

MEMORANDUM

RELATING TO THE AGREEMENT REVISING AND RENEWING THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT, OPEN FOR SIGNATURE AT WASHINGTON FROM APRIL 13, UNTIL APRIL 27, 1953, INCLUSIVE.

Language experts in the Department of State of the United States of America, in the course of a routine comparison of the several versions in which the agreement above-mentioned was signed, have noted the following differences between the French version on the one hand and the English and Spanish versions on the other hand:

1. In Article II

In the definition of "Engagement non rempli" it appears that in the fifth line, "pour ladite année agricole" should have been inserted after "et les ventes garanties de ce pays" so that the text would read: "et les ventes garanties de ce pays pour ladite année agricole". It appears unlikely that any administrative difficulty could arise as a result of the omission.

2. In Article IV, paragraph 5, second line

Although the meaning is clear, it appears that "2 et 4" should read "2 ou 4".

3. In Article IV, paragraph 6 (e), fourth line

The words "ou partie de transaction" should have been inserted after "l'inscription d'une transaction" so that the text would read: "l'inscription d'une transaction ou partie de transaction". Apparently not of substantive importance.

4. In Article VI, paragraph 1 (b), second line

It appears that the words "au vendeur" should have been "à l'acheteur". As a substantive matter, this could have importance.

5. In Article X, paragraph 6 (b), second line

It appears that "pays importateur" should conform with "reporting country" in the English version, e.g., an expression something like this: "pays qui en a référé au Conseil". As a substantive matter, this could have importance.

6. In Article XIX, paragraph 1, third line

It appears that the words "tout pays exportateur ou de tout pays importateur partie au différend" would more properly have been made to read "tout pays partie au différend". However, there appears to be no question of substantive effect.

7. In Article XIX, paragraph 3 (a) (iii), second line

It appears that "(a) et de (b)" should have been made to read "(i) et de (ii)". This could have substantive importance but appears unlikely to cause any administrative difficulty.

8. In Article XX, paragraph 1, first line

The words "à Washington" should have been inserted after "sera ouvert" so that the text would read "sera ouvert à Washington". This is now purely academic in Character.

9. In Article XXII, paragraph 6, fourth line

The words "ou à l'Annexe B" should not have been included. Apparently no administrative difficulty is likely to arise therefrom.

¹ Prepared by the Department of State and transmitted under cover of circular note dated June 22, 1953, to the Chiefs of Mission of Governments concerned with the above named agreement. The International Wheat Council at London was also informed of the discrepancies.