mutually satisfactory result.

We well understand the concern of our developed-country friends to protect the quality of life at which their peoples have arrived after arduous efforts, to which we wish to pay a tribute; but is it right to protect the quality of life in their countries to the detriment of that of the developing countries, to the detriment of those who are denied the right to the minimum basic income?

Is that the best approach?

And for how long is the quality of life to be protected in the most privileged regions of the world while two thirds of mankind, deprived of the minimum basic income, are nevertheless obliged to produce food for the others?

To find appropriate solutions to these extremely complex problems what we need, rather than a technocratic or technician's approach, is a true transformation of mentality, an in-depth mutation of spirit.
In acceding to the General Agreement and to the Tokyo Declaration all of us took on specific commitments toward the developing countries, and in particular the least developed among them.

In our capacity as members of the United Nations we have taken on specific commitments by supporting the establishment of a new, fairer and more equitable international economic order.

Yet despite this general picture which is more depressing than encouraging, and despite the conjunctural difficulties currently besetting the Republic of Zaire, my country has recently adopted a series of measures to liberalize its trade with its principal partners. Some of those measures imply substantial reductions in certain tariffs and constitute our general contribution to the multilateral trade negotiations, in response to those of our developed-country partners who have felt themselves obliged to ask us for contributions.

In addition to those tariff reductions, my country has also adopted in the context of reform of the import duty tariff, a series of unilateral and autonomous measures supplementing its efforts toward liberalization of international trade. Those measures include reductions extending to full elimination of certain revenue duties and of the turnover tax.

On the basis of Zaire's import statistics for 1975, the liberalization measures just taken affect trade of a value of nearly $102 million.

This reflects the constant desire of the Republic of Zaire to contribute to the establishment of a renovated framework for the conduct of world trade.

For the rest, and with all reservations, we will submit to the competent authorities of the Republic of Zaire, for their examination, all the texts and other relevant legal instruments comprising the results of these negotiations, in accordance with our national legislation.

Meanwhile, we request the secretariat to continue to make all necessary efforts to utilize the tremendous possibilities inherent in the organization and promotion of trade among developing countries, in the context of activities bearing on enlargement of the Protocol relating to Trade Negotiations among Developing Countries.
ROMANIA (Mr. M. Petrescou)

The Romanian delegation supports the statement made by the representative of Yugoslavia on behalf of the developing countries, with these few general considerations.

1. While no human achievement is perfect - and in particular the results of the multilateral trade negotiations - the way of using it is of very great importance: good achievements can by their application become bad, and less good ones can be improved. It is our hope that the framework at which we have arrived today can serve for the removal of barriers to trade, particularly those affecting the developing countries, for holding back protectionist tendencies, strengthening economic co-operation among the nations of the world with the participation of all States in conditions of full equality and with consideration of the interests of all participants, and for the establishment of a new economic order.

2. Romania has participated in the negotiations to the extent of its economic possibilities, having in view the legitimate need to obtain increased access for its exports on the international market, consistently with its economic development needs, while taking account of the justified interests of its partners.

3. While the representative of Romania will sign the Procès-Verbal drawn up following this meeting, that signature will imply only authentification of the documents annexed thereto, without in any way anticipating as to the decision of the competent authorities and without making any appreciation as to the value of those documents.
INDIA (Mr. Prem Kumar)

My delegation supports the statement made by Dr. Tomić of Yugoslavia on behalf of developing countries. We have circulated our specific comments on the various codes and documents before us. I shall make some general observations here and refer to some aspects of our specific comments. The rest may be taken as read and fully reflected in the records of the meeting.

It is not my intention to try to evaluate today the results of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations. We are too close in point of time to the concluding stages of these negotiations for a detailed analysis and in certain areas like tariffs it is only just now that we are seeing the final schedules of the countries following the formula approach. We intend to make such an evaluation later, as indeed we have been mandated to do by our Ministers at Arusha and revert to the subject in the future. We shall have to test the results against the objectives and commitments of the Tokyo Declaration.

Today, we have mixed feelings. The negotiations have been long and arduous in which several problem areas were identified. Our participation has varied from very close and intensive in certain sectors to a peripheral rôle in others where the negotiations have been conducted largely among the major trading countries. There are some useful Codes emerging from negotiations and it would be our expectation that they would be implemented in a manner keeping the basic objectives of the Tokyo Declaration in view and, to the extent special and differential treatment has been provided for in these Codes, it would be consolidated and effectively implemented.

In view of the fact that we have neither participated in the negotiations nor had occasion to examine the texts which we have seen only now, I would like to express my delegation's total reservation with regard to the agreements reached among some delegations from developed countries in respect of Anti-Dumping and Civil Aircraft.

I do not think we have fundamentally restructured the framework of GATT in a manner so as to make the trading system more responsive to the needs of developing countries and to the dynamics of the world economy. Thus for example, the basic principle of preservation of rights of trading countries is still based on the law of the jungle, i.e. tit for tat, and not what an enlightened world community might wish to follow in order to collectively safeguard and preserve the rights of the weaker partners.

Another area in which little progress has taken place is that of "Quantitative Restrictions" affecting the developing countries. The most pervading restrictions, namely those in the textiles sector, have not even been discussed on the ground that they are covered by the MFA. The MFA, however, is a temporary arrangement, a departure from generally accepted principles while what we are trying to do is long-term liberalization of
world trade. It is disappointing to see that attempts are still being made to protect in the countries boasting of most advanced technologies and highest standards of living, such industries as those producing shellac from seed lac and weaving of jute, when these industries generally are threatened by synthetics and substitutes. Very little effort has been made to eliminate tariff-escalation which would facilitate diversification of economies of the developing countries to which we are committed as long ago as when Part IV of the GATT was incorporated. It is anomalous to see in today's world developed countries' insistence on obtaining tea in bulk and hides and skins rather than encouraging their processing in developing countries in keeping with the commitments made in different fora.

We feel there is still time to make improvements and to rectify these deficiencies. We would invite our developed countries partners to sit with us and join in this effort before we close the negotiations. Steps should be taken to not only remove quantitative restrictions within a time frame and improve the tariff offers but to implement them in one stage and rectify the erosion of tariff offers made for tropical products. On our side we have made a major contribution through liberalization of imports, the details of which were circulated among the participating countries last year. Let it be noted that this we have already implemented and it is not to be staged and not subject to review before starting action. We are engaged in further bilateral exercises also.

One last general point I would like to make is that we have to be cautious about the structure we set up for administration of various codes. For every code, a committee of signatories is being suggested to administer it. This must not be allowed to lead to fragmentation of GATT or in any way to erode the universal character of this organization charged with the responsibility of maintaining the legal frame of the world trading system. In any event, the operation of these codes should involve "open decisions openly arrived at" and these committees should be answerable to the GATT CONTRACTING PARTIES who should be able to issue directions to them.

The representative of India then made a statement based on written statements on safeguards, technical barriers, government procurement, subsidies and countervailing duties, licensing and customs valuation, which, together with written statements on tariffs, quantitative restrictions and agricultural framework had been made available to delegates in the meeting, and are reproduced below. He also recalled the statement he had made in the Group "Framework" at its meeting of 3 April 1979 (MTN/FR/W/23).

Safeguards (MTN/SG/12)

My Government considers the question of "Safeguards" to be one of the most important in the MTNs. Evolution of a code on safeguards which would lead to greater discipline, objectivity, transparency, and better
surveillance; a code which would provide for a dynamic world economy in which the developing countries can continue smoothly to develop and diversify their economies, in our view must be an essential element of any international trading system. The MTNs provide for a great opportunity for bringing about structural changes in the world production and for attainment of the goals generally accepted for developing countries' share in world manufactures. A code on safeguards ought to facilitate the attainment of these objectives. Consequently I have to express great concern of my Government at the fact that there is no such code in the proposals presented today. In considering their attitude towards the final package that may emerge from the negotiations, the Government of India would view this as a serious lacuna affecting the overall balance and the objectives of the Tokyo Declaration as remaining unfulfilled. They particularly regard codes on subsidies and countervailing duties and on safeguards as twin disciplines striking a balance between the interests of developed and developing countries. It would be difficult to view in isolation one of them.

It is a matter of disappointment that the situation should be so, after developing countries have taken such a large step to accommodate the wishes of some trading partners on the modalities of safeguard action, which involved sacrifice of basic principles and risking the possibility of discriminatory action against them which could affect their growth process. The positions reached on this question were acceptable to a large number of developed and developing countries but for a few of developed countries. In response to what Sir Roy Denman has said about the role of the surveillance body, I would only say that there is no question of sovereignty or freedom for taking safeguard action involved. As is the case in many articles of GATT, prior authorization is necessary to deviate from the general law and the norm.

We hope that efforts would still be made to evolve the code by 15 July 1979, and meanwhile nothing would be done unilaterally to change the agreed interpretation of Article XIX of the GATT or the manner in which this has been applied all through. There are rules in GATT for interpreting its articles and a unilateral interpretation could open doors for a similar approach with regard to other areas of the General Agreement.

**Technical barriers to trade (MTN/NTM/W/192/Rev.5)**

With reference to Articles 7.2 and Articles 9.3, it is our understanding that access relating to the use of any "standard mark" may be subject to the condition that the government of the supplier's country accepts the responsibility for preventing the misuse of the standard mark.

**Government procurement (MTN/NTM/W/211/Rev.1)**

My delegation participates in the consensus that has emerged with regard to the text of the Agreement on Government Procurement contained in MTN/NTM/W/211/Rev.1. We would expect that with regard to the entities
listed in the Annex, products of interest to developing countries would be particularly opened up for procurement and where such products are subject to bilateral quotas, the quantities to be procured by the entities in developed countries would be over and above the quotas. We hope also that at the time of proposed review the threshold be suitably adjusted to enable developing countries' firms to benefit from procurement. We would like to clarify our understanding that no compensatory adjustments would be required in the event of a developing country seeking modification of its schedule of entities on account of balance-of-payments difficulties.

Subsidies and countervailing measures (MTN/NTM/W/236)

This delegation has participated actively in the last stages of consultations and negotiations that led to the preparation of document MTN/NTM/W/236. Our principal objective in this connexion was to ensure that the text finally arrived at was one which developing countries could consider reasonable and acceptable. This required that the code recognized the need and made adequate provision for developing countries to continue to utilize subsidy measures in pursuit of their fundamental goals of economic development and to overcome the structural deficiencies of their economies and historical disadvantages. At the same time, the code should be such as to provide for rights and obligations which individual countries can assume whenever they feel capable of so doing.

It is gratifying to note that following the adoption of the proposed code, there would be general acceptance of "injury criterion" for countervailing action; we would have liked though the definition of "material injury" to be sharper. Also we consider the concept of a region introduced in paragraph 7 of Article 6 to be lacking in justification.

With regard to Article 7, it is our understanding that it would not cast any additional obligations on developing countries, than those already provided for in Article XVI of the General Agreement.

As regards Articles 9 and 10, it would be our understanding that for "developing countries" the definition of primary products would continue to remain unchanged and in administration of Article 10, the need for developing countries to increase their earnings through export of commodities of special interest to them would be always fully reflected.

I would also like to refer to two specific points arising out of the illustrative list of export subsidies that is annexed to the code. The first point relates to illustration (h) regarding exemption, remission or deferral of prior stage accumulative indirect taxes. Since the code allows countries using VAT to rebate taxes on inputs not physically incorporated, it is our understanding that paragraph (h) would enable countries using a cascade system to do likewise. Since the text as it stands appears to
imply otherwise, it would be necessary for this aspect to be clarified. This is necessary if we are to avoid discrimination against developing countries whose economies are generally not amenable to a changeover to a VAT system.

My second point concerns illustration (k). We consider that the second sentence of this paragraph confers an unjustified advantage to developed countries inasmuch as they can offer long-term export credits at rates of interest lower than those prevailing commercially. To permit derogations from the disciplines of the code to cover limited agreements reached elsewhere would be a risky precedent under GATT. Insofar as India is concerned, it is our understanding, therefore, that interest rates of export credits lower than international commercial rates, should be deemed to be subsidies.

Import licensing procedures (MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.2)

We note that for the purpose of this Agreement, import licensing is defined as "administrative procedures" used for the operation of import licensing régimes. Accordingly, it is our understanding that paragraph 3 of MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.2 relates only to administrative rules and does not affect in any way substantive issues that may be involved. In our view, therefore, where "special trade and payments agreements" are concerned, which term would include barter agreements or agreements relating to trade conducted through a balanced clearing account system, the paragraph requires that the administrative procedures shall be no more complicated than those applicable to other similar agreements, except where the parties concerned agree otherwise.

I would also like to clarify that in the administration of India's import régime, the term "automatic licences" is employed in a sense different from that obtaining in document W/231. In India, automatic licences are employed to administer import restrictions. Where used in this manner, they would be governed by paragraph 14. Also, as regards clause (1) of paragraph 14, we would not infer that it is mandatory to consider the cases of new comers in all cases. This would depend upon merits of each situation.

Our final comment refers to paragraph 15. We consider it unnecessary to establish an exclusive committee of parties to the Agreement. The type of activity envisaged for the body should, more appropriately, be carried on by contracting parties to the GATT in the normal course. We would, therefore, have preferred to see a consultative group on import licensing set up by the GATT Council, if such a group was considered necessary by them.

Customs valuation (MTN/NTM/222/Rev.1 read with MTN/NTM/229/Rev.1)

My delegation has participated in the negotiations relating to customs matters in the MTNs with the aim of establishing a valuation system which would be objective, neutral, and fair and which could be uniformly followed
by the participants. In keeping with this objective, we had sought to do away with systems based on current domestic value or the local selling prices. We had supported the discipline which was sought to be introduced through a system of regressivity requiring step by step movement from one method of determining the value to another, so that subjective elements are minimized. It was also our endeavour to take care of the concerns of developing countries in the case of which import duties can be an important source of revenue. From time to time, our delegation has proposed changes or amendments in the drafts being discussed with these objectives in view. The changes proposed were suggested in order to bring about a general improvement in the code. It was only when we found that the developed countries who had put up their draft were unwilling to build in these changes generally into the code, that we proposed some of these elements to be incorporated in Part III of the text relating to special and differential treatment for developing countries. These proposals which are contained in the document MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1 dated 27 March 1979 have the support of a very large number of developing countries.

One of our main concerns with the proposal of the developed countries in document MTN/NTM/W/229 of 26 March 1979 is that the system of valuation for related persons tends to be more favourable. Thus, for example, clause (b) of paragraph 2 of Article I allows related persons to establish the validity of their invoice value according to any of the methods provided for under Articles 2, 3, 5 and 6 at once, without going through these methods step by step, which destroys the idea of regressivity built into the code and weakens it. What is worse, price comparisons are also permitted against goods exported from third country sources, this is discriminatory as this method is not available to unrelated persons. This is likely to favour the related persons, which in a large number of cases would be transnational corporations, and would adversely affect developing country exports in third markets. There are also deficiencies in the provisions relating to considerations which a buyer is obliged to discharge as a condition of sale and which can be added to customs value, as it does not cover such expenses as those relating to advertising and other price reductions not freely available to different buyers. The fact that sole agents can be treated as related persons only if they belong to certain categories like directors, ignores the realities of different economic situations.

The proposals submitted by developing countries are meant to take care of these objectives and basic concerns, to strengthen the code, to eliminate the bias in favour of related persons which has crept in and therefore my delegation would support the acceptance of the proposed code with the amendments contained in document W/222/Rev.1

Tariffs

We have just received the schedules containing the final offers of the so-called formula countries on tariffs. It will take some time to examine these. We have also held bilateral discussions with all these countries on
products of interest to us. While some useful offers have been made, it is a matter of concern to us that some products of interest to us have either been excluded or nominal tariff cuts have been made with regard to these. I would refer particularly to sectors such as textiles, jute and leather products. In some cases the concessions made in the context of tropical products, have been eroded by offers now being made by other developed countries. We hope efforts would still be made to improve these offers and rectify these deficiencies before the negotiations are finally closed.

On our part we have made a general contribution to liberalization of our imports as already circulated last year and have also made bilateral offers. Some of these have already been implemented. We would hope that the offers being made to us would also be implemented in one stage.

Statement in relation to document MTN/AG/10

It is our understanding that the proposed framework would concern itself with the cause of promoting international trade in agriculture and concentrate its activities on matters which are within the purview of GATT. I would also like to point out that the appropriate international forum for consultations and international co-ordination of farm and food policies, etc. is the Food and Agricultural Organization and that while establishing the consultative framework, we must ensure that it should not contain elements which would either overlap with or weaken the decisions of other international organizations, especially the World Food Council.

Quantitative restrictions (MTN/NTM/W/68)

On behalf of my delegation, I must record the fact that while various non-tariff measures have been the subject matter of discussion or negotiations, the most widespread quantitative restrictions, viz. those relating to textiles have been meticulously and successfully excluded from the negotiations altogether. The argument has been given that these are covered by the Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Textiles (MFA). But the MFA is temporary and an exception to the rules, whereas what we were trying to develop in the MTNs was a long-term and equitable trading system. We were making an effort to liberalize world trade and seek additional benefits for the trade of developing countries. Yet, the barrier that has the most widespread impact on LDC trade, remains untouched. It is a matter of disappointment to us, that even such traditional sectors and products which are facing difficulties generally like jute have not been touched by developed countries maintaining QRs, on the ground that one or two industrial units are to be protected. Another such area has been leather and leather products. We consider, to the extent such problems have remained untackled, the results of MTNs incomplete and we would continue our efforts in various forums to tackle these.
AUSTRALIA (Ambassador Fogarty)

Since the Tokyo Declaration of September 1973, we have had almost six years of hard bargaining. It is therefore almost with a sense of relief that we can now say that at last the negotiations are coming to a close. If there were no conclusion of our negotiations now, we believe that we would run the serious risk of ending those six years with failure rather than success.

It may well be said that the results of the Tokyo Round do not reflect the high hopes of 1973. But Australia believes that they are sufficiently positive to have a significant influence for good on world trade and investment. The product of this round of negotiations will play an important part in restoring business confidence around the world.

Apart from the tariff component, these negotiations have seen the emergence of texts on a wide range of non-tariff measures. This is an achievement of some magnitude in itself and it sets the Tokyo Round apart from all previous rounds. We regret that it is not possible to note today that another achievement of the Tokyo Round is a new set of rules of conduct on trade in agricultural products.

Unfortunately the fundamental problems of agriculture have not been tackled as seriously despite the high hopes we all had after Tokyo. This fact has considerably lessened reciprocity in the negotiations for agricultural exporting countries.

The package of results before the Trade Negotiations Committee today reflects to a very significant extent the interests of the highly industrialized countries. As in past GATT negotiations the emphasis has been on the industrial sector. Even the non-tariff measure agreements are addressed essentially to the problems of trade in industrial products.

In the area of agriculture we welcome the International Dairy Arrangement which expands arrangements which already exist in respect of certain of these products. The new Arrangement on Bovine Meat is a modest one. We hope that in practice it will prove to be fruitful and that there will be the necessary political will to make it effective. This was never in evidence in the International Meat Consultative Group which the new International Meat Council will replace.

Our bilateral negotiations have so far produced some limited though useful concessions in respect of agricultural products, balanced by appropriate reciprocal concessions. We regret that for those agricultural products of most importance to us we were obliged on the basis of the limited offers from our trading partners to negotiate concessions of a quantitative nature. The alternative was no concessions at all. It is a sad reflection on the GATT rules that this had to be done despite the existence of a fundamental principle in the General Agreement that except in specified circumstances, tariffs or other charges are the sole instruments which may be used by contracting parties to govern the importation of products into their territories.
We are disappointed with the outcome on a question which is of major concern to Australia - agricultural export subsidies. Our proposals on this were made known very clearly in the Group which dealt with this question. We were told by certain participants that these proposals were not negotiable. We have taken note of that. We regret the absence of any multilateral solution of the serious problem of quantitative import restrictions (many inconsistent with the General Agreement) which impede market access for agricultural products. Australia made some modest proposals that those restrictions inconsistent with the GATT be phased out over a long period of years. Our proposal brought no response. Both questions I have just mentioned have been largely swept under the carpet. We hope that in the post-MTN period the GATT will undertake serious work on the question of quantitative import restrictions.

We hope also that the Contracting Parties will move quickly to the definition and development of an effective consultative framework for agriculture within the GATT. Perhaps within such a consultative forum there may be forged the will to achieve rules on agricultural trade which the Tokyo Round has failed to do.

I now refer to the question of safeguards. Paragraph 3(d) of the Tokyo Declaration called for a study of the adequacy of the multilateral safeguards system as a whole, mentioning as one of the elements in this study the modalities of application of Article XIX. The work on safeguards has concentrated solely on Article XIX and has ignored the wider obligation imposed by the Tokyo Declaration.

We regard this as a serious deficiency in the work so far done on this subject. This is because the existence has been ignored of practices followed by many contracting parties which amount to permanent safeguards impeding and often preventing access to their markets particularly of agricultural products. We also regret very much that within this draft agreement the fundamental principle of the most-favoured-nation clause, upon which the GATT is based, is under pressure.

The Australian Delegation is not convinced that this work warrants the priority given to it in the summing-up by the Chairman of the Group Safeguards on 10 April 1979 in document MTN/SG/12. If this is reflected in a procès-verbal which will come before the Committee later, I have to say that the Australian authorities do not necessarily endorse that priority.

I do not wish to comment specifically on any of the summings-up by the Chairmen of the various Groups or Sub-Groups but simply wish to draw attention to Australian statements made with respect to Quantitative Restrictions (MTN/MTW/W/237), the Understanding on Export Restrictions and Charges (MTN/FR/W/22) and Technical Barriers to Trade (MTN/MTM/W/234).
As I said, Australia has concluded bilateral negotiations with a number of its trading partners. Other negotiations are well advanced. We note that the way is being left open for bilateral negotiations to continue for a short time. We stand ready to engage in such negotiations at least up to the end of April.

In summary, Australia welcomes the conclusion of the negotiations. Overall we believe that they will assist the further expansion of world trade. They will provide an improved framework within which trade can grow. We are disappointed that many of our objectives in the area of agriculture have not been realized. We are not certain that some of the texts before us reflect a mutually satisfactory balance of interests. The Australian Government will need to take account of this as it comes to final decisions on the MTN in the months ahead.
MEXICO (Mr. S. Delgado)

My delegation endorses and supports the ideas and comments so rightly expressed by Mr. Tomić, the representative of Yugoslavia.

The results that we are considering at this meeting constitute, as he said, a first step towards the reformulation of the rules governing international trade, within the context of the dynamic process towards a new international economic order.

The results are definitely incomplete. Specifically, my Government is deeply concerned by the situation existing in the area of safeguards. We consider it a matter of critical importance that we must arrive at an agreement in this area, within the framework and the terms of the Tokyo Declaration, in the shortest time possible and in any case prior to 15 July 1979.

My delegation is of the opinion that the tariff negotiations are as yet not terminated. We are still engaged in an intense and delicate process of bilateral negotiations with the principal developed participants. In that connexion, and as everyone is aware, I must reiterate here that the contribution my Government is making in this and the other areas of the negotiations must also be regarded as a contribution by my country in relation to possible accession to the GATT. It is also indispensable that, in this area, there should be no retreats for the sake of striking balances among the developed countries that harm the interests of developing countries like mine.

Allow me at this time to make some observations of particular interest to my delegation.

With regard to the texts prepared by the Group "Framework" (MTN/FR/W/20/Rev.2), it is my delegation's understanding that the contributions of the developing countries and their greater participation in the General Agreement will take place in the course of trade negotiations and will depend on the additional benefits obtained by these countries in those negotiations.

As to the draft understanding regarding the resolution of disputes, it is my delegation's understanding that, insofar as matters raised by developing countries are concerned, the CONTRACTING PARTIES, in considering what further action they might take, will do so in terms of their collective responsibility and as joint action to assist in protecting the rights of the developing countries.

With respect to questions relating to the Understanding Regarding Export Restrictions and Charges, it is my delegation's understanding that the guiding principles for their future consideration will be the sovereignty of States over their natural resources and the need for developing countries to
make optimum use of their resources for their development, as they deem appropriate, including the processing of their raw materials, the establishment of industries to diversify their economies and the acquisition of supplies for their national industry.

With regard to the drafts concerning import licensing (MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.2), I must emphasize that my authorities consider that the agreement will not limit appropriate application by my country of requirements in the matter of samples. We also consider that in the case of bilateral import and export agreements reached within the framework of multilateral agreements, importing countries will allow imports on the basis of export licences, visas or permits of the exporting country, in accordance with the specific provisions of the bilateral agreements.

With regard to the situation in the area of customs valuation, my delegation wishes to declare its support for document MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1 and to express the concern of my authorities over the lack of a satisfactory solution capable of protecting the interests of developing countries like mine. We believe that efforts to arrive at such a solution must continue.

With regard to the draft Agreement on Government Procurement (MTN/NTM/W/211/Rev.2 and Add.1), we share the views expressed by Mr. Tomic. It will prove practically impossible for my authorities to envisage the participation of my Government in such an Agreement.

With regard to the draft agreements on civil aviation trade and anti-dumping, my delegation wishes to place clearly on record that it completely reserves its position.

It is necessary to ensure the effective participation of developing countries non-members of GATT in the results of these Tokyo Round trade negotiations. In that regard, it is my delegation's understanding that the terms of such participation will be directed towards ensuring parity of rights and obligations as between contracting parties of GATT and non-contracting parties in the context of each one of the agreements, and in that sense my delegation supports the suggestion made by the Chairman at the beginning of the meeting. My Government is, at present, engaged in a process of negotiation with a view to identifying the conditions and terms of possible accession to the General Agreement. However, as my delegation stated at the meeting of the GATT Council on 29 January 1979, we do not exclude the possibility of other alternatives - admittedly more complicated but possible and logical - of involving ourselves, if only partially, in the results of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations.

My Government has participated in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations at considerable effort and with a constructive attitude. The results, as I said at the beginning of my statement, are, at the moment, incomplete. It will be necessary, at the appropriate time, for us to make a global assessment at the internal level when we have the final results in the areas which are
still in a process of negotiation and the results of our negotiations for accession. A key factor is the way in which the governments of some of the delegations here present will incorporate in their national legislation, where required and in accordance with their internal procedures, the pertinent results of our negotiations. Such legislation must not invalidate or distort the content of the agreements.

This is particularly important in the case of subsidies and countervailing duties, especially as regards the time necessary for decisions and the way in which the concept of damage will be measured.

When we have had all those elements is when my Government will be able to decide.

We are only at the starting point.
In the MTN, New Zealand has consistently sought, through bilateral and multilateral negotiations to secure more liberal and stable conditions of access for those agricultural export products of vital concern to New Zealand, and a multilateral system of trade which would be fair and equitable and which would provide for more adequate and disciplined control of the problems in world agricultural trade arising, in particular, from the widespread subsidy practices in those areas of concern to us.

It would not be appropriate or realistic for me to say that our objectives have been attained in full but nor would it be appropriate or realistic to say that we have not, in part, obtained some satisfaction from these multilateral trade negotiations. On the bilateral front, while the emphasis of the results in agriculture has been more on achieving stability and security of terms of access, we can also point to a degree of liberalization. On the multilateral side we have been disappointed that the work on subsidies and countervailing measures has not gone as far as we would have liked. On the positive side, however, we believe that the International Dairy Arrangement and the Arrangement Concerning Bovine Meat should play a significant rôle in improving the conditions of world trade in those products.

My delegation believes that most valuable work has been done generally to extend disciplines over non-tariff barriers. My delegation is prepared to refer all of the multilateral agreements which have resulted from these negotiations to my authorities for their consideration, and eventual decision.
CHILE (H.E. Mr. Trucco Gaete)

My delegation feels well interpreted by the statement made by the spokesman for the developing countries, the distinguished representative of Yugoslavia. That statement faithfully reflected the disenchantment of the majority of participants in this Round at seeing the final phase begin without the Tokyo mandate having been complied with adequately.

For my delegation this situation is particularly regrettable, because my Government has made a genuine effort to participate constructively in these negotiations. Indeed, marked progress in Chile's economic situation, and broad and continuing liberalization of its foreign trade make it possible for my country to offer a substantial contribution in the tariff field, together with its readiness to subscribe to most of the codes and other instruments supposedly designed to restrain non-tariff barriers.

We have found, nevertheless, with disappointment that the package presented to us today by way of conclusion of this Round is far from being a real step in the direction of liberalization of world trade. The lack of transparency in tariff negotiations, the absence of agreement on matters of such importance as safeguards or quantitative restrictions show that we are placed before a minimum compromise between the major trading nations, and one that, because of its limited scope, has not taken adequately into account the interests of the rest of the participants.

In the tariff area, the customary system of linear or product-by-product negotiations tends to limit developing countries to some relative expansion of their traditional exports, without affording adequate access to major markets for those products that would allow greater diversification of exports. We still believe that a global negotiation, establishing general tariff ceilings, would be an effective contribution to ensuring order in international trade, and we hope that this idea may be recognized in the future. Meanwhile, Chile maintains its decision to bind virtually all its tariff at a maximum level of 40 per cent; we must, however, express our discouragement at finding that the replies made to Chile's requests by the major developed countries are not adequately related to the Chilean offer. My country is even ready to undertake a global binding at a lower level if in exchange it were to receive substantial concessions.

In the non-tariff field, we have serious doubts that the instruments formulated can contribute effectively to discourage the protectionist trends that are affecting international trade with growing frequency. In particular, our agricultural exports are being threatened by quantitative restrictions or so-called phyto-sanitary regulations that, so far as we can see, cannot be eliminated by the codes or other agreements that have been drawn up.
Lastly, selective application of restrictions seems to us clearly intended to prevent broader participation of the developing world in international markets.

In the hope that the additional period that has been envisaged for the tariff negotiations and for some fundamental aspects of non-tariff restrictions may allow some balancing of an overall picture that for the moment hardly seems encouraging, my delegation is still ready to sign most of those agreements.
NIGERIA (Ambassador O. Adeniji)

Nigeria's main interest in the Tokyo Round of negotiations is in the tropical and agricultural products areas. Her interests in the industrial areas are minimal compared with those of other countries. In the area of industrial exports, my country is in the category of those countries that can be described as small suppliers or new entrants. This situation is true not only of Nigeria but of most African and ACP countries and this situation determined our negotiating positions during the course of this entire process. The major markets of Nigeria and other ACP countries in Africa, in the tropical, agricultural and industrial sectors are the EEC markets. Other markets like those of the United States and Canada are of some considerable importance to ACP Caribbean members in certain products.

From our point of view, the Tokyo Round negotiations have resulted in substantial erosion of our preferential agreements with the EEC. This is pronounced, in particular, in the tropical products sector.

The immediate beneficiaries of the EEC concessions are some developed countries and some developing countries with much stronger industrial and technological bases.

There is now great apprehension that the future industrial and export diversification programmes of countries like mine and other ACP countries might be thus retarded. It is important, therefore, for our negotiating partners and, in particular, the EEC to allay such fears.

Concessions received by Nigeria and other ACP countries from developed countries fall far short of expectations and in most cases, reduce existing GSP preferences.

At the conclusion of the tariffs negotiations, substantial tariffs still exist in some developed countries on tropical products such as cocoa, coffee, tobacco and vegetable oil-seed products. What is lost in the traditional markets is not compensated for in other markets.

My delegation places much importance on the outcome of negotiations in the safeguards group. Nigeria like most of the countries in Africa and the ACP countries is a small supplier of industrial products. They would like to see the evolvement of an international safeguards code which would adequately protect the fragile positions of small suppliers and new entrants.
The obligation imposed by the new code on import licensing with respect to the allocation of foreign exchange for licensed imports is too burdensome to make the code attractive to developing countries facing foreign exchange shortages.

The stricture on subsidies granted by developing countries on products which displaces foreign imports will run contrary to the aspirations of developing countries wishing to establish and expand import substitution industries in some consumer goods' areas.

My delegation subscribes to a statement made this afternoon by the distinguished representative of Yugoslavia expressing the general view of developing countries that the procedures of negotiations adopted in the present negotiations are much biased in favour of developed countries. Many developing countries' delegates were not consulted in some areas until the last days of negotiations when amendments were impossible. This situation will be naturally taken into account in my Government's consideration of the various proposed agreements.

At this stage, I would like to pay tribute to the valuable technical assistance rendered to developing countries by the GATT Technical Assistance Unit and that of UNCTAD MTN Project. An effective participation of delegations like mine would have been near impossible without the assistance received from the two units on trade data collection and analysis. It is important that these services be continued after the negotiations. In addition, the country studies already commenced should be enlarged to cover most ACP countries. These would facilitate regional and inter-regional exchange of trade and service concessions.

GATT and UNCTAD in collaboration with the ITC should help developing countries in finding and developing markets in countries which have granted concessions.

The efforts of the Nordic countries in this regard for the least developed countries are commendable. The proposed training programmes for the least developed countries should be extended to other developing countries in the ACP countries. They, as a whole, are greatly handicapped in trade logistics.

It is expected that other developed countries would follow the noble example of the Nordic countries. The United States, EEC and others should remember their pledges to the least developed countries.
I would like to join the previous speakers from developing countries in expressing dissatisfaction over the package before us today.

Above anything else it has to be pointed out that several key and essential elements are missing from the package that the Tokyo Declaration intended to build in. Safeguards and quantitative restrictions remain unresolved. Tariff negotiations between some developed and developing countries are still far away from satisfactory conclusion.

Therefore, I share the view that our MTN work has not yet been fully successful and completed.

As stressed by Dr. Tomić, the distinguished representative of Yugoslavia, in his statement we shall have to continue our work in coming months to seek solutions on the outstanding questions which are of vital interest to all of us.

As regards specific points, I have to refer to the negotiation on safeguards.

Taking into account the crucial importance of safeguards in the whole exercise of MTNs, it is a source of regret and disappointment that we have not been able to reach agreement, in spite of the maximum concessions made by developing countries.

My delegation is certainly willing to engage in further negotiations with a view to having a safeguard code.

But such posture of my delegation does not imply, in any sense, that we would agree on the code at the expense of discipline which should embody the concept of prior authorization by the Committee for certain actions.

Finally, it shall have to be reconfirmed that rules and practices and agreed interpretations in regard to the application of Article XIX be adhered to by all contracting parties until such time as a new safeguard code can be agreed upon.
AUSTRIA (Mr. Willenpart)

Since 1973 when we launched these negotiations in Tokyo, developments in the international economic and monetary field have more than once endangered the substantive results we expected from them. I believe that now we have achieved results which are a clear sign of the intention of governments to act actively against protectionist tendencies all over the world, to pursue liberalization of world trade and to secure its results also in the future.

Before the signature of the negotiated texts, I would simply say as a general comment that our aspirations have been satisfied in certain respects and remain unsatisfied in other areas. But it became clear that a compromise solution had to come and today we can safely say that these compromise texts are the only ones we could obtain at this point in time. I am therefore prepared to initial each of the negotiated texts, with the exception of the so-called "Aircraft Arrangement" which, unfortunately, was brought to our knowledge too late for the elaboration of an Austrian position.

As to the negotiated texts, I wish on behalf of the Austrian delegation to make a few comments with respect to some of these texts.

For customs valuation we had first thought that the Brussels definition of value correctly applied could provide an excellent basis for an international set of rules in this area. But it proved to be impossible to convince others of this view. As we believe that any valuation system should cover as much of world trade as possible and in order to bring to an end the present practice of using customs valuation as a means of disguised protectionism - therefore clearly for trade policy reasons - we are now prepared to go along with the text in the respective document.

Government procurement is another example of a draft agreement where all our aspirations have not been fulfilled. At different occasions, we made the point that this draft agreement would create an unbalanced situation by disadvantaging the countries the economic structure of which is predominantly characterized by small and medium-sized industries. We have, however, to recognize that the threshold finally agreed upon will attenuate to a certain extent, but not eliminate the effects of this fundamental imbalance. We think that this is one of the issues we should address at the first major review of the Government Procurement Agreement after three years of operation.

With respect to Countervailing Duties our negotiating aim was to arrive at a set of rules applied by all CONTRACTING PARTIES to the GATT. The draft agreement on Interpretation and Application of Articles VI, XVI and XXIII of the GATT satisfies our aspirations in this respect. But it also will bring subsidizing practices which were escalating in the recent past under a better international control. This will in particular help all those smaller countries which do not have the necessary resources allowing them to compete with the richer nations.
Let me also say a few words on the tariff negotiations. We all know that the importance of tariffs is decreasing in modern trade policy. But they still are a politically highly sensitive area. Having been confronted during the last years with world-wide difficult economic situations, it is an achievement that at the end of the day we will have agreed on a substantial lowering of present tariff rates.

My delegation welcomes that the negotiated texts before us provide for special and differentiated treatment in favour of developing countries wherever it was feasible and appropriate. The intensive negotiations in particular during the last weeks improved the relevant provisions in order to accommodate developing countries' proposals whenever it was possible. My delegation hopes that developing countries will not fail to realize the numerous benefits the negotiated texts before us will provide to them in the future.

After the initialling of the Procès-Verbal we will have, like others, to go at home through a final round of hearings, adjust our respective national laws and seek the approval by our Government and our Parliament. This procedure will take some time. We will nevertheless try to do our best to set the results into effect within a reasonable time and hope that others will do likewise.
The fact that the major trading nations have been able to find a balance in their bilateral negotiations and thus attain the objectives they had set themselves at Tokyo is a positive element that will help the international community to overcome current economic difficulties and we welcome this.

There are, however, certain points that are not entirely positive in this picture. Indeed, we have not been able to find a common basis of agreement for certain important elements of the negotiations. We hope that the relevant problems can be solved within the next few months.

Furthermore, although the results of these negotiations can certainly not be considered a failure, they cannot be said to have achieved a series of results to the full satisfaction of all participants. In this context, it is difficult to say that the multilateral negotiations have been able to achieve the objectives set for the developing countries in the Tokyo Declaration, as the distinguished representative of Yugoslavia has rightly underlined in his statement on behalf of the developing countries. The results obtained in the negotiations of the Group "Tropical Products", which are of special and priority importance for the developing countries, have been far from yielding the satisfaction they were expecting, and subsequent negotiations in other areas have not brought any improvement of the situation.

We have found that certain industrial countries, in their bilateral negotiations with us, have sought not a contribution consistent with our development, financial and trade needs as provided in the Tokyo Declaration, but full reciprocity. This situation has not allowed developing countries such as Turkey to offset even partially the losses they have incurred because of erosion of the preferential margins they had enjoyed in the context of the GSP.

That is why we hope that the countries concerned might be able to make a last effort in order to meet certain requests more satisfactorily. The fact that the negotiations are not considered to be definitively completed for certain areas and for the tariff area gives us grounds for some optimism in this respect.

My delegation has taken note of the texts of the agreements and arrangements annexed to the Procès-Verbal which is to be initialled by a number of delegations.

We shall submit them to our government for consideration. The Turkish Government will, of course, examine them very carefully and in the light of the overall results of the negotiations, including any results obtained in the next few days.

We recognize that the codes prepared during the MTN are of great importance for the future of world trade.
In this connexion, I should like, however, to draw your attention to one point to which we attach great importance. We believe, indeed, that the fact that a contracting party has not been able to adhere or accede to one or more of these codes should in no case modify the rights and obligations incumbent on it under the General Agreement, nor adversely affect the interests of the contracting party concerned.

Lastly, I should like to underline that the interpretation and application of the results of these negotiations will be of very great importance for attainment of the objectives of the General Agreement, including Part IV thereof. We believe, furthermore, that adjustment measures in the economies of the industrial countries are also of vital importance so that any trade negotiation, including the Tokyo Round, may yield real benefits for the developing countries.
PAKISTAN (Mr. M. Hamid)

The delegation of Pakistan understands and to some extent shares the general sense of relief at the conclusion of the most long-drawn-out and intensive round of trade negotiations in the history of the GATT. The feelings uppermost in this delegation are however those of disappointment and regret that the negotiations, launched at Tokyo nearly six years ago with high hopes and expectations, particularly for the developing countries, have had to be wrapped up under the shadow of continuing international recession, inflation, monetary instability and financial imbalances, at the level of the lowest common denominators in the positions of national delegations. The results that we are to authenticate today fall far short of the ambitious goals and aims set out at Tokyo, particularly as regards the promised "additional benefits" for the trade of the developing countries, that could lead to "substantial increase in their foreign exchange earnings", "acceleration of the rate of growth of their trade" or "a substantial improvement in the conditions of access" to markets for their products.

We would like to believe and hope that the agreements resulting from the Multilateral Trade Negotiations would lead to a stabilization of international trading conditions and a stemming of the rising tide of protectionist policies in the developed countries. This would however remain to be seen. Ultimate judgement on the results of the Tokyo Round would depend upon the spirit and the manner in which the agreements are honoured and the disciplines provided by the new codes accepted.

While it is inevitable that our energies and efforts in the immediate future should be concentrated on the implementation of the results of the negotiations, my delegation is strongly of the view that GATT should face up to the responsibility of dealing effectively with problems that still remain with us. The most important of these is that of working out agreements and understandings that may lead to the dismantling of all existing quantitative restrictions and other non-tariff barriers to trade, which constitute far more serious impediments to the trade of the developing countries than tariffs. It is a matter of profound regret for us that it was not found possible to deal with these measures in the course of the Tokyo Round. It is of the utmost importance that procedures be instituted in the GATT for dealing with these problems effectively on a continuing basis.

I would now like to make a few specific comments in regard to some aspects of the package that is before us.

Safeguards

We are deeply disappointed at the failure to come to an agreement in regard to the modalities and discipline for safeguard measures in the future. This is an area where the need for greater discipline and more responsible
behaviour is perhaps greater than anywhere else. We hope that further work in this area would lead to a satisfactory agreement. We would like to emphasize that only an agreement that reaffirms the temporary character of safeguard measures, and that rests upon the fundamental principles of equity and non-discrimination in trade relations, would be acceptable to this delegation. We would also like to emphasize, and this should not come as a surprise, but like other developing countries, we are not ready to surrender our rights under the General Agreement in exchange for assurances of goodwill or charitable motives on the part of the more powerful trading powers. I would refrain from making any mention of track records to which a reference was made earlier this evening.

Framework

In the context of the agreement on the Enabling Clause, my delegation very strongly supports the principle of non-discrimination in international trade relations. It is the understanding of my delegation, however, and we believe that this understanding is shared very broadly amongst the participating countries, that non-discrimination does not preclude the adoption of measures and procedures to ensure broad and equitable sharing of the benefits of the GSP amongst developing countries.

In the context of the agreement in regard to further work on export control measures, it is the understanding of my delegation that the matter would be considered in conjunction with consideration of the linked questions of tariff escalation and existing quantitative restrictions and other non-tariff barriers maintained against imports, particularly imports from the developing countries.

Subsidies and Countervailing Duties

In the context of the Agreement on the Interpretation and Application of Articles VI, XVI and XXIII of the General Agreement, it is the understanding of my delegation that clauses (h) and (i) of the Illustrative List of Export Subsidies are not to be interpreted so as to prejudice the interests of or discriminate against countries which do not have the VAT system, and that follow alternative procedures for the remission of import charges and prior stage taxes on goods or services or other inputs such as energy used in the production of export products. It is our further understanding that the major trading powers, amongst whom this text was primarily negotiated, share this view. Reference to this broad understanding has been made in the summing-up of the proceedings of the final meeting of the Sub-Group "Subsidies and Countervailing Duties" which, as we understand, is to be annexed to the record of the proceedings of the present meeting.
Dairy Products, Customs Valuation and Anti-Dumping Code

For reasons of limitations of manpower, this delegation has not had the possibility to take part in the work of the Sub-Groups on Dairy Products and Customs Matters. It is well known that hardly any of the developing countries have had the opportunity of taking part in the preparation of the draft agreement on amendments to the Anti-Dumping Code. It is a matter of profound concern to us that the developed countries have not found it possible to respond to the fundamental concerns of the developing countries in these important areas. The texts of these agreements as of the other agreements in the package will have to be considered carefully by my Government. We would however like to put on record that, of the alternative texts on the table, my delegation supports the texts that embody the proposals and positions of the developing countries, namely Annex C under International Dairy Arrangement, MTN/NTM/W/229/Rev.1 as amended by MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1 in regard to the Agreement on Valuation, and MTN/NTM/W/232 and Add.1 as amended by MTN/NTM/W/241 in regard to the amendment of the Agreement on the Implementation of Article VI.
VENEZUELA (Mr. H. Griffin in the name of the member countries of the Andean Group)

I have the honour to make this statement in the name of the member countries of the Andean Group - Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela - which have participated jointly and actively from the outset in these Multilateral Trade Negotiations, with great hopes that those negotiations would secure terms and conditions that are just and are consistent with our economic and social development needs.

As you know, not all the member countries of the Andean Group are contracting parties to the General Agreement; nevertheless, we have participated in response to the invitation extended to us, and we hope to be able to benefit jointly from any positive results that may be achieved in these negotiations, in accordance with the commitments laid down in the Tokyo Declaration in conditions of equality and equity with all the participants.

We support the statement made by Dr. Tomić in his capacity as spokesman for the developing countries; he expressed the feelings of those countries in regard to the present results of this important round of negotiations, and indicated the fields in which future action by GATT is necessary with a view to finding solutions to the trade problems of the developing countries, and to affording them better opportunities conducive to their more rapid development.

Unfortunately, and without prejudice to an in-depth overall evaluation that our governments and our community authorities will make in due course, we believe that not all the objectives set forth in the Tokyo Declaration have been accomplished, and we are therefore not entirely satisfied with the results of the negotiations.

The negotiations on tariff matters have had various effects in the countries of the Andean Group. Despite the importance of the contribution offered jointly by the Group to the Multilateral Trade Negotiations, as set forth in detail in a letter from the Co-ordinator of the Group to the Director-General of GATT, dated 27 June 1978, and notwithstanding the fact that our requests concern only very few products, only a small proportion of those requests have found a favourable response.

One of the objectives of the Tokyo Declaration was to obtain improvements in the Generalized System of Preferences, and given that two of our member countries are excluded from the scheme of preferences of one of the most important trading countries, we hoped that this problem might have been solved in the course of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations. Furthermore, with the erosion that has occurred in the Generalized System of Preferences because of reduced preferential margins in respect of products of interest to developing countries, it is clear that the result of the negotiations weakens still further the situation of the Andean Group in regard to export prospects.
As we have underlined, one of the areas of particular importance for our countries is that of tropical products and in view of the fact that the negotiations on tariffs are to continue until the end of 1979, we hope it may still be possible to obtain improvements in that field.

In conclusion as far as the tariff negotiation is concerned, it would be desirable for all the industrial countries to give advance implementation to offers on products of special interest to developing countries; not to withdraw those products in the final adjustments of their offers; and on the basis of the requests made in regard to special and differential treatment in tariff matters, to hold back the application of reductions on products enjoying preferential margins under the Generalized System of Preferences.

With respect to non-tariff measures - one of the most important areas for the developing countries - we must state that no substantial progress has been achieved.

We regret that the question of quantitative restrictions has not been considered, and we hope that efforts will be continued in this area with a view to eliminating such restrictions.

All the developing countries, including the Andean Group countries, have considered of essential importance the negotiations undertaken in the Group "Framework" with the objective of amending the rules of the international economic system, taking into account differences in economic and social systems and the various levels of development existing in the international community. In the light of the work done to date, the results seem to us inadequate and weak. Accordingly, we consider that what has been achieved should be the first step towards making a real change in GATT that would contribute to a positive trend in the establishment of a just and equitable world economic system.

We regret likewise that it has not been possible to arrive at a text on customs valuation that reflects a consensus of the participants in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations. There are two separate proposals, and the Andean Group supports document MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1, presented by a large group of developing countries. We consider that the negotiations in this area have not been completed, and that they should continue therefore with a view to establishment of a new, equitable and neutral system that could be applied everywhere.

We believe that acceptance by all the contracting parties of the rules of the General Agreement in respect of countervailing duties is a major step forward. We trust that the application of the new Code on subsidies will allow the developing countries to strengthen their export sector, which is obliged to rely on export subsidy policies; in this connexion, the commitments taken on by the developing countries in the light of that Code cannot exceed their possibilities in regard to finance, trade and development.
The Andean countries are participating in the negotiation of an Agreement on Export Licensing Procedures on the understanding that this is an agreement on procedures that will in no way affect the commercial policy measures that have been or may be adopted in future by our countries in the light of their economic, trade, and financial development needs. As we have already had occasion to state, we cannot accept the provisions set forth in paragraph 13(e); accordingly, we should like to support the proposal by Brazil regarding that paragraph. Similarly, since the Agreement is of a procedural nature, we do not consider it necessary to establish a committee since the General Agreement already contains provisions for the solution of any disputes that might arise.

With respect to safeguards, we shall participate actively in the negotiations that will be taking place until July next; we feel sure that an agreement can be reached that takes due account of the particular interests of developing countries and affords greater international discipline in this important area, while preventing the unilateral application of selective safeguards.

It should be underlined that in general the special and differential treatment included in the various texts is not, in the view of the Andean Group, the best that was hoped for. We hope, nevertheless, that what has been achieved will be implemented.

The Andean Group wishes to confirm that its member governments and its community authorities attach great importance to the Multilateral Trade Negotiations that have taken place within the framework of GATT; that is why, as regards the record or "Procès-Verbal", we are studying and evaluating the present result of the negotiations at those levels; on the basis of that study a decision will be made as to any initialling, signature, adherence or translation into law of each of those instruments.
SRI LANKA (Mr. L.J. Mariadason)

My delegation associates itself with the statement made by Dr. Tomić this afternoon on behalf of the developing countries. My delegation is one of those which was not able to participate as actively as it would have liked in the negotiations which have resulted in the texts before us, nor has it been able to keep track of the changes that have taken place in the last few weeks. It has, of course, not been possible for small delegations to keep pace with, let alone participate, in the negotiations much of which inevitably took place in closed sessions. The texts will obviously have great significance for future international trade and the trade of developing countries and would require the closest scrutiny in order to assess their implications. This is particularly true for those developing countries like mine which are not familiar with many of the situations that are being catered to in these texts which have little meaning for those countries in their present stage of trade and development. Indeed one can even surmise that these countries are not expected to be parties to the codes with their many obligations and disciplines. In so saying, it would be our understanding that if countries should decide at some later date to accede to any of the codes, there would be no qualifications attached, nor would these countries have to negotiate their way into the codes as it were. For its part therefore this delegation would require time to consider and evaluate the codes. Needless to say we reserve all our GATT rights. Nothing in the codes can detract from the rights of contracting parties under the GATT, including most-favoured-nation treatment and the provisions of Part IV. Nor can anything in the codes create additional obligations for contracting parties if they do not participate in them.

A cursory look at some of the texts shows that we are being asked to shoulder additional responsibilities which were not envisaged in the General Agreement, with little in the way of additional benefits in the various areas of the negotiations and in spite of a clear recognition by all our Ministers in Tokyo in 1973 that special measures needed to be taken in the negotiations to assist the developing countries in their efforts to increase their export earnings and promote their economic development. My delegation would therefore urge that if the objectives of the Tokyo Declaration are to have any meaning, benefits that may accrue to the parties to the individual codes should be extended, without reciprocity, to non-participating developing countries.

At this stage I shall only refer to tropical products, an area of prime concern to Sri Lanka in these negotiations. My delegation must record its profound disappointment at the results so far and the lack of response on the part of a number of developed countries to requests by my delegation both of a tariff and non-tariff nature. Even tea continues to be the subject of import tariffs. In this regard we would urge that the Group "Tropical Products" continue its work with a view to achieving improvements.
SPAIN (Mr. J.A. Castillo)

Allow me to employ some familiar commercial terms in my statement. We are now at the end of the financial period represented by these Multilateral Trade Negotiations and we are about to draw up a balance-sheet of the results. As you know, the term "balance-sheet" may relate to a given period in the life of a commercial enterprise or activity, and also to the final moment of that life, in which case one may speak of drawing up an account of profits and losses.

It is not for me to say that this is such a moment. Each one of us today, here in this Committee, has to perform this task, but allow me to speak as a shareholder who owns a small share in the great enterprise of world trade.

The enterprise in which we were invited to participate at Tokyo, in 1973, has lasted over a longish period during which general economic events have had a significant impact on the development of trade and also, logically, on the development of what may be regarded as reflex activities such as the assembling of a new framework for the international trade of coming years.

Obviously, any calculation of a profit and loss account requires the introduction of items of income and expenditure. We see the income items in these documents before us, which contain the results of the work done on non-tariff questions by the various Groups and Sub-Groups. Other income items are represented by the tariff negotiations still being pursued by various delegations.

The expenditure items, to be sure, are not easy to determine. On the one hand, there is the natural fatigue of persons who for years have been working on the basis of certain hypotheses laid down by the Tokyo Declaration, persons who have had to take into account the very different international economic structure and conditions of these recent years, which, even with the application of modern techniques of economic analysis, make assessment in monetary and real terms very difficult.

If we were to draw up provisional estimates for the results of each one of the Groups which have led to the preparation of texts, we would find that the results have sometimes measured up to the expectations and the efforts of the representatives of the various countries. In other cases, the situation has been rather different. Indeed, we find that certain doubts continue to exist and that there are certain positions which are not entirely acceptable to all of the countries that have participated.

To revert to the analogy of shareholders in an enterprise, we now have before us a proposal from the board of directors suggesting the possibility of our making a further investment in the enterprise. How are the shareholders, i.e. our Governments, going to react to this new proposal?
Allow me to state the position of my authorities, i.e. owners of a small share of world trade. It can be described in terms of three groups of concessions and in an attitude, which is, namely, to obtain the maximum liberalization of our trade. The groups of concessions would be:

1. A tariff reduction which will be presented very shortly.

2. The widest possible participation in the greatest number of codes after assessment in the light of the present state of our economy and the future prospects of its development, and I can inform you today of our immediate participation in some of them, with the hope of being able to participate in the others within a reasonable period of time.

We can immediately accept the code on Technical Barriers to Trade, contained in document MTN/NTM/W/192/Rev.5. We can also subscribe to the text of the International Dairy Arrangement, in document MTN/DP/8, as regards the Arrangement itself and the first Protocol, but not the second and third Protocols (milk fat and certain cheeses), on which we maintain a reservation. Similarly, we accept the code on subsidies and countervailing duties, MTN/NTM/W/236, in its entirety with the exception of a reservation to paragraph (h) of Annex A, already recorded in document MTN/NTM/W/227. We can also accept the text on customs valuation as contained in document MTN/NTM/W/229/Rev.1, subject to the amendments in document MTN/NTM/W/222/Rev.1. We accept the agreement on application of Article VI of the General Agreement as contained in document MTN/NTM/W/222, Add.1/Rev.1, Add.2 and Corr.1. We also subscribe to the text of the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures contained in document MTN/NTM/W/231/Rev.1, subject to the reservation that we support the wording proposed by the delegation of Brazil for paragraph 13, as contained in document MTN/NTM/W/233/Corr.1. Lastly, we accept the "Framework" text (MTN/FR/W/20/Rev.2) and the undertakings to continue negotiations with regard to the multilateral agricultural framework (MTN/27) and safeguards.

On the other hand, my country's present legislation, while old, does not enable us, for the moment, to contemplate adherence to the Agreement on Government Procurement (MTN/NTM/W/211/Rev.2 and Add.1), or to the Arrangement on Rovine Meat (MTN/ME/8) until Spain's foreign trade in this product is shifted to the private sector - which is already envisaged. The late, last-minute preparation of the Agreement on Trade in Civil Aircraft did not leave time for my authorities to study possible adherence to that document.

3. Liberalization of certain goods subject to quantitative restrictions at the beginning of the MTN. This applies to a high percentage of the value of our trade as can be seen from a series of secretariat communications, at the present time more than 90 per cent, practically 95 per cent, of Spain's trade is in the category of unrestricted trade.
In the analysis which the various Chairmen of the negotiating Groups and Sub-Groups have made of what has been this great enterprise of the MTN, there is no doubt that there are matters which are of vital interest for my country's trade. There are, however, also matters referred to by the Chairmen of the various Groups and Sub-Groups which relate to considerations of another kind having nothing to do with trade that tends to inhibit somewhat our general position.

I am happy to acknowledge that the formula which you have proposed and which we fully support regarding territorial application of the various codes, has solved and eliminated an obstacle to acceptance by my country, since the formula which was previously included in the codes themselves made acceptance by my country impossible and to some extent beclouded the traditional neutrality of GATT in this area.

Also, as has been pointed out in some of the reports by the Chairmen of Groups and Sub-Groups, we reserve the right to suggest changes in the Spanish texts in order to bring them as close as possible to the English or French versions.

What is more, in line with the report presented by the Chairman of the Sub-Group on Government Procurement, I think the time has come to state clearly what working languages are to be used by the various countries which sign the codes and by the various committees created thereby. In that connexion, allow me to indicate that we have requested the inclusion of Spanish as one of those languages.

Lastly, allow me to express the hope that, once a stage of serious difficulties in the international economic sphere is overcome, the introduction of these new elements will facilitate the opening of new roads to prosperity for all nations, which is what we desire with absolute sincerity.
UNITED KINGDOM on behalf of HONG KONG (Mr. P.K.Y. Tsao)

We have now reached the point where we must examine and assess the results of our efforts in this protracted and complex round of negotiations.

While I would not wish to prejudge the views of the Hong Kong Government, at delegation level, I must say that we are not entirely happy with the results. I am sure you will not find this surprising since most, if not all, delegations here would probably share this feeling.

We are particularly unhappy in certain key areas of these negotiations, and if I may briefly list these areas.

First, the draft Aircraft Code and the Anti-Dumping Code. Hong Kong was not involved in any of the negotiations leading to the publication of the draft texts on 9 April. We may have an interest in both these subjects, but we were not afforded an opportunity to study the texts and to make recommendations to our authorities.

Secondly, safeguards. We started the negotiations on this on the premise that Article XIX needed to be strengthened, to ensure that any trade liberalization achieved in these negotiations would be preserved. We are disappointed at the failure to bring within the Trade Negotiations Committee package an improved set of rules to fulfil that objective. I can only add that we are, of course, prepared to continue these negotiations, on the terms set out in the Chairman's summing-up of 10 April in MTN/SG/12. We are prepared to negotiate a set of new and improved disciplines on safeguards. What we cannot accept is to give importing countries unfettered right to act discriminatorily against exporting countries. For this reason, we place considerable importance on the concept of multilateral surveillance and prior authorization.

Thirdly, tariff requests. We are again extremely disappointed, because none of our requests was met. We were told in bilateral consultations that Hong Kong had nothing to offer in return; that Hong Kong had no bargaining power. If the way in which Hong Kong has been treated in these negotiations is an example of how a trading entity will be treated when it practices no trade restrictions, then I must say there is little if any incentive for developing countries to move towards free trade, since the only result would be to deprive themselves of bargaining power.

Lastly, quantitative restrictions. At the end of what is described as a round of trade negotiations designed, in the words of the Tokyo Declaration, "to achieve the expansion and ever greater liberalization of world trade", we still face quantitative restrictions which are incompatible and inconsistent with the GATT.

I am grateful to you for allowing me to outline what may be construed as a list of complaints. Complaints they are.
At the outset, I would like to associate myself with the statement made this afternoon by Dr. Tomić on behalf of the developing countries. Today, we are meeting to wind up a major part of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations. This is not the last word on the MTNs as we will possibly have perhaps another occasion to say the last word.

Our thoughts naturally go back to Tokyo, and particularly to the Tokyo Declaration. This Declaration was an important document. It enshrined the hopes and the aspirations of developing countries, contained the promises made to the developing countries, gave a vision of trading systems for the 1980's. No wonder the Tokyo Declaration has been one of the most quoted documents. The results of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations should be measured against the yard-stick of this Declaration. Will the developing countries get additional benefits for their international trade? Will there be substantial increase in their foreign exchange earnings? Will the results of the MTN bring about an acceleration in the rate of growth of their trade? Will the balance of international trade be more favourable to developing countries? The answer to these questions seems to be leaning to the negative side. The major beneficiaries of the MTN seem to be our developed partners. Developing countries will only get the fall-out benefits. Aside from a few positive offers, from one or two countries - this is concerning my own country - and the hope that one gets from the encouraging statement of Ambassador Dunkel of Switzerland on the continuation of negotiations on tariffs for further improvement, one would ask what would be the additional benefits or possibilities of increased foreign exchange earnings for a country like mine when textiles do not get the full tariff reductions. The import restrictions on textiles remain and the results on quantitative restrictions are next to nothing.

It is said that, while the results of the MTN in securing the removal of tariff and other obstacles affecting trade of developing countries might have been modest, developing countries would stand to gain from the improvements in the trading framework which would result from the acceptance of the Agreements negotiated in the MTN. We have been told that these Agreements, which clarify and interpret the GATT rules and lay down procedures for consultations and international surveillance of such actions would work to the advantage of all countries, both developed and developing. My delegation does not share these optimistic conclusions. We are apprehensive that at least some of these Agreements may not be at all in the interest of developing countries.

Developing countries had an occasion in the past to bring to the attention of the members of this body the difficulties which they encountered as a result of the tendency to carry out negotiations on certain issues in
small close-knit groups. We had expected that the assurances which were
given to us would bring in a change in the working methods adopted by our
negotiating partners. Unfortunately, however, these working methods did
not change. The result has been that at a time when we are meeting to
conclude the major part of the negotiations, we are faced by texts which
are to be included in a so-called package. Two days ago, a text making
significant changes in the Anti-Dumping Code, which was agreed in the
Kennedy Round, was presented by a few delegations for inclusion in the
package. My delegation has been, for the last four years or so, pressing
for the establishment of a separate group of negotiations in the area of
anti-dumping practices. Even though the group was not appointed, we had
formerly tabled proposals for changes in the Anti-Dumping Code. We have not
been able to reach a solution in this field. My delegation, in fact,
welcomes the statement just made today by Mr. Lemmel on this subject, and
we are prepared to continue the discussion.

In the field of customs valuations, there has been reluctance to give
adequate consideration to the proposals made by developing countries for
amendments to the text agreed among the developed countries. On safeguards,
my delegation hopes that the further work on this subject would bring about
mutually acceptable solutions on an adequate multilateral safeguards system
considering the modalities of application of Article XIX. My delegation
considers it imperative that any agreement on safeguards should include
clear provisions on adjustment measures and policies on the part of our
developed partners. That is, actions have to be taken by them to encourage
business which are less competitive internationally to move progressively
into more viable lines of production or into other sectors of the economy
and provide increased access to their markets for products from developing
countries.

The existence of a separate text on dairy products is largely due to
the reluctance on the part of some countries to take into account the view-
point of developing importing countries. I would be failing in my duty if
I did not say a word on this subject. Commodity agreements currently exist
for sugar, cocoa, coffee and tin negotiated within the United Nations frame-
work by producers and consumers, which contain economic clauses providing
for minimum and the maximum prices. Agreements for two other commodities,
olive oil and wheat, provide for consultations only and do not contain
economic clauses regarding desired prices. The draft Dairy Arrangement,
Annex A in document MTN/TP/8, differs from all such Agreements. It is a
unique one. It sets a minimum price to ensure minimum revenues to producers
who are mainly developed countries. Provisions were not incorporated to
assure that the interests of developing importers are accommodated. The
absence of sufficient provisions to satisfy importing developing countries
would indeed be a dangerous precedent in an international arrangement. By
the end of the work of the Sub-Group, we were faced by the presentation of two texts, attached to the Chairman's summing-up of the meeting of 27 March 1979. In the summary it is stated "the Sub-Group as such has not finally agreed on any text". However, the attached text A of the producers, mainly developed, has been cleaned, combed and perfumed, I do not know where! The other text, Annex C, that of importing of developing countries mainly, has been used as a storage of all brackets in the world. Amazingly enough it includes the brackets and reservations that we, importing developing countries, made on the other text. It looks now as if we are even bracketing or making reservations on our own proposals.

My delegation has proposed earlier that the Committee should take necessary action on adoption, adopting any text before this text is opened for acceptance, for signature or otherwise. This proposal has been supported by many developing countries. It goes back even to July 1978 and one can look at the document MTN/W/35 where the statement made on behalf of the developing countries by Dr. Tomić then contained this request and this proposal. The procedure of adoption is in line with the fact that this Committee, according to paragraph 10 of the Tokyo Declaration, is the authority to supervise the progress of the negotiations. It is the duty of the TNC to decide, particularly where alternative texts are on the table, which texts the TNC would adopt.

I would here like to draw the attention of the TNC to a further point, that there is a group of countries that have been recognized as the most needing additional benefits and their interests should be taken care of as embodied in paragraph 6 of the Tokyo Declaration. Those are the least-developed countries whose interests have been lost sight of in the MTN, but we still hope that the interests of those countries should be taken care of in the next few weeks.

Since September 1973, the date of the Tokyo Declaration, wherever and whenever we go or went, in every international forum, we were told go to the MTN, take the MTN road, take the MTN autoroute. It is short, comfortable and direct; we took it, but discovered that it is something different. It may not be very wrong to say that this may be an opportunity lost; an opportunity like this may not arise again for another decade, but who would have the patience to wait so long? The problems of developing countries are likely to get more difficult. May I add my voice to those who have said that the Tokyo Round has not finished yet and to say that it is not beyond ingenuity to find ways and means of continuing work on the unfinished business so as to achieve and realize the objective of the Tokyo Declaration.
JAMAICA (Ambassador K.G. Hill)

The thrust of the remarks that have been made since this afternoon have been on two tracks. One set of remarks have been directed to the fact that we are here merely to take cognizance of texts and to say that they are authentic and then to submit them to governments for approval. The statements on this track have been made by a minority of speakers. On the other track have been statements which clearly reflect the fact that the negotiations have not been completed and that there is still substantial work to be done. It was in this context that Dr. Tomic spoke on behalf of the group of less-developed countries and my delegation would join with the others in expressing our full support for that statement.

The Jamaican delegation has participated in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations, not as a theoretical exercise, but out of practical necessity. Jamaica has a small, but highly diversified economy. Concessions in both agriculture and the industrial sectors are important for our economic growth and development. For a significant number of items in both these sectors, we are principal or substantial supplier. As such, we have made requests seeking tangible expression of one of the main objectives of the Tokyo Declaration; that is to increase the export trade of developing countries, increase our foreign exchange earnings and increase our share in an expanding system of world trade.

In the course of these negotiations, we have indicated to our trading partners that it was our intention to adhere to the codes, not only to demonstrate our belief in, but also to show our commitment to, an orderly world trading system. We based our intention on the assumption that these codes would reflect the basic interests of the developing countries and reflect the need for special and more favourable treatment. For this reason, Jamaica indicated, and the text on government procurement does reflect to a large extent, our intention to participate in the eventual operation of that code. We have in fact made an offer.

Jamaica's participation in the codes would have to be seen as a major contribution to the negotiations, and responses to our requests for tariff concessions and special and differential treatment in the codes were expected from our major industrialized trading partners.

As I said, we are travelling on two tracks, and the second track that I am emphasizing is the one that the negotiations are not yet completed.

Jamaica is highly dependent on trade for its national prosperity. Jamaica has a very liberal trade régime with very low tariffs. Jamaica has an open economy, highly dependent on imports for its domestic development and exports for its foreign exchange earnings. Jamaica depends on a liberal and open trading system that recognizes as legitimate the interests of small trading nations.
My delegation would also, at this stage, like to draw attention to the fact that we have accepted the obligations of GATT, not only as an individual country, but as part of the Caribbean Community. As one of the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries which have acceded, with the EEC, to the Lomé Convention, we have had to defend both the Convention and the integration of the Caribbean Common Market, in this forum.

In looking at the results so far achieved, for Jamaica, we must say that they are disappointing. Non-tariff measures and tariff concessions cannot be separated. Jamaica has not to date received anything we have asked, nor indeed have we given anything in return. The results to date do not show the proper balance, more so for developing countries.

We wish to conclude an agreement with our largest trading partner, because it would contribute to increased productivity and employment in Jamaica. We also seek tariff concessions from the other industrialized countries to whom requests have been made.

The Jamaican delegation does not view the Multilateral Trade Negotiations only from a narrow and national perspective, but also from the broader international perspective. Our country recognizes the reality of interdependence.

We recognize that these results today are modest achievements, when set against the starting point of the Tokyo Declaration. We consider the present and the recent past international economic situation as particularly bad, bordering as it was on depression. Against that background, we join with you and some of our colleagues when we say that, in that context which reflected dangerous tendencies towards protectionist policies, the results today may be said to be a major achievement for all of us, but more specifically for the industrialized countries. In that context, we echo the words of Dr. Tomic when he says that the results are important in their modesty. We from the developing countries, in that spirit, call again for a renewal of the efforts and an expression of the will of the industrialized countries for making concessions and contributions which would be to the benefit of developing countries.

During the course of these negotiations, the structure of international trade has shown an important innovation; that is a strong interdependence between energy exporters and the industrialized countries. This is an important new departure because it should be noted that to a significant extent this trade runs parallel to the trade of the GATT members because many trading nations involved are not participating in these negotiations nor are they members of GATT.

Over the next few months and years, I believe that the international community will need to develop both the substance and the procedure for structural adjustment, and perhaps we may have one incorporated in the results of the MTN because we believe a code on adjustment is certainly as, or more, important than any agreement or understanding on counterfeit goods.
We urge the industrialized countries to provide advanced staging for the tariff concessions for developing countries. In this connexion we congratulate those industrialized countries which have done so in the context of the implementation of cuts on tropical products. But we would like to point out that there must be some balance. It cannot be only one set or one group of industrialized countries, others have to play their part and in this connexion my delegation joins with Nigeria to point to the impact on the ACP countries of certain concessions implemented by the EEC.

Further, the tariff schedules of the industrialized countries should be improved by including further concessions for products of LDC's. Too much emphasis also has been placed on reciprocal concessions from the developing countries and we would like in the forthcoming weeks for this requirement to be moderated.

For the texts of the codes, those negotiated in the Sub-Groups as well as those negotiated plurilaterally, my delegation will need some time to be sure that they reflect our concerns and to be equally sure that they are authentic, since we did not participate in some of these negotiations. We should point to the need to be careful that these plurilateral negotiations do not offend both the spirit and the letter of multilateral negotiations by becoming, as they were, some kinds of "producer associations" within the framework of GATT.

We should like to remind our colleagues that in the forthcoming weeks and months it will be necessary to face the important practical consequences of ensuring that the codes in substance and in operation are compatible with the GATT. Specifically, there are complex issues to be faced before the GATT can give its imprimatur to the codes and this important work is still ahead of us.

In the process of negotiations it has been more clearly recognized that trade negotiations are an integral part of a wider and more complex set of economic and commercial factors. That GATT, as an international institution, has emerged somewhat strengthened, partly because of the modest agreements in Group "Framework", but because they offer at least some scope and hope for developing countries to secure some benefits. But I repeat that those benefits are still ahead of us. We will have ample opportunity to pursue these discussions, regarding GATT's future rôle and while we must continue to concentrate on expanding trade between the industrialized and the developing countries, we, for our part, that is the developing countries, will have to intensify our efforts to increase trade among countries in the context of the Protocol of sixteen.
First of all, my delegation would like to support the statement made by Dr. Tomić in the name of the developing countries. In my view, he has situated the problem so well that there is no need to enlarge upon the matter.

My delegation shares many of the concerns that have been expressed by developing countries, in particular those voiced by the distinguished representative of Nigeria regarding the situation of the ACP countries.

Our countries have made great efforts; they have made many sacrifices to participate in the MTN, in the hope of obtaining additional benefits, in accordance with the Tokyo Declaration.

Those efforts have not always been well rewarded, particularly in the tariff area.

With respect to the codes, small delegations such as mine have suffered from the lack of transparency to such an extent that they have found themselves unable to make an adequate evaluation of the content of the various codes, which were negotiated among the larger delegations.

Given that situation, my delegation hesitates to make any specific reservations, for fear of not being exhaustive, and reserves the right to revert, after having received the opinion of our Government, to one or other provision of one or other of the codes.

In general, one can say that the codes that have been negotiated will improve the rules of international trade. So far as the developing countries are concerned, however, the effects of those codes may well be minimal, because they do not take full account of the interests of the developing countries.

As I have already said, my delegation does not intend at this juncture to make reservations on any specific points, not having had the possibility to make an adequate evaluation of the results of the negotiations on the codes.

At first sight, however, my delegation has difficulties regarding certain codes such as "customs matters", "government procurement", to mention only those.

We venture to hope that special and differential treatment, where it exists, will be applied by the developed countries and that the international discipline required under the various codes will be observed to the great benefit of everyone.
GREECE (H. E. Mr. Metaxas)

My delegation welcomes the concrete and realistic results achieved in the Tokyo Round of multilateral trade negotiations, which are designed to strengthen discipline in international trade and constitute a step toward liberalization of that trade.

The position and contribution of Greece to the Tokyo Round were the subject of a special communication circulated in document MTN/20 on 25 May 1978. In that communication, it was mentioned that Greece would have to apply, as from its accession to the European Economic Community, the more liberal trade policy of that Community, in accordance with the transitional adjustments then being negotiated. Greece is therefore contributing to the Tokyo Round negotiations in a very positive manner without, however, receiving valid compensatory benefits from its trade partners, in particular the most developed ones. The consultations we have had with them have not given us satisfaction.

My Government recognizes, nevertheless, that the results we have achieved represent, particularly in the area of non-tariff barriers, a simplification and greater transparency of the procedures applied.

The Greek Government is giving favourable consideration to the possibility of my country's participation in the various arrangements, with the reservation that such participation will be taken into consideration in the context of the current procedure of adapting our national legislation to that of the European Economic Community, and in accordance with the conditions and general provisions of the agreement for accession of Greece to the EEC.
The delegation of Singapore wishes to associate itself with the statement made by Dr. Tomic on behalf of the developing countries. We would also like to support the views of Hong Kong that trade liberalization efforts of developing countries should not be held against them in their bilateral tariff negotiations.

Like our other colleagues from the smaller delegations, my delegation has been following developments very closely in a number of Groups and Sub-Groups of the TNC only in the recent past (I am almost tempted to say in recent history). I must say that we have benefited from this exposure to the multilateral trade negotiations and the whole gamut of international politics in Geneva. But it is our view that the overall results of the negotiations have not fully met with our expectations. The tariff offers by developed countries could have been improved with deeper cuts and the inclusion of certain items of export interest to my country which are currently excluded from the offers.

My delegation regrets that we have not been able to reach an agreement on safeguards in accordance with paragraph 3(d) of the Tokyo Declaration. We note the tremendous concessions made by developing countries in the Group "Safeguards" - which we ourselves however have yet to agree. Despite these efforts, certain developed countries, I understand, are still intransigent and are maintaining that the efforts of developing countries are insufficient. Be that as it may, we would like to state that unless and until we are convinced that there is a case for selectivity, we reaffirm the recent Arusha Declaration of the Group of 77 that the MFN principle of Article XIX should be maintained and preserved. It is our view that the developed contracting parties owe that much to developing countries in view of the escalating tendency among developed countries to adopt the easy path towards protectionism which the General Agreement was originally formulated to avoid.

I would like to conclude by urging all contracting parties to live up to their international obligations. We also hope that the tariff offers made by the formula countries will not be withdrawn but implemented as soon as possible. We ask no more than a fair and meaningful share in international trade for developing countries like Singapore whose hard work and diligence should not be penalized.
The delegation of Ghana wishes to associate itself generally with the statement that has been made by the distinguished representative of Yugoslavia, speaking for and on behalf of developing countries participating in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations.

When we cast our minds back to September 1973 and reflect deeply on the high hopes that our Ministers raised for the entire international trading community and match those hopes with the results before us today, there is hardly any good reason to rejoice. As the spokesman for the developing countries has adequately pointed out, the results of the negotiations have not been quite encouraging. The absence of a code to regulate the multilateral safeguard system from the present package leaves a lot to be desired.

Despite the obvious shortcomings in the deal, Ghana is prepared to work with our trading partners in a very positive spirit in the days ahead. Towards this end, it is our fervent hope that the remaining areas of negotiations will be handled in a more open manner than has been the case in the past.

It is a matter of deep regret that the tariff negotiations to which my Government attaches considerable importance have not been brought to an end at this stage. It is my hope that not only will the days ahead see more improvements, but also that the withdrawals that some countries have hinted would not be carried out. Furthermore, we wish to urge our trading partners from the developed world to carry out the promises that their Ministers made in Tokyo, that is to carry out the advance implementation in respect of products of particular export interest to developing countries.

My delegation views with considerable concern the refusal of certain countries to accept documents MTN/KTM/W/222/Rev.1 and MTN/KTM/W/241 amending the codes on customs valuation and anti-dumping respectively. I wish to place on record that these two amendments enjoy the full support of my delegation, and also hope that the amended versions of those codes will be accepted by all countries so as to make their implementation easier.

My delegation is of the view that it is important that the various summings-up of the Chairmen of the different Groups and Sub-Groups should be sufficiently reflected in the records of this Meeting. Apart from the need to amply educate posterity on these negotiations, this delegation strongly feels that such a procedure would be of immense benefit to our negotiators between now and the time that the negotiations will wind up finally.
ETHIOPIA (Mr. Alula Gebrekidan)

At the outset, I would like to state that my delegation associates itself with the statement made by the representative of Yugoslavia on behalf of the developing countries, particularly with his remarks in regard to the question of the least-developed countries, in which he stated that "the application of paragraph 6 of the Tokyo Declaration for the interest of the least-developed countries has practically been completely absent" from all texts of trade agreements and the various codes resulting from the MTN, and he pointed out that "this situation is not only of deep regret and concern to those countries but to all other developing countries".

It may still be remembered that early in 1972 the United States, the EEC, Japan and the other developed contracting parties to GATT expressed the need for and their intention to proceed with a comprehensive review of the international economic relations in order to negotiate their improvement in the light of the structural changes that have taken place in recent years. They pointed out that the review should cover, among other things, the obstacles that impede or distort the trade of agricultural, raw materials and industrial products, and that, in the process of negotiations, special attention should be given to the problems of the developing countries.

During the meeting held in March 1972, the GATT Council decided to invite "all developing countries irrespective of whether or not they are contracting parties to GATT" to be associated with the preparatory work connected with the forthcoming negotiations.

Ethiopia, although not a member of GATT, in response to that invitation, agreed to participate in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia informed the Director-General of GATT in December 1972 to that effect, on the condition that, non-member countries need not abide by the rules and principles of GATT to which they are not party. And again in July 1978, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Socialist Ethiopia reaffirmed its desire to continue to participate in the negotiations.

Thus Ethiopia has been taking an active part, even during the pre-Tokyo conference preparatory work which led the Ministers of MTN participating governments in their 1973 "Tokyo Declaration" to, among other things, recognize "the particular situation and problems of the least developed among developing countries and stress the need to ensure that these countries receive special treatment during the negotiations".

We are, in parenthesis, mentioning this historical background for our participation in the MTN, because member countries of GATT are now, at the very end of the MTN negotiations, saying that non-member countries cannot join the codes on the basis of equality with members of GATT in the MTN, nor claim benefits resulting thereof unless they accept to take additional
obligations to be agreed with members of GATT, which we consider to be contrary to the earlier understanding reached and commitment made, which is reflected in the footnote of paragraph 9 of the Tokyo Declaration.

Coming to our experience during the long years of negotiations, we have to our dismay, discovered that the method and procedure employed for the Tokyo Round of negotiations, in practice, had a built-in mechanism based on unjust criteria which worked against the poorest and smaller producer-exporter developing countries and prevented them from taking part in the negotiations effectively, because only those major-producer-exporter countries of a given product or products were allowed to negotiate the removal of tariff and non-tariff obstacles to their products, even though the existing trade obstacles probably hurt the poorer and smaller producer-exporter countries more severely.

As the least-developed countries are (perhaps with the exception of one or two countries who may be second or third) not major producers-exporters of any one export item, they were generally excluded by this procedure from any bilateral and plurilateral negotiations.

Notwithstanding its title of "multilateral", the Tokyo Round of negotiations now declared as being concluded was, therefore, in reality, anything but "multilateral" negotiations, in any sense of the term, because during, specially, the past one year nearly all serious negotiations were conducted on a bilateral and plurilateral basis, excluding nearly all the developing countries from taking part in any serious negotiations.

Nevertheless we (Ethiopia) together with the other representatives of least-developed countries who were taking part in the MTN have been pressing during the negotiations for the establishment of a legal and institutional framework for the commitments made in the Tokyo Declaration, paragraph 6, to grant them special treatment in the context of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations and we had proposed to the developed countries participating in the MTN, the adoption of a Trade Protocol for the least-developed countries which contained among other things the following provisions:

1. That all export products from the least-developed countries should enter into the developed countries free of import duties.

2. That each developed country shall accord to the trade of all the least-developed countries treatment no less favourable than that accorded to any other country, including its partners in customs union, free-trade area association or preferential arrangements and regional groupings.

3. That developed countries do not expect nor demand any form of reciprocity from the least-developed countries.
4. That a Standing Committee on least-developed countries be established to supervise the implementation of the provisions of the Protocol.

We also had proposed amendments to the various codes, negotiated under the MTN because we felt that there was a need to define in a concrete way the term "special treatment" for the least-developed countries in the context of differential and more favourable treatment for developing countries.

However, in spite of all our efforts, specially during the past one year of intensive negotiations, the developed countries apart from occasionally saying "taking into account the special problems of the least-developed countries" here and there, as if, almost an afterthought, in their statements, the Ministerial commitments made in the "Tokyo Declaration to accord concrete benefits as a specific treatment" to them are completely ignored.

We believe that every country, both developed and developing participating in the MTN agrees and with deep regret acknowledges that there has been no special tariff and non-tariff removal for the export products of the least-developed countries nor do the texts or codes or legal instruments agreements include any special provision in favour of the least-developed countries. Thus, their "particular situation and problems" have not been fully recognized nor have "their needs been stressed" by the developed countries and they therefore, did not receive during the negotiations any "special treatment" as envisaged in the Tokyo Declaration.

However, now that the major trading partners have settled their own trade and other related problems and have reached agreements, mainly among themselves, we naturally expect that they will also settle the yet unsettled and forgotten question and fulfill their political commitment and moral obligation made in paragraph 6 of the Tokyo Declaration, in the coming month or so, but not later than September of this year. And we hope that the representatives of the developed countries will draw their respective governments' attention to that effect.

For we, nevertheless, believe that in spite of what has happened up to now, there is sufficient goodwill among all participating countries and an honest desire to correct the situation in the case of the least-developed countries.

The case in point, is what we have just heard this evening in the announcement, that "the Nordic countries have jointly decided to undertake the financial sponsorship of two trade policy courses in order to enable the least-developed countries to assess the result of the MTN", for which, my delegation would like to express its sincere gratitude and hope that others too would follow their good example, and that I at the same time would like
to urge all developed countries to remove, in particular, all tariff and non-tariff barriers to the exportable products of the least-developed countries. Following the proposal made by the spokesman of the developing countries, the representative of Yugoslavia on our behalf that "by unilateral decisions the developed countries shall open their markets for the free access to their products", I would therefore like now to submit the following recommendations for the developed countries to consider:

1. That notwithstanding Article 1 of GATT, each developed country that had participated in and agreed to the adoption of the Tokyo Declaration shall between now and the months ahead, consider granting to all export products of the least-developed countries to enter into their countries free from import duties and other charges, without discrimination (between equals) and on the basis of non-reciprocity.

2. That a committee should be established as a permanent subsidiary organ of the TDC or any other appropriate organ of GATT, in order to promote and supervise the implementation of paragraph 6 of the Tokyo Declaration and document MTN/W/37 and that the committee shall be opened to all the least-developed countries that have participated in the MTN.

3. Request the Director-General of GATT to continue his contacts with the developed countries participants of MTN, with a view to realizing the above-mentioned recommendations.

Coming to the question of signing the Procès-Verbal and the initialling of the various codes, it is recognized by all participants that the least-developed countries that have participated in the MTN need time to examine the overall results of the negotiations, with a view to determining that paragraph 6 of the Tokyo Declaration and the relevant proposals made by them are fully included in the various texts and in the case of Ethiopia also in the light of the footnote of paragraph 9 of the Tokyo Declaration before signing the present Procès-Verbal.
We think it would be prudent to expect that the degree of trade liberalization attained in the MTN will exert a positive influence on world trade and economic growth of a number of countries and that the results of the MTN will improve institutional arrangements to resist protectionism. We also hope that the MTN results will assist in establishing a greater degree of security, stability and predictability in world markets.

The tariff part of the negotiations is not less important in this round than in the previous rounds but the monetary fluctuations may have some impact on it. In the non-tariff field useful codes have emerged from the negotiations and we appreciate particularly the conclusion of some agreements such as the agreements on technical standards and customs valuation. The valuation code we consider as a reasonable and balanced compromise which establishes a neutral valuation system.

Although the provisions of this code prohibit the use of some valuation methods such as the price comparison based on domestic price of importing country, these methods appear, nevertheless, in the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervails. This rather ambivalent approach with respect to treating the same problem differently in individual codes and in relation to different countries does not contribute, in our view, to creating the necessary degree of security and predictability in trade.

Like some other delegations we share the view that the results of the MTN in the field of quantitative restrictions failed to meet the expectations of a number of countries. The predominantly bilateral approach in this field tended to be selective and neglected more general issues such as the search for multilateral solutions. Particularly the lack of progress in dealing with quantitative restrictions not consistent with GATT and of discriminatory character is to be regretted. The existence of this type of quantitative restriction remains an unsettled problem. We expect therefore that GATT in its activities after the Tokyo Round will be more instrumental in dealing with these quantitative restrictions and in seeking appropriate multilateral solutions.

We also regret that in the provisions of the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures it has not been possible to state, without any ambiguity that this Agreement and in particular paragraph 3 thereof should be applied in full conformity with GATT and particularly with its Article I. We are afraid that the approach as reflected in the Licensing Code may gradually lead to modification of obligations under Article I.
With regard to safeguards like some other delegations we do not consider the respective negotiations as a problem of two groups of countries only and we share the preoccupation expressed by developing countries. We hope that the future code on safeguards will lead to better discipline, objectivity, transparency and surveillance without making sacrifice of basic principles of GATT.

As some of the agreements in which my country may have interest have been negotiated and circulated in the very last moment of the MTN, like the aircraft agreement, we need some time for their consideration.

The codes and arrangements negotiated in the MTN should create a system assisting the existing GATT principles and rules to guide trade policies in a more coherent and comprehensive way. Consequently, we attach importance to prompt and effective implementation of these codes and the results of the MTN in general by the greatest number of countries possible on a multilateral basis. We would also like to point out that the achievements of the MTN will be assisted by adherence to and increasing the authority and the observance of existing principles and rules of GATT, the integrity of which should be preserved.
IVORY COAST (Mr. J. Amani-Guilbert)

With the end of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations and after the general statement made in the name of the developing countries by Dr. Tomić of Yugoslavia, with which I associate myself fully, likewise after the special remarks concerning the ACP countries and contained in the statements made by Nigeria and Senegal, which I support, my delegation would like to make the following brief statement:

Despite the difficulties of all kinds which its delegation has encountered in this exercise, which was particularly arduous and virtually new for my country, the Ivory Coast is glad to have participated, albeit modestly, in this common effort designed to establish new trade relations that are healthier and more profitable for all the trading nations.

All hopes were possible, particularly among the group of developing countries, when our ministers meeting at Tokyo made the Declaration with which we are familiar and which is a true profession of faith in favour of achieving the solidarity which is essential among men and nations.

For its part, my delegation has taken the measure of the results of the negotiations so far as the Ivory Coast is concerned. It would therefore like to associate itself with all those who, despite certain inadequacies noted here and there, are laying special emphasis on the positive aspects of these negotiations.

In this order of ideas, my delegation wishes to underline that although offers in the "Tropical Products" and "Tariffs" areas do not fully correspond to its expectations, nevertheless certain acquirements have resulted and my country will have to exploit these to the full.

As regards the various draft codes on which no consensus was possible because of divergences, my delegation hopes that negotiations will be resumed as soon as possible.

In addition, I should like to underline the value that my country attaches to technical assistance which might be furnished by the secretariat and the industrialized countries. The Ivory Coast therefore hopes that this assistance will not be lacking, so as to allow better exploitation of the results of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations.

In conclusion, and without wishing to prejudge the final decision to be taken by my authorities regarding the instruments that have been negotiated and are submitted to us for signature, my delegation wishes to state that it subscribes in general to the texts of those instruments.
BULGARIA (Mr. Anastassov)

Bulgaria is not a member of the GATT, nevertheless we have participated in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations with the aim to join the results as widely as possible in order to make a contribution to a more organized development of international trade.

After more than five years of negotiations, we are facing now a situation when we have to start new negotiations in order to receive the right to join the major part of the results in the non-tariff field.

This situation is a reality and we take it as such. We are ready to sign the Procès-Verbal now (with the exemption of the codes in the drafting of which we have not participated), but in the light of the fact, that we have to have additional negotiations, we reserve the right to consider our application for accession to the various codes on a case-by-case basis.
BANGLADESH (Mr. M. Karim)

My delegation feels that from the point of view of a least developed country, the least said about the present stage of negotiations in the MTN the better it will be.

Because the promises held out in Article 6 of the Tokyo Ministerial Declaration to the least developed countries were completely forgotten as protracted negotiations continued through a difficult period in international trade. Some of the distinguished delegates from the developed countries alluded today to the need to consider the draft Protocol and the draft addition circulated by the least developed of the developing countries very recently.

This draft Protocol contained in document MTN/W/37/ was circulated on 22 November 1978 as it was strongly felt that the needs of thirty least developed countries with a population of 253 million were completely being ignored in spite of the encouraging objectives contained in Article 6 of the Tokyo Declaration.

We thank those countries who have made some gestures to the least developed countries, but we feel very strongly that more positive responses are required to move us from a mood of despair to undertake a global evaluation after more of such positive offers have been received in the near future.

We therefore fully endorse the statement of the distinguished delegate of Yugoslavia on behalf of the developing countries made today; we would require more time to consider the final provisions of the codes in the light of other negotiations.

I would like to end my statement by stating that for the sake of an orderly and stable growth of international trade it is even more vital that the least developed countries are brought within the orbit of increased trade and development. I am confident that there are in this room many developed countries who would have the vision to make the necessary responses to meet the important challenge of our time.
POLAND (Mr. Z. Krzysztofowicz)

We can today conclude these negotiations with results that are without doubt significant. It is not my intention to make any detailed evaluation of the results obtained. That would be somewhat premature, in our view. At the same time, however, I should like to make two brief remarks.

First, we regret very much that it was not possible in the course of the negotiations to arrive at adequate results on problems of particular importance for world trade, namely on quantitative restrictions including those of a discriminatory nature still applied by certain countries. We hope that this problem will not be left outside the field of action and that in the very near future we can revert to this question and discuss it in depth, as it deserves, in order to find multilateral solutions satisfactory to all of us.

Second, the fact that my country is mentioned as a co-author of the Agreement on Interpretation and Application of Articles VI, XVI and XXIII of the General Agreement in no way implies that we are in agreement with all the provisions of that arrangement. We are particularly concerned over Article 15 of that Agreement, which provides for the possibility in special situations of comparing export prices with prices in the importing country. Nevertheless, to be quite clear, we recognize that the Agreement as a whole constitutes a step forward in the direction of harmonizing and improving the application of Articles VI, XVI and XXIII.
HUNGARY (Mr. Nyerges)

When these negotiations were launched in Tokyo, the Hungarian Minister of Foreign Trade stated that Hungary would participate in the MTN as a virtually non-discriminated country.

At the end of the MTN I have to state that this assumption has not yet materialized. Therefore, Hungary's eventual acceptance of the agreements negotiated in the MTN will be made in anticipation of the early elimination of quantitative restrictions maintained against Hungary inconsistently with Article XIII of the General Agreement.
NICARAGUA, ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTRIES MEMBERS OF THE CENTRAL AMERICAN COMMON MARKET

(Mr. G. CAJINA)

At this stage of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations, we countries members of the Central American Common Market wish to make some observations. First of all, we declare our agreement with the statement made by the spokesman of the developing countries.

We confidently expected the results of the MTN to conform to the principles and objectives set forth in the Tokyo Declaration whereby the developing countries were to be allowed better and more equitable access to international markets for their products.

We members of the Central American Common Market believe that special and differentiated treatment must be recognized by the developed countries as a right of the developing countries. We are concerned by the interpretation which the developed States are giving to that undertaking, since such an interpretation does not fully meet the interests of the countries members of the Central American Common Market.

In general, the agreements are not clear as regards that treatment; the relevant provisions in the texts are ambiguous and their implementation is not binding on the developed countries.

The not very satisfactory results of the MTN for the developing countries are due to the limited flexibility shown by the industrialized countries and the insufficient transparency of those negotiations.

On 6 March 1979, we countries of the Central American Common Market submitted our offer, which represents a substantial contribution to the liberalization and expansion of world trade.

As regards tropical and agricultural products, we reiterated our basic interest in export of such products, including sugar, meat, coffee, bananas, flowers, fruit, honey and shrimps, in view of their importance for our economies, in general, and for the volume of employment they generate, in particular. It is our view that much remains to be done in these sectors, and we ask that these negotiations should remain open in view of the fact that our interests have not been taken into account, and, in many cases, have even been questioned by certain developed countries by way of requests for contributions which are not in keeping with our development, trade and finances.

With regard to the agreements on meat, subsidies and countervailing duties, technical barriers to trade, quantitative restrictions, import licensing procedures, safeguards, government procurement, framework,
multilateral agricultural framework and other matters, we wish to state that, while having not yet thoroughly studied the final texts of the agreements which are now before the Committee for consideration, we feel concern over the way in which many of them were negotiated.

The final provisions of the agreements relating to accession by governments which are not contracting parties to the General Agreement should not be discriminatory in character or impose onerous conditions on such countries if and when, after studying the advisability of acceding to the agreements, they should decide to do so. On this particular point, it is well to remember that the developing countries interpreted the Tokyo Declaration in the sense that, in agreeing to participate in the MTN, they did so without prejudice to their legal status with respect to the agreements.

With regard to the Procès-Verbal, which forms part of the final stage of the MTN, the decision will be taken by our respective Governments.

Our delegations have repeatedly indicated that the participation of the countries of the Central American Common Market, and consequently their final decision regarding the Multilateral Trade Negotiations, will depend on the overall results of those negotiations and on the benefits that may ensue in quantitative and qualitative terms.

Accordingly, we reserve for our Governments any opinions concerning the instruments which have emerged in the course of the MTN and which are under consideration by the Committee at this meeting until such time as they complete the necessary assessments and decide what might be their position vis-à-vis the overall context of the negotiations.
URUGUAY (H.E. Mr. Real)

Our delegation concurs in and supports in general terms the statement made by the delegation of Yugoslavia, presenting the position of the developing countries in regard to the Tokyo Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations.

At this level it is somewhat difficult for the developing countries to make a precise assessment of the results achieved, not only because they have not participated directly in the virtual majority of the agreements reached, but also because some of those agreements have only recently been made known. In addition, there are still today areas such as safeguards which are still awaiting definition, and this area is one of fundamental importance, not only for the developing countries but also for the future organization of international trade.

Furthermore, there are various specific situations that must be taken into account in present circumstances, since not all the participants in the negotiations have had an opportunity to complete them satisfactorily, but are still awaiting bilateral contacts in order to finalize understandings that are in course of preparation.

In this context of preliminary comments, one forms a first impression that the trade expansion expectations of the developing countries as envisaged in the Tokyo Declaration of 1973 can only be materialized with difficulty. Indeed, as has already been pointed out, even in the tariff area the benefits for developing countries seem to be limited to seeking products of export interest to them that receive treatment less favourable than that resulting from the general tariff reduction régime (as is the case for textiles and leather manufactures, inter alia).

As regards what has been achieved in other areas of the negotiations in the broadest sense, our delegation considers it appropriate to refer in particular to the agricultural sector. In the first place, it is our understanding that the agreements on tariff concessions and all the multilateral agreements concluded within the framework of these multilateral trade negotiations will be applicable to trade in industrial and agricultural products. In some of the instruments that have been negotiated, however, for example, the Code on Subsidies and Countervailing Duties, one can easily see that different treatment is provided for these two product sectors, in that the grant of subsidies on agricultural products is still to be permitted; this would have a negative influence on exports of those products, on which the great majority of developing countries depend to a very great extent.

With respect to the arrangements drawn up in this sector - i.e. on dairy products and on bovine meat - we consider with respect to the latter in particular that little has been achieved in regard to solving the main problem besetting this product, namely the problem of securing regular and permanent access to markets. We hope nevertheless that the implementation of the mechanisms provided under that arrangement will contribute in some way to establishing an orderly situation in regard to the international trade concerned.
With respect to the consensus reached in regard to defining as soon as possible an adequate consultative framework for the agriculture sector and the tasks to be carried out therein, our delegation considers that this can be of interest if within this framework there is full consideration of the question of agricultural trade within the system of the CONTRACTING PARTIES, without duplicating work being done in other specialized fora.

As regards the various codes that have been negotiated, without examining them individually, among other reasons and as already mentioned because of the fact that we have only recently been apprised of some of the texts, we wish to express our concern regarding the multiplicity of organs envisaged therein, which would undoubtedly make it very difficult for countries whose human, technical and financial resources are limited to follow the relevant activities closely. We believe, therefore, that in due course the CONTRACTING PARTIES will have to give special attention to this aspect which is directly linked to the activities of the Council and the secretariat of GATT.

We believe that in these circumstances it is appropriate, furthermore, for all the participants in the trade negotiations to express their views as to the initial evaluation that they deserve, and similarly to say what in their opinion has been their main contribution so that the negotiations may achieve a balanced result as between what was expected from the negotiations, what has been requested and what has been granted. In the case of our country, we believe that we have been making a substantial contribution to the multilateral trade negotiations in the form of various reforms of our foreign trade régime. Indeed, in recent years a number of measures have been adopted in Uruguay that are designed to align the country's trade policy and its various instruments and mechanisms with the general scheme in effect in the international community. In this connexion, we should mention implementation of the Brussels Tariff Nomenclature, adoption of the definition of value of goods, in accordance with the valuation criteria established by the Customs Co-operation Council, bringing together of a great variety of customs taxes in a single tax (IMADUMI) and, more recently, adoption of a tariff liberalization programme, to be applied progressively and gradually, which over a period of five years will bring national tariffs to adequate levels, with the twofold purpose of making our domestic industry healthily competitive and bringing within reach of the domestic consumer the benefits of international trade.

In accordance with the statements made and with the content and the spirit of the Procès-Verbal that has been circulated to us by the secretariat, our delegation will bring the documents resulting from this meeting to the attention of the Uruguayan Government for its consideration and, when it deems appropriate, adoption of the necessary decisions by the competent national authorities.