

RESTRICTED

SR.38/9

14 December 1982

Limited Distribution

# GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

---

CONTRACTING PARTIES  
Thirty-Eighth Session  
Ministerial Meeting  
(24-29 November 1982)

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE NINTH MEETING

Held in the Geneva International Conference Centre,  
on Monday, 29 November 1982, at 3.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ALLAN J. MacEACHEN (Canada)

Subject discussed: Ministerial Part of the Session

The CHAIRMAN said that the Ministerial Meeting had been a crucial meeting, the first occasion since 1973 that Ministers of the contracting parties had met. The task had not been easy. The discussions had been thorough and prolonged, delegations had been consulted very extensively and the negotiations had been intense. There had been, however, a willingness to wrestle with difficult problems and to take into account the views of others. Furthermore, the work had benefited from the patience, understanding and good will shown by all concerned.

He then put forward for approval the results of the deliberations at the session, which were set out in the proposed Ministerial Declaration contained in document W.38/4. He said that while no delegation might find it totally satisfactory, in his belief it represented an important overall achievement. The proposed Declaration placed on record the CONTRACTING PARTIES' agreement at ministerial level that the GATT was vitally important in maintaining an open and equitable multilateral trading system. A stand was taken against protectionism; and priorities were established for future activity.

He mentioned that during the session a number of ideas and suggestions had been put forward. A proposal on trade in tropical agricultural products by the Ivory Coast had been circulated in document W.38/3. While it had not been possible to deal with this proposal in the draft Declaration, it would be dealt with after the session in the normal course of GATT work.

The CHAIRMAN highlighted two points as particularly important in the stand taken against protectionism.

The first was the political undertaking to make determined efforts to ensure that trade policies and measures were consistent with GATT principles and rules and to resist protectionist pressures in the formulation and implementation of national trade policy and in proposing legislation; and also to refrain from taking or maintaining any measures inconsistent with GATT and to make determined efforts to avoid measures which would limit or

distort international trade. It was the understanding of the CHAIRMAN that with reference to the word "maintaining", some governments would require a certain amount of time to fulfill this undertaking.

Secondly, on safeguards there was agreement that the understanding mentioned in the draft decision contained in document W.38/4, pages 5 and 6, would be negotiated in as short a time frame as possible. In this context, an interim report would be presented by July 1983. In the meantime, all contracting parties committed themselves in their actions to take into account all the principles and elements referred to in the above draft decision.

With respect to the matter of "aspects of trade in high technology goods", he stated that it had been agreed to refer it for further consideration to the GATT Council.

He proposed that the CONTRACTING PARTIES approve the Declaration contained in document W.38/4, after which individual contracting parties might wish to make statements which would be reflected in the Summary Record of the meeting. He stressed that it was clear to him, following the efforts which had been made in recent days and hours, that the undertakings and decisions contained in the document formed part of a package. In many instances, the parts were essential for maintaining the whole. He urged upon each contracting party the importance of moving ahead in a spirit of compromise, in order to reinforce the common efforts to support and improve the multilateral trading system for the benefit of all nations.

Mr. NYERGES (Hungary) referred to the Chairman's understanding in respect of paragraph 7.1 of the proposed Declaration that some countries needed a certain amount of time to fulfill this undertaking, and asked why if some contracting parties were permitted to have a certain amount of time, all contracting parties were not in the same position.

The CHAIRMAN said that he understood this statement was meant to take account of the time element involved in the fulfilment of that undertaking. Nothing in this document could prejudice existing rights of any contracting party under the General Agreement, including those under Article XXIII.

The Ministerial Declaration was adopted (L/5424).

It was decided that the text of the Ministerial Declaration would be derestricted.

Mr. TEESE (Australia) made a statement on behalf of the Rt. Hon. Mr. J.D. Anthony, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Trade and Resources of Australia. He said that the Minister, in his statement of 24 November, had made it clear that what was needed from this meeting was a conclusion which contained a real political commitment which would help all contracting parties to withstand the protectionist pressures which all of them now faced. The Declaration, taken with the Chairman's statement, fell

well short of this objective. It was a papering over of a number of the real issues. In most, if not all, of the important issues, the words were vague, ambiguous and shrank from firm commitments. He said that in agriculture the suggestion of negotiation had disappeared, as had the very mention of limitation of export subsidies. Yet the document talked solemnly of a "work programme" on agriculture. On protectionism, positive and firm statements of intention earlier under consideration had given way to vague generalizations. The commitment to dismantling illegal trade measures had disappeared. In its place was a declaration of intent which could well be interpreted out of existence. Safeguards and dispute settlement had fared little better in the search for consensus. As a result, Australia was not able to associate itself with this document and reluctantly could not accept that, in itself, it represented a successful and adequate outcome from this meeting. As his Minister had made clear, a document coming out of this meeting which, in respect of the critical issues dominating world trade, did little more than put together a package of words that were offering to all contracting parties the license of interpretation, would not be acceptable to Australia and would signal failure to Australia. He recalled his Minister's having indicated that this in no way affected Australia's basic commitment to the GATT and that Australia would continue to work constructively towards the longer-term objective underlying this meeting and the GATT.

Mr. DAS (India) said that his delegation had welcomed the proposal to convene the Thirty-Eighth Session at Ministerial level. India's endorsement of the proposal had been based on the belief that the Ministers, meeting after nearly ten years, would be able to address some of the outstanding issues and take actions to rectify some of the strains to which the multilateral trading system was being subjected. He recalled that the preparatory process for the Ministerial meeting had been commenced on the explicit understanding that the meeting would result in forward movement on the outstanding issues from the Tokyo Round, which the CONTRACTING PARTIES had adopted as their Work Programme in 1979 (BISD 26S/219). Nearly one year later the CONTRACTING PARTIES now had texts on some of the outstanding issues of the Tokyo Round such as Safeguards, Dispute Settlement, issues relating to trade liberalization and of particular interest to developing countries which were modest in their content and scope. He underlined that GATT needed to address itself fully to the existing Work Programme adopted in 1979. The understanding of the Indian delegation was that the parts of the Declaration dealing with the new subjects did not confer any extension of the sphere of competence of GATT in these fields. He expressed the hope that the Ministerial Declaration would contribute in some small measures at least to restoration of confidence in the multilateral trading system. Whatever had been achieved through the Declaration would be realized in practice only if the decisions were implemented with sincerity and speed. He concluded by saying that GATT would be moving towards its objectives if it intensified its endeavour within its competence for the economic development and expansion of the trade of developing countries.

Mr. HAFERKAMP (European Communities) welcomed the commitment in the Ministerial Declaration to overcome protectionist pressures, as well as the clear reaffirmation of the resolve to support and improve the GATT trading

system. These had been the basic objectives of the Ministerial meeting. He expressed the determination of the European Community to devote maximum efforts to these objectives. He said that, in view of the importance of the range of issues in the Ministerial Declaration on which it had been possible to reach agreement and in view of the critical importance, at this time of crisis in the world economy, of maintaining solidarity between the trading nations of the world, the Community was prepared to accept the Declaration in its final version, as submitted by the Chairman. The Community needed, however, to make its position absolutely clear on certain points.

As regards the undertaking in paragraph 7(i) to refrain from taking or maintaining any measures inconsistent with GATT, the Community considered this undertaking to mean that its best efforts would be deployed to avoid taking or maintaining such measures.

The Community reaffirmed the points made in its letter of 27 November to the Chairman, regarding agricultural issues, and requested that the relevant passages in that letter be recorded in the Summary Record of this meeting.<sup>1</sup> The Community recognized that only some of its proposed amendments were taken account of in the new text.

---

<sup>1</sup> Extract from the Community letter of 27 November 1982:

"Para 7(v)

'to ensure in the agricultural sector, both for market access and for export competition, the full operation of relevant GATT rules, provisions and disciplines inter alia through their common interpretation; to this end a major two-year work programme shall be undertaken.'

As regards the chapter on Trade in Agriculture, the European Community is willing to accept the following text:

'TRADE IN AGRICULTURE

With the purpose of accelerating the achievement of the objectives of the General Agreement, including Part IV, and recognizing that there is an urgent need to find lasting solutions to the problems of trade in agricultural products, the CONTRACTING PARTIES decide:

I. That the following matters be examined, in the light of the objectives, principles and relevant provisions of the General Agreement and also taking into account the effects of national agricultural policies, with the purpose of making appropriate recommendations. The examination shall cover all measures affecting trade, market access and competition and supply in agricultural products, including subsidies and other forms of assistance.

1. Trade measures affecting market access and supplies, with a view to achieving greater liberalization in the trade of agricultural products, with respect to tariffs and non-tariff measures, on a basis of overall reciprocity and mutual advantage under the General Agreement.
2. The operation of the General Agreement as regards subsidies affecting agriculture, including export subsidies, with a view to examining its effectiveness, in the light of actual experience, in promoting the objectives of the General Agreement and avoiding subsidization seriously prejudicial to the trade or interests of contracting parties. Other forms of export assistance will be included in this examination.

Therefore, while the Community accepted and fully supported a major work programme on agriculture which would examine all measures on the same basis, it underlined that this acceptance was on the understanding that this was not a commitment to any new negotiation or obligation in relation to agricultural products. This was also the position as regards those tropical products which were subject to rules for the common organization of the market within the Community.

The Community welcomed also the fact that it had been possible to reach agreement on the means to improve dispute settlement procedures. The strengthening of the conciliation procedures should be of value. The Community further agreed that without prejudice to the provisions on decision making in the General Agreement, consensus would continue to be the traditional method of resolving disputes. However, obstruction in the process of dispute settlement should be avoided.

As regarded the work programme on quantitative restrictions and other non-tariff measures, the Community was willing to participate fully in the review established by the CONTRACTING PARTIES, in order to achieve elimination where possible. It would envisage in this context giving priority to measures in favour of developing countries. However, the Community recalled that there was a long historical background to the few residual measures which still existed within the Community; and that, if it was to achieve further liberalization, this would have to take account of the fact that there was an imbalance in the level of commitments which contracting parties had accepted.

---

<sup>1</sup>  
(cont'd)

3. Trade measures affecting agriculture maintained under exceptions or derogations without prejudice to the rights of contracting parties under the General Agreement, with a view to achieving greater liberalization in the trade of agricultural products.

II. That in carrying out the tasks enumerated above, full account shall be taken of the need for a balance of rights and obligations under the GATT, and of the special needs of developing countries in the light of the GATT provisions providing for differential and more favourable treatment for such contracting parties. Full account shall also be taken of specific characteristics and problems in agriculture, of the scope for improving the operation of GATT rules, provisions and disciplines and agreed interpretations of its provisions.

III. That for the purpose of carrying out this work, an improved and unified system of notifications shall be introduced so as to ensure full transparency.

IV. That a Committee on Trade in Agriculture shall be established, open to all contracting parties, for the purpose of carrying out the tasks enumerated above and of making recommendations. The Committee will report periodically on the results achieved and make appropriate recommendations to the Council and the CONTRACTING PARTIES for consideration not later than their 1984 Session'."

The Community accepted a decision of principle on a study on fisheries products, on the understanding that this study would take account of the structural effects on trade of the introduction of exclusive economic zones. The Community would insist that the terms of reference of the study cover this point.

The Community was very glad that the Ministerial meeting had been a success. This showed that the trading countries of the world wanted - even in difficult times - to give the one world trading system their full support. For the European Communities, he pledged their full support in this endeavour.

Mr. BERGUNO (Chile) said that the aim of the Ministerial meeting was to obtain an expression of the political will of the contracting parties to try to contain and to reverse protectionist tendencies. He expressed the view that the CONTRACTING PARTIES had not fully achieved this objective in fields such as agricultural trade, export subsidies, safeguards and dispute settlement. He regretted in particular the lack of political and operational commitments to deal with distortions resulting from export subsidies, as well as the watering down of the work programme for agriculture to a point which risked to turn it into an academic exercise. Referring to the understanding which the Chairman had read out to the effect that "some governments would require a certain amount of time to fulfill this undertaking", as well as to certain interpretative statements that had been made, he stated that it was not possible for his delegation to accept understandings or reservations which could be considered as incompatible with the full implementation of the provisions of the General Agreement and of contractual obligations derived from the General Agreement for all contracting parties. He said that the Chairman's statements in introducing the approved Ministerial Declaration as well as his answer on this matter were satisfactory to the Chilean delegation in this respect. He said that his delegation's deep disappointment in view of the elements lacking in the Declaration would not impede his Government from continuing to make serious efforts in order to fulfill effectively the principles and objectives of the General Agreement.

Mr. JUNG (Czechoslovakia) said that from the outset Czechoslovakia had considered as a basic purpose of the Ministerial meeting a more faithful observance of the General Agreement, a fuller application of its principles and the reversal of the tendency towards the proliferation of protectionist measures. It was in this light that his delegation wished to present its views on the results of the Ministerial meeting. He said that the Ministerial Declaration could be credible only if it were supported by concrete and convincing steps. To his regret, some of these steps were missing. For instance, there was no forceful commitment to phase out existing illegal trade restrictive measures; and earlier firm statements of intention on protectionism had been weakened. Grey zone measures had not been incorporated within GATT disciplines. Progress on dispute settlement was limited, particularly in the area of the treatment of panel findings and recommendations by the Council. In the view of his delegation,

protectionism could not be seriously confronted without dealing effectively with such issues. It was to be regretted that there had been found no worthwhile solutions to these important issues acceptable to all. He expressed his delegation's disappointment at the lack of substantive progress in these areas. In his view, the real outcome from the Ministerial meeting would depend primarily on the fulfilment in good faith of the basic obligations under the General Agreement by all contracting parties. Czechoslovakia would continue to exert its best efforts to that end.

Mr. RUIZ (Cuba) expressed regret that, in spite of intense negotiations over the past days, Cuba's expectations from the Ministerial meeting had remained unsatisfied in the most fundamental aspects. In his view, this feeling was also shared by other developing countries. In the preparatory process, intense work had been done to reach agreement on a text meeting the essential interests of developing countries as well as of all contracting parties. Unfortunately, the equilibrium reached after a number of months had been eroded in the course of the final days. He expressed disappointment that, in spite of the recognition in the plenary by almost all delegations of the serious situation of developing countries in the context of the present economic world crisis, there had not been sufficient political will at the time of decision-making to translate these pronouncements into concrete results. His country was particularly disappointed about the changes introduced in the chapters of the Ministerial Declaration dealing with protectionism, safeguards, dispute settlement, trade in the agricultural sector and the references to services. With regard to services, he reiterated the position of Cuba that GATT was not legally competent in this area and that, consequently, the decision appearing on page 15 did not compromise nor prejudice the treatment of services. He said that, unfortunately, the present text of the Ministerial Declaration would not contribute to the solution of the most serious problems which confronted his country as regards its external trade, trade in agricultural products and coercive economic measures from which Cuba suffered and which constituted a flagrant violation of the principles applying to international trade. It had been in a constructive gesture that Cuba, as a contracting party, had joined the consensus to approve the Ministerial Declaration.

Mr. CHAU (United Kingdom on behalf of Hong Kong) expressed his support for the Ministerial Declaration and said that the introductory remarks of the Chairman did not form part of the Declaration. Referring to the Chairman's understanding regarding the word "maintaining" in paragraph 7(i) on page 4 of the Declaration, according to which some governments would require a certain amount of time to fulfill this undertaking, he regretted that this understanding was incomplete because there were other governments, including his own, which were of the view that measures inconsistent with the General Agreement should be eliminated forthwith. The statement, in this regard, could be no more than the Chairman's own observation and had no status in juridical terms. It, therefore, could not and did not add to or detract from the rights and obligations of any contracting party under the General Agreement.

Mr. NYERGES (Hungary) said that the Hungarian delegation endorsed the Ministerial Declaration. It was Hungary's intention to make the best efforts to take into account the relevant parts of the Declaration in implementing its trade policy and in anticipation of early elimination of quantitative restrictions not consistent with Article XIII of the General Agreement maintained against Hungarian exports and in the light of the fulfilment in good faith of the GATT obligations by all contracting parties. With reference to the Chairman's explanation concerning his understanding of paragraph 7(i) of the Declaration, the delegation of Hungary fully shared the view expressed by the delegation of the United Kingdom speaking on behalf of Hong Kong as to the legal non-existence of such an understanding.

Mr. GRUNWALDT-RAMASSO (Uruguay) said that the results of the Ministerial meeting were far from satisfactory. A compromise solution had been very difficult to find. He said that the Ministerial Declaration had to be construed in a manner so as to reaffirm the basic principles of the General Agreement, effectively implementing the present provisions designed to ensure greater participation by the developing countries in international trade. Uruguay firmly supported the setting up of an agricultural committee, the main purpose of which would be to examine multilaterally the international impact of national agricultural policies, with a view to achieving the maximum possible level of free trade through the reduction of stocks, limitation of export subsidies and a more liberal opening-up of consumer markets. He said that this was virtually a condition sine qua non if GATT was to be able to attain its basic objectives fully. It was essential in this respect to achieve the necessary agreements to re-establish an adequate framework for international trade, based on equitable principles and rules and eliminating the present uncertainty surrounding market access for manufactured products. He said that an essential factor in this was the work to be done by the group which was scheduled to examine quantitative restrictions and other non-tariff measures. His delegation considered it inadvisable to extend GATT's field of activities with tasks which, in the view of Uruguay, did not come within its specific legal competence. There was needed a careful examination of the effect which the Ministerial Declaration was likely to have on the economies of the developing countries, as well as of the forums in which these tasks should ultimately be considered. He concluded by saying that Uruguay reserved its rights under the General Agreement as to the extent to which the objectives of the Ministerial Declaration would not be adequately implemented.

Mr. ALI MCHUMO (Tanzania) said that the difficulties of the Ministerial meeting were a reflection of the difficult world trade situation. Tanzania supported the Ministerial Declaration but had very strong reservations on the paragraph regarding trade in services. His country had consistently argued during the Ministerial meeting that this issue was outside the competence of GATT and that its inclusion in the Declaration in the present form was not to the advantage of developing countries or, at least, of Tanzania. The question of trade in services could be much better tackled by other bodies and organs of the



United Nations system with the required competence. He said that despite Tanzania's reservation in respect of the part of the Declaration concerning services, he wished to reaffirm his Government's commitment to the multilateral trading system of which the GATT was the legal foundation. As a contracting party, Tanzania would continue to fulfill its obligations under the General Agreement, subject to the areas on which he had indicated Tanzania's reservation.

Mr. VILLAR (Spain) welcomed the fact that the difficult work of the Ministerial meeting had culminated in a realistic Ministerial Declaration, even though this end result of a delicate negotiation could not fully meet the desires of all participants. He said that with some of the reviews and up-dating which were indispensable, the Declaration was opening up a new horizon based on the ordering of international trade within the system of GATT. He said that Spain had accepted a high degree of undertaking within the GATT. It had consolidated 50 per cent of its tariff positions, had liberalized most of its foreign trade and had endeavoured to adapt to the GATT system. Spain would continue to make efforts in the direction of compliance as much as possible during the difficult economic situation and also to the extent that the other contracting parties would also comply with these obligations. For these reasons, Spain would take an active part in the examination referred to by the Declaration in respect of quantitative restrictions and other non-tariff measures. As to the commercial problems of fishing, he expressed concern, as well as the hope that a genuine study of these problems would necessarily have to take into account the effects on fishing and on international trade in products from fishing brought about by the modification of maritime fishing zones. Finally, he recalled that his authorities had not considered it opportune to place the matter of services in the Declaration. However, in a spirit of co-operation and compromise, Spain had accepted the text in the hope that an analysis of this question would prove useful for all contracting parties. It was his belief that the plan of action contained in the Declaration and the spirit that had been evidenced would strengthen the instruments already available in the GATT system so as to avoid the disastrous consequences of past crises which, at the time, did not have the benefit of such instruments.

Mr. VARGAS (Nicaragua) said that the Ministerial Declaration did not satisfy the desires expressed by many developing countries at the session. However, he felt that the text could be transformed into something more than a simple declaration if the parties accepting it had the firm intention and sufficient political will to concretize its contents. In particular, this would mean (a) respecting with determination the rules of the General Agreement; (b) deciding not to apply illegal measures or measures which could limit or distort international trade or to apply measures for political reasons; (c) applying fully the provisions of the General Agreement concerning developing countries; (d) incorporating agriculture fully into the multilateral trading system; and (e) liberalizing substantially the trade in tropical products. Furthermore, if it were possible to restore confidence by means of a just, multilateral and truly effective safeguard system and through a dispute settlement mechanism capable of protecting on an equal basis the rights and interests of all contracting parties, his delegation would not consider this meeting

as having been inappropriate. Finally, he referred to the statement made by the foreign ministers of developing countries in New York to the effect that GATT should not deal with matters beyond its competence, such as services.

Mr. HUSLID (Norway), speaking for the delegations of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, said that the Nordic delegations expressed their satisfaction that after intense negotiations a document had been adopted by consensus. The Nordic delegations especially welcomed the commitments to overcome the protectionist pressures and to support the GATT system. They were, however, concerned by the fact that a number of delegations had found it necessary to make interpretations which indicated that there was not a common understanding on some important points in the Ministerial Declaration. He said that the Nordic countries, as nations heavily dependent on foreign trade and thus on the open multilateral trading system, could not compromise with the principle of universality with regard to GATT objectives and commitments. The Nordic countries could, therefore, only participate in the commitments of the Declaration to the extent that this principle was being upheld.

Mr. KACZURBA (Poland) said that since the wording of some important parts of the Ministerial Declaration, such as those dealing with dispute settlement, services, high-technology and several other items, was the result of a last minute informal process involving a limited number of delegations, Poland wished to reserve its position with respect to relevant parts of the Declaration.

Mr. ALIRO-OMARA (Uganda) said that his delegation had come to the Ministerial meeting with the hope of seeing its success. However, he felt that the Ministerial Declaration adopted was not satisfactory, and at best was a document of studies. In his view, the language of the Declaration avoided the real issues that had brought his delegation to Geneva. It did not deal decisively with the issue of protectionism, in particular, in areas such as agricultural trade, safeguards, dispute settlement and others. As to the sensitive issue of services, his delegation was of the opinion that this matter did not fall within the competence of the GATT. He regretted that despite opposition from many delegations this matter had found its way into the Declaration. Finally, his delegation wondered about the legality of the Declaration which, in his view, contained many unsatisfactory aspects. However, his delegation, in a spirit of compromise, accepted the Declaration, except the text on services, with respect to which it wished to be dissociated.

Mr. NETTEL (Austria) expressed satisfaction that the Ministerial Declaration had been adopted by consensus. However, various contracting had given different interpretations of undertakings which apparently had already been agreed on. Under these circumstances, Austria had to reserve for itself the right to interpret and apply the undertakings expressed at this meeting in the same way as they were interpreted and applied by other contracting parties.

Mr. REINO (Portugal) expressed satisfaction that a consensus had been reached in respect of the Ministerial Declaration. The Portuguese delegation had been happy to accept the declaration submitted to the CONTRACTING PARTIES. Nevertheless, and taking into account the interpretations and even reservations made by several delegations, he wished to reaffirm in the name of Portugal the universal character of GATT, of the obligations deriving from the General Agreement and, more concretely, of the commitments just entered into by contracting parties in approving the Ministerial Declaration. In that sense, Portugal accepted all the commitments of the Ministerial Declaration to the extent that they were accepted by all other contracting parties.

Mr. PONCE (Peru) said that the Peruvian Government would respect the Ministerial Declaration approved by consensus to the extent that all contracting parties carried out faithfully their commitments under the GATT system and respected the agreements arrived at, in particular those of special interest to developing countries.

Mr. MEJIA-RICART (Dominican Republic) expressed regret that many of the expectations regarding the Ministerial meeting as a starting point towards a new international economic order, which was intended to end the erosion of the purchasing power of developing countries, should have been largely frustrated. He said that the poor results obtained on key issues of interest to developing countries, such as agriculture, tropical products, subsidies, safeguards and dispute settlement, as well as the reference to services as a possible item to be included within the General Agreement, left his delegation with a feeling of pessimism as to the immediate future. In spite of this, his delegation was of the opinion that the General Agreement must continue to play a rôle towards the liberalization of international trade, including a fair treatment for the trade of developing countries. Overall, his delegation considered the Ministerial Declaration as a very modest step taken in this direction.

Mr. MOTILLAL (Guyana) said that his delegation had taken cognisance of the number of restricted meetings, after which changes had resulted and a new document had emerged. Furthermore, in the light of the short time allowed to delegations to scrutinize a document that appeared at first glance rather ambiguous in a number of areas, he noted that although Guyana did not reject the Ministerial Declaration it could not definitely accept all the provisions encompassing it at this point of time. He said that Guyana, therefore, reserved its position until certain areas of the Declaration had been more closely analysed. In conclusion, he pledged Guyana's continual support to the GATT in respect of any move to bring about greater liberalization of international trade.

Mr. PASIN (Turkey) said that without discussing or questioning the legal value of individual statements and interpretations, he wished to register Turkey's disagreement in respect of that part of the European Communities' statement which regarded fisheries and particularly economic zones.

Mr. JAYASEKERA (Sri Lanka) said that although the Ministerial Declaration had been adopted by consensus, in which Sri Lanka had also joined, he had noted with some surprise and concern the number of interpretative statements which indicated a lack of common understanding on the adopted text. His delegation did not find the Declaration fully satisfactory since it did not adequately deal with the problems of protectionism which lay at the heart of the malaise afflicting the international trading system. His delegation also reserved its position on the inclusion of the section on services which, in his view, was not within the competence and jurisdiction of the GATT.

The CHAIRMAN, after expressing his thanks and appreciation for the work performed by all concerned, said that consideration of the Ministerial part of the session was completed.

The meeting adjourned at 5 a.m.