CCIU / II / 11
ORIGINAL: French

BUREAUX INTERNATIONAUX
RÉUNIS POUR LA PROTECTION
DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE
GENÈVE, SUISSE

BIRPI

UNITED INTERNATIONAL
BUREAUX FOR THE PROTECTION
OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

COMITÉ DE COORDINATION INTERUNIONS, DEUXIÈME SESSION
INTERUNION COORDINATION COMMITTEE, SECOND SESSION

(Genève, 28 septembre au 2 octobre 1964)
(Geneva, September 28 to October 2, 1964)

(PROVISIONAL) MINUTES

Index

FIRST MEETING, Monday, September 28, 1964, a.m.

Opening of the session and election of the new Officers
(Items 1 and 2 of the Provisional Agenda; document CCIU/II/1)

1. Mr. MORF (Switzerland), in his capacity as Chairman of the Interunion Coordination Committee, welcomed the participants to the second ordinary session and proceeded to the election of new Officers who, according to the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, must be elected during the first meeting of each ordinary session.

2. As the result of the drawing of lots, provided for in the Rules of Procedure, the Chairman was to be elected from amongst the States which were Members only of the Permanent Committee of the Berne Union and, it followed that one Vice-Chairman was to be elected from amongst the States which were Members only of the Permanent Bureau of the Paris Union and the other from amongst the States which were Members of both the Permanent Committee and the Permanent Bureau.

3. Following a proposal by Mr. PURUSHOTTAM (India), seconded by Mr. DATE (Japan) the Committee unanimously elected by acclamation Mr. ANGHEL (Rumanian People's Republic) as Chairman; Mr. BRENNER (United States of America) and Mr. BORDONAU (Spain) were elected Vice-Chairmen.

4. Before handing over to the new Chairman, Mr. MORF (Switzerland) thanked the Committee for the tribute paid to his country when they elected him as first Chairman and expressed his gratitude for the support which he had constantly received from the States.

5. Mr. ANGHEL (Rumanian People's Republic) took the Chair and presided over the second ordinary session.

Adoption of the Agenda
(Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda; document CCIU/II/2)

6. As there were no objections to the draft agenda submitted by the Secretariat (document CCIU/II/2) the CHAIRMAN declared it unanimously adopted.

Report on the activities of BIRPI since November, 1963
(Item 4 of the Agenda; documents CCIU/II/3 and 4, and Management Report of BIRPI for 1963)

7. The DIRECTOR stressed that the Report on the activities of BIRPI since November, 1963 concerned only past activities of BIRPI and not the future program and budget, which were dealt with in other documents (CCIU/II/8).

He drew particular attention to the following activities of BIRPI during the past year:

(a) A Working Party composed of experts from 10 countries had met in May, 1964, to study the structural reorganization of BIRPI; the draft Convention would shortly be communicated to all Member States of the Paris and Berne Unions, who would be invited to take part in the work of an Expert Committee, probably in March, 1965.

(b) Relations with the United Nations had developed considerably, both the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) had adopted resolutions providing explicitly for UN-BIRPI collaboration in the preparation of certain projects. In this connexion, the Director stated that he had just received, on September 28, a letter from the Secretary-General of the United Nations outlining conditions for future collaboration; this letter would shortly be distributed (document CCIU/II/4 Add.)

(c) A draft model law for the protection of inventions and technical know-how had been drafted by BIRPI for developing countries; it would serve as the basis of the work of a committee of experts which would meet in October, 1964, and to which 64 developing countries had been invited.

(d) The Conference on Industrial Property for Latin America had been held in Bogota in July, 1964. A resolution was adopted recommending particularly to those Latin American countries which were not parties to the Paris Convention to consider the advisability of accession; since then, three countries had expressed their intention of joining: Argentina, Colombia and Venezuela. With reference to BIRPI activities in Latin America, the Director stressed that the Permanent Secretariat of the General Treaty for Central American Economic Integration (Treaty which grouped Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and El Salvador) had asked BIRPI to help prepare a draft Central American Convention on Trademarks, Patents and Designs. BIRPI would naturally respond to this request.

(e) BIRPI had organized training courses for people who were or would be responsible for the administration of industrial property in developing countries. These courses were to be held either at BIRPI or in countries with Administrations experienced in industrial property matters. The Director stated that 8 trainees had been selected, from Colombia, Ghana, Iraq, Iran, Morocco, the Philippines, Thailand and Venezuela and they would be proceeding to the following countries: Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, Switzerland, United Kingdom and United States. This program could be extended if the financial situation allowed.

(f) The possible revision of the Paris Convention to include the idea of inventor's certificate, particularly as a basis for priority right, was being studied. The Director recalled that a Study Group had been convened by BIRPI in January, 1964, and that the work would be pursued by an expert committee, which would probably meet in March, 1965, composed of the representatives of all the Member States of the Paris Union; the USSR would be invited as Observer.

(g) With reference to the Berne Union, the Director mentioned that the Permanent Committee had held their eleventh session in December, 1963, in New Delhi, at the invitation of the Indian Government. The Committee had expressed the wish that Member States of the Union be consulted on the subject of the English edition of the Review "Le Droit D'Auteur". Consultations had begun on this subject.

8. Mr. FINNISS (France) congratulated BIRPI for this activity; he stressed that a policy of presence paid, especially if BIRPI was to appear everywhere as the sole intergovernmental organization qualified in the field of intellectual property on a world scale.

9. Mr. BRENNER (United States of America) also expressed his Government's satisfaction with the results obtained. He was particularly pleased with the collaboration being established between the United Nations and BIRPI.

10. Mr. WINTER (United States of America) suggested that BIRPI should examine the possibility of working with the United Nations, within the framework of the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance of that Organization, and requested the Director to report to the next session on this subject.

11. The CHAIRMAN noted that the expression of views requested in document CCIU/II/3 was favorable.

Financial Report for 1963
(Item 5 of the Agenda; document CCIU/II/5
and Management Report for 1963)

12. Mr. BOGSCH (Deputy-Director, BIRPI) in presenting document CCIU/II/5, stated that it was primarily intended to complete the Management Report by adding certain details. He recalled that BIRPI had strictly adhered to the decisions taken by the Interunion Committee at its first meeting in connexion with the settlement of accounts between the different Unions.

13. Mr. GRANT (United Kingdom) congratulated the Secretariat on the details contained in the documents submitted and for the work which these represented, but he did not feel that in future such detailed documents were necessary. He requested that, in future, corresponding figures for the previous year be given, to allow rapid comparison between the two financial periods.

14. Mr. FINNISS (France) stated that both the financial services and the Cours des Comptes had been agreeably surprised by the details contained in the documents. He agreed with Mr. Grant that fewer details would suffice in future. With reference to salaries, he requested that the yearly figure for each post be indicated.

15. Mr. de HAAN (Netherlands) noted that under Heading 82 an amount of more than 500 Swiss Francs had been debited to the Paris Union, as expenditure in connexion with the Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants; this was surely an item of common expenditure.

16. Mr. BOGSCH (Deputy-Director, BIRPI) replied to the previous items:

(a) BIRPI would be pleased to present reports with fewer details in future;

(b) it had not been possible to give "corresponding figures" for years prior to 1964, since the whole method of presentation had been altered considerably in 1963. In future these figures would be given;

(c) with reference to salaries, the grade of each post was shown in the budget document and the Administrative Handbook (Manuel administratif) showed the salary corresponding to each grade;

(d) with reference to expenditure in connection with the protection of new plant varieties, it had been decided, following the Report of the Financial Experts (Messrs. Jeauffre, Cummins and Davenport) that the "parent-union" would make advance payments on behalf of future unions or, where no "parent-union" existed, the union covering the field nearest to that of the future union. It would appear that in this instance, the union covering the field nearest to that of the future union for new plant varieties was the Paris Union, as plant varieties in many countries were considered to be in the field of patents. It was, furthermore, only a loan which would be reimbursed to the Paris Union as soon as the new union for plant varieties began to function.

17. Mr. FINNISS (France) expressed agreement with Mr. Bogsch on expenditure in connection with the future union for plant varieties.

18. After Mr. WINTER (United States of America) had added his congratulations to those already expressed, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Financial Report of BIRPI for 1963 was unanimously approved.

Financial Rules of BIRPI
(Item 6 of the Agenda; document CCIU/II/6)

19. Mr. BOGSCH (Deputy-Director, BIRPI) recalled that according to the provisions of Articles 10.1 and 5.1. of the Financial Regulations, the Director, with the advice of the Interunion Committee, was responsible for the preparation of rules regulating the organization of the financial services of BIRPI as well as the accounting services. The draft before the Committee was a set of rules for the implementation of the Financial Regulations. It had been prepared on the basis of the work of the financial experts (Messrs Cummins, Davenport and Jeauffre), who had enumerated in their Report of 1963 the matters which should be covered by such implementary rules. There were two parts. One corresponded to Article 10.1. (organization of the financial services) and the other to article 5.1. (accounting) of the Financial Regulations.

20. Mr. MORF (Switzerland) suggested that the following clause be added to article 3 (f) "..... a report shall be established and sent to the Supervisory Authority".

21. Mr. BOGSCH (Deputy-Director, BIRPI) stated that the proposed amendment was acceptable.

22. Mr. FINNISS (France) pointed out that the Controller was, according to article 1 (b), directly responsible to the Supervisory Authority, whereas in article 1(c) he was subject to BIRPI Administration. As there could be no question of employing two different officials to deal with financial control and the direction of the Finance and Personnel Division within such a restricted Secretariat, he would have preferred a controller to be seconded to BIRPI by the Swiss Government.

23. Mr. BOGSCH (Deputy-Director, BIRPI) drew attention to the fact that the Swiss Government exercised a very careful and strict control; if the Government were to second an official for internal auditing, they would also then be responsible for control at two stages. He proceeded to outline current practice in other international organizations. First an internal audit was made by an official and then an external audit by a Government or by a firm of Chartered Accountants. A similar system was proposed in article I.

24. Mr. GRANT (United Kingdom) agreed with the principle of the French statement. Nevertheless, the fact that the Controller was in direct contact with the Supervisory Authority should be sufficient guarantee.

25. Mr. LABRY (France) stated that his delegation was not concerned with the control of expenditure actually made, but with the control of amounts obligated, before expenditure was incurred. However, in view of the small Secretariat at BIRPI his Government would not insist that the two functions be handled by different officials, especially as the Financial Rules provided for the possibility of direct communication between the Controller and the Supervisory Authority.

26. Mr. HAERTEL (Fed. Republic of Germany) stated that the principles of audit were similar in his country to those proposed for BIRPI. A first audit was made by an official, a second by an outside body. He therefore agreed with the structure proposed.

27. Mr. VOYAME (Switzerland) asked whether the Controller should not also check that the expenditure envisaged was in accordance with texts in force (Conventions, Regulations etc.)

28. Mr. de HAAN (Netherlands) and Mr. FINNISS (France) agreed with Mr Voyame.

29. Mr. TESORO (United States of America) pointed out that this had been provided for in Article 3(a)(ii) of the draft Financial Rules, but only with reference to payments. A similar proviso might be inserted in Article 2 with reference to obligations.

30. Mr. BOGSCH (Deputy-Director, BIRPI) agreed that such an addition be made to Article 2.

31. The CHAIRMAN declared that there was a unanimous opinion in favor of the draft Financial Rules, with the two amendments proposed above (paragraphs 20, 27 and 29).

SECOND MEETING, Monday September 28, 1964, p.m.

Report on Staff Matters

(Item 7 of the Agenda;
documents CCIU/II/7 and 7/A (Confidential))

32. The DIRECTOR of BIRPI, presenting document CCIU/II/7, stressed the efforts made by BIRPI to achieve a balanced geographical distribution of the staff and stated that this effort would be pursued. With reference to their integration into the "regime commun", three officials had requested a re-examination of their cases, following his implementation of the two reports of the Integration Committee.

33. He proposed that the problem of pension adjustments for ex-officials, the ex-gratia payment to Madame Secretan, widow of the previous Director, and the question of the continuation in office of the Deputy Director, Mr. Magnin, be discussed in camera at the end of the meeting

34. Mr. PURUSHOTTAM (India) congratulated the Secretariat on their policy of balanced geographical distribution and expressed the hope that more and more nationals of non-represented States would be recruited in future.

35. Mr. KUNZ (Czechoslovak Socialist Republic) wished to be associated with Mr. Purushottam's statement.

36. Mr. TALAMO (Italy) stated that as there were several Unions in existence, the specific situation of States belonging to several Unions ought to be considered as well as geographical distribution. All things being equal, the nationals of such countries should have priority over the nationals of other countries.

37. Mr. MORF (Switzerland), referring to contributions to the Pensions Fund, stated that the Supervisory Authority had no objection to the amendment of Article 3.15 of the Staff Regulations to permit contributions to reach the level of the "regime commun",

38. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee was in favor of all the matters dealt with in the Report on Staff Matters, with the exception of the three matters which the Director had suggested be discussed in camera (1).

(1) These matters were discussed in camera and no summary record was made. For the results of the Committee's discussions, see Report (document CCIU/II/10/rev.)

Draft Program and Budget of BIRPI for 1965
(Item 8 of the Agenda; document CCIU/II/8)

39. Mr. BOGSCH (Deputy-Director, BIRPI) stated that following the entry into force of Article 14 (5)(a) of the Lisbon text of the Paris Convention, BIRPI had prepared a draft budget for three years for the Paris Union; for 1965, this draft coincided with the part of the draft budget of BIRPI relating to the Paris Union, and was presented in document CCIU/II/8. In connexion with this document, he wished to draw attention particularly to the financial situation of the Berne Union and to the proposal that the ceiling of contributions to the Union be raised from 400,000 to 700,000 Swiss Francs per annum.

40. The DIRECTOR added that if it was wished to develop the Berne Union, it would be necessary for BIRPI to deal with the activities covered by the draft supplementary budget for 1965 and more specifically, with the preparation of the Diplomatic Conference in Stockholm, with the strengthening of ties with the states in Latin America and Africa and finally with an extension of the trainee program. If funds were not made available to BIRPI this program would have to be abandoned.

41. Mr. FINNISS (France) stressed that the budget of the Berne Union was very small compared to the interests involved and added that France wholeheartedly agreed with the increase requested. He pointed out that sooner or later there would have to be an increase in the contribution to the Paris Union.

42. Mr. GRANT (United Kingdom) enquired whether an increase of 300,000 Swiss Francs was really necessary; an increase of 200,000 Swiss Francs appeared to be sufficient.

43. Mr. PERALES (Spain) stated that in view of the importance of the tasks covered by the draft supplementary budget of the Berne Union for 1965, his Government had given him authority to approve the increase in the contributions ceiling. He was prepared however to agree to the proposal made by Mr. Grant to reduce the increase from 300,000 to 200,000 Swiss Francs. He would like to have details of the proposed use of this sum.

44. Mr. HESSER (Sweden) approved the program in the field of copyright as proposed. The Swedish Government was prepared to meet certain expenditure in connexion with the Stockholm Conference, but BIRPI would also be incurring specific expenditure for the preparation of this conference and an increase in their resources was therefore called for. A further reason which led his Government to approve of the BIRPI request was the fact that assistance to developing countries was useful and even necessary.

45. Mr. de HAAN (Netherlands) noted that the amount, when spread over the 53 Member States of the Union, was insignificant. He approved the BIRPI request.

46. Mr. ROHMER (France) indicated that his Government had agreed to increase its contributions; the Finance Administration had been a little surprised at the percentage of the increase, but they had finally accepted the principle. It would be useful, nevertheless, if BIRPI would give details of the estimated expenditure.

47. Mr. TALAMO (Italy) admitted that it was necessary to develop the Berne Union, but his financial services could not take a decision without receiving a more analytical budget, giving reasons for the amount requested.

48. Mr. KUNZ (Czechoslovak Socialist Republic) was of the opinion that the reasons put forward by BIRPI should be studied, bearing in mind possible economy; his Government had not yet taken a decision. He would have to abstain.

49. Mr. DATE (Japan) stated that he agreed with the BIRPI program. He had not received any instructions from his Government on the subject of an increase in the funds of the Berne Union, but the Government would certainly not be hostile on this matter since they had just decided to increase their contributory share, passing from class VI to class III.

50. Mr. LUND (Denmark) had not received any instructions from his Government. However, as the proposed increase would facilitate the preparatory work for the Stockholm Conference, he suggested that the Interunion Committee should agree to the proposed increase in the contributions ceiling of the Berne Union.

51. Mr. HAERTEL (Fed. Republic of Germany) had not received any instructions from his Government either. He agreed with Mr. Talamo's statement that BIRPI ought to present a more detailed draft budget. Finally, he expressed concern as to whether the present staff of the Copyright Division was adequate to carry out the proposed program and new staff would be needed.

52. Mr. BOGSCH (Deputy-Director, BIRPI) pointed out that if the principle of an increase were adopted, the Swiss Government would send a circular letter to the Governments of Member States and all budgetary details would be given with that letter.

53. Mr. PURUSHOTTAM (India) expressed satisfaction with the new activities envisaged by BIRPI, with particular reference to those in newly independent States and the relationship with the United Nations, and would like to stress the need to increase them even further. He was also satisfied with the trainee program and wished to thank BIRPI for having arranged a course in the United States for an Indian official. As to the level of contributions, the Indian Government would take a decision when the opinion of other Member States was known and when they had received a request from the Swiss Government.

54. Following these different explanatory statements, Mr. GRANT (United Kingdom) withdrew his proposal to limit the increase in the contributions to the Berne Union to 200,000 Swiss Francs.

55. With regard to the details of the estimated expenditure, he queried whether it was justifiable to debit the Union with the travel expenses of delegates to various meetings.

56. The DIRECTOR stated that he had envisaged bearing part of the cost of travel for delegates to some meetings because experience had shown that certain Governments were not able to meet these expenses for their delegates. It was nevertheless useful for BIRPI to hear the opinion of these delegates.

57. Mr. GRANT (United Kingdom) questioned the usefulness of training courses in the Copyright field, as administrative problems at the Governmental level were somewhat limited.

58. Mr. BOGSCH (Deputy-Director, BIRPI) stated that fewer courses would be required in this field than for Industrial Property, because the number of state officials dealing with Copyright matters was considerably fewer than those dealing with Industrial Property. The amount of 20,000 Swiss Francs estimated would cover the organization of two, or at the most of three, courses.

59. Mr. PALOS (Hungarian People's Republic), expressed disagreement with the procedure proposed in connexion with the increase of the income of the Berne Union. The Diplomatic Conference alone could increase the contributions ceiling.

60. Mr. BOGSCH (Deputy-Director, BIRPI) recalled that a period of 19 years would have elapsed between the Diplomatic Conference of Brussels (1948) and Stockholm (1967) and that no national administration was living on the basis of a budget adopted in 1948. These were the reasons that had led BIRPI to ask for an increase of the contributions to the Berne Union, without waiting for the Diplomatic Conference.

61. Mr. HAERTEL (Fed. Republic of Germany) repeated that he had no instructions from his Government. He was further of the opinion that a higher budget would be required if the Berne Union was to develop; it was essential that States be asked to contribute whatever was necessary to the Berne Union and to give them the means to pay the staff required. His Government, however, would not be able to make the additional payment already in 1965; it would be preferable therefore if the request was made for 1966, which would give the States time for decision.

62. Mr. TALAMO (Italy) said that his country was in the same position. Any increase was inconceivable before 1966.

63. Mr. MORF (Switzerland) in reply to Mr. Haertel and Mr. Talamo stated that contributions for 1965 were payable in the course of 1966.

64. Mr. de SANCTIS (Italy) stated that the developing States were not favorable to the Berne Convention in the field of substantive law. Out of the additional budget of 160,000 Swiss Francs, 42,000 Swiss Francs would be used for African countries and 42,000 Swiss Francs for Latin America; these amounts were high and useless. The Berne Union would attract the under-developed States only if the level of the Convention was reduced. He expressed certain doubts as to the usefulness of BIRPI's activities on behalf of these countries.

65. Mr. MASOUYE (Head of the BIRPI Copyright Division) stated that the idea of the Latin American Seminar was several years old. It had not previously been possible to convene the Seminar because of lack of funds and because of the priority given to the Brazzaville Seminar. The Latin American Seminar would certainly be useful as there was at present a strong movement in Latin America in favor of accession to the Berne Union, particularly noticeable in Argentina and Ecuador. Collaboration with Unesco would, furthermore, reduce by half the cost of the organization of the Seminar.

66. Mr. de SANCTIS (Italy) continued that the movement in the countries referred to showed that they could not accede to the existing Berne Convention, and that it would be necessary to reduce the level of protection given if the geographical coverage were to be increased. This was not desirable. Since the Universal Convention was in existence, it would be preferable to encourage accession of these States to the latter rather than to the Berne Convention.

67. Mr. KUNZ (Czechoslovak Socialist Republic) stated that some tates had declared at Brazzaville that the Berne Convention was more favorable to the 'exporters' than to the 'importers' and it had been proposed that certain clauses to alter this situation should be introduced. Might it not be more prudent to wait until after the Stockholm Conference before holding any new Seminars?

68. Mr. BOGSCH (Deputy-Director, BIRPI) recalled that the Committee could not commit the Governments on matters concerning the Berne Union, it could simply express an opinion as to whether the Swiss Government should send a circular to the States requesting an increase in contributions on a voluntary basis.

69. Mr. TALAMO (Italy) stressed that the purpose of the Berne Union was not to widen the circle of Member States but rather to improve the level of Copyright protection. He recalled that he had expressed agreement with the increase requested and that his Government would have to be informed of the way in which BIRPI intended to use the amount involved.

70. Mr. de HAAN (Netherlands) pointed out that the Committee had only to request the Swiss Government to send a circular to States.

71. Mr. RECHT (Belgium) agreed with Mr. de Haan's remark.

72. Mr. PURUSHOTTAM (India) asked whether the letter sent by the Swiss Government would give some indication of the opinions expressed in Committee.

73. Mr. TALAMO (Italy) felt that, on the contrary, the Swiss Government should give the reasons for the proposed increase and details of the use to be made of this additional amount, but not the opinionsof the delegates at the Interunion Committee.

74. Mr. HAERTEL (Fed.Republic of Germany) stated that he would abstain on the matter as a whole.

75. The CHAIRMAN summed up the consensus of opinion as follows: (1) the draft ordinary budget of BIRPI was unanimously adopted; (2) with reference to the additional budget for the Berne Union, the Committee recommended, subject to reservations expressed by the delegates of the Federal Republic of Germany and certain statements made by Mr. de Haan and Mr. Talamo, that the Swiss Government should send a circular letter to the Member States of the Berne Union asking them to increase the ceiling of expenditure for the Berne Union to 700,000 Swiss Francs; this circular letter should state the reasons for the proposed increase and details concerning the use to be made of it.

Cooperation with the United Nations
(Document CCIU/II/4 Add.)

76. The DIRECTOR reminded the Committee that when the Report on BIRPI activities since November, 1963, had been discussed, he had said that a letter received on September 28 from the United Nations would be distributed shortly. The letter was contained in document CCIU/II/4 Add. together with Resolution 1013 (XXXVII) of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, to which the letter referred.

77. Mr. FINNISS (France) congratulated BIRPI on the success which this offer of collaboration from the United Nations represented.

78. Mr. WINTER (United States of America) also expressed satisfaction at the strengthening of the relationship between BIRPI and the United Nations.

79. Mr. PURUSHOTTAM (India) pointed out that the Secretariat would soon have to implement paragraph 1 of the Economic and Social Council Resolution 1013 (XXXVII) which included a study of "the possibilities for adaptation of legislation concerning the transfer of industrial technology to developing countries". BIRPI should be ready to cooperate with the United Nations in this matter. Would it not be advisable for BIRPI officials to begin to study the question?

80. Mr. TALAMO (Italy) stated that the problem of the relationship between the United Nations and the "Bureau of the International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property" was less a matter for the Interunion Consultative Committee than the Union of Paris Committee.

81. The DIRECTOR stated that he had taken note of Mr. Purushottam's remarks. Following the statement by Mr. Talamo the matter would also be submitted to the Consultative Committee of the Paris Union.

82. The CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee was of the opinion that the Director of BIRPI should accept the offer made by the United Nations.

THIRD MEETING, Friday October 2, 1964. a.m.

Approval of the Report on the work accomplished by the Committee during the second ordinary session (Item 9 of the Agenda; document CCIU/II/10)

83. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Report prepared by the Secretariat (Document CCIU/II/10) should be discussed paragraph by paragraph.

84. Any paragraphs not specifically referred to hereafter were adopted without discussion.

85. The following comments were made on the other paragraphs:

Paragraph 2.

86. The DIRECTOR stated that Portugal should be deleted from the list of States not represented. (Portugal had not been present at the first two meetings of the Session).

Paragraph 10.

87. Mr. FINNISS (France) wished to have inserted a statement to the effect that the French delegation had asked for certain details on the Financial Report.

Paragraph 32.

88. Mr. PURUSHOTTAM (India) requested that his statement (see paragraph 53 above) be included in the Report.

89. Mr. FINNISS (France) wished it stated in the Report that he had drawn attention to the fact that the increase in BIRPI staff would soon give rise to problems concerning the balancing of the Paris Union budget and its income.

90. Mr. KUNZ (Czechoslovak Socialist Republic) asked that it be recorded that at the end of his statement on his Government's position, he had said that the matter was still subject to reservation, as it was still under consideration.

Paragraph 34.

91. The DIRECTOR said that as the Permanent Bureau of the Consultative Committee of the Paris Union had been superseded by the Executive Committee of the Conference of Representatives, the Paris Union would in future be represented by the said Executive Committee at the Interunion Coordination Committee.

92. The CHAIRMAN explained that pending the formal revision of the Rules of Procedure of the Interunion Coordination Committee any reference to the Permanent Bureau in those Rules would be taken as reference to the Executive Committee.

93. The CHAIRMAN declared that the Report had been adopted unanimously, taking account of the preceding details.

Closure of the second ordinary session of the Committee

(Item 10 of the Agenda)

94. Following the adoption of the General Report, the CHAIRMAN expressed satisfaction at the fortunate outcome of this second session of the Interunion Coordination Committee and the spirit of understanding that had been apparent during the discussion. He also thanked the Director of BIRPI and his staff for the excellent way in which the documents had been prepared and the information they had constantly provided during the meeting.

95. Mr. LABRY (France) thanked the Chairman on behalf of all the participants for the firm, courteous and rapid manner in which he had conducted the work of the session and expressed his support for the vote of thanks to the Secretariat.

96. Noting that all items on the Agenda had been dealt with, the CHAIRMAN then declared closed the second ordinary session of the Interunion Coordination Committee.