On page 3: first paragraph reads as follows:

"M. PIERRE FORTHOMME (Belgium) (Interpretation): Gentlemen:

"the Belgian and Luxemburg delegations believe that paragraph 1
"of Article 34 provides far an escape clause of a very general
"character, and that therefore we must be very careful to limit
"strictly the cases in which this paragraph can be applied. If
"we admit as a principle, and that is already an important privilege
"that a country can revoke some concessions on tariffs which it has
"conceded, in order to protect its own producers, it would be going
"a little bit too far to extend the possibility of such an action
"being taken at the request of a country which enjoys such pre-
"ferences, and if we are not very careful what that paragraph en-
"tails we will, to a great extent, augment the difficulties of
"those who have to protect their production if they have to discuss
"not only with one country but with the territories which are related
"to that country by preferential arrangements. Therefore, the
"Belgian delegation proposes to delete this paragraph to make equal
"as far as possible the means of defence of all the parties engaged
"in such negotiations."
Page 14 - should read as follows :-

"When countries which enjoy no preferences negotiate, the benefit
"of their agreements is extended by the M.F.N. clause to many other
"countries. We have seen several times before the war the attempts
"by countries to get together in order to lower the tariff barriers,
"in negotiations which were absolutely open, which meant that any
"country which was outside could enter if it made the same con­
"cessions as had been made by those engaged in the original
"negotiations; but those arrangements were stillborn, because
"immediately one invoked against them the most-favoured-nation
"clause.

"As far as preferential treatments are concerned the
"situation is very different. It is true to say that those
"preferential treatments were also the result of negotiations.
"However, they were negotiations within a closed circle. Only
"those with a certain privilege were admitted to participate in
"the negotiations. Nobody else from the outside was admitted.

"Therefore I believe it cannot be said that somebody who
"is outside of such an inner circle has the same needs of negotia­
tions with the Members of that circle as two nations which are
"both not part of the inner circle.

(After interpretation)

"Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium): No, I said : It cannot be said
"that the nation which is outside the circle has the same means
"of action or of defence as a nation within against those without".