



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L' ALIMENTATION ET  
L'AGRICULTURE ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA  
AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION  
00100 Rome, Via delle Terme di Caracalla. Cables: FOODAGRI, Rome. Tel.  
5797



WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION  
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTÉ  
1211 Genève, 27 Avenue Appia. Cables: UNISANTÉ Genève. Tél. 34 60 61

---

ALINORM 72/22

**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME**  
**CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**  
**Ninth Session, Rome, 6-17 November 1972**  
**REPORT OF THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE**  
**CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING**  
**Ottawa, 3-10 June 1972**

1. The Seventh Session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling under the Chairmanship of the Government of Canada, was held in Ottawa, Canada. 5-10 June, 1972. The Session was opened by Mr. G.F. Osbaldeston, Deputy Minister, Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department. Dr. D.G. Chapman, Director, Food Advisory Bureau, Health Protection Branch, Department of National Health and Welfare, was Chairman of the Session- Representatives from 24 countries were present. Observers were present from 7 international organizations (See Appendix I for the List of Participants).

The delegation of Argentina, speaking on behalf of the Spanish speaking delegates, thanked the host country for the provision of documentation and simultaneous interpretation into Spanish.

**Adoption of the Agenda**

2. The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda with a slight rearrangement, reversing the order of the related items dealing with Claims and Advertising. The Delegations of Denmark and the United States of America drew the attention of the Committee to certain other points which they intended to raise under "Other Business".

It was agreed that the nutritional aspects of claims should be discussed under the item dealing with Claims, and the other points would be treated under Item 10 of the Agenda ("Other Business").

**Endorsement of Labelling Provisions in Codex Commodity Standards at Step 8.**

**Canned Corned Beef**

3. It was noted that at the Sixth Session meeting of the Codex Committee on Processed Meat Products (ALINORM 72/16), the only standard which had been advanced to Step 8 was that for Canned Corned Beef. The relevant sections from the Report and the Draft Standard were contained in the document CX/FL 7 2/11.

The Committee took note of the discussion in paragraph 73 of the report of the Sixth Session of the Codex Committee on Processed Meat Products relative to the name of the food. The Committee endorsed the present name and noted that it would be possible to use this name in conjunction with supplementary information to the consumer.

It was noted that the wording in the standard as to "list of ingredients" differed from the General Standard as it referred to "descending order of quantity by weight m/m" rather than "descending order of proportion". The Committee agreed that the wording "descending order of proportion" was commonly understood to mean "by weight". It was agreed that the wording suggested by the Commodity Committee was clearer and more specific but that the original wording in the General Standard should be retained for the time being in order not to affect the standards already sent out to governments for acceptance. When the General Standard for Labelling of Pre-Packaged Foods is reviewed for possible amendment, this point should be raised again.

4. The Delegation of Argentina drew the Committee's attention to the fact that in their legislation, declaration of country of origin was mandatory and that this information should be indelibly printed in clear on both the can and the label.
5. Corned Reef - Additional provisions for lot identification.

The Committee was informed that Section 6.6 of the standard was similar to provisions included in other draft standards elaborated by the Codex Committee on Processed Meat Products and that the intention was to require the container itself and not any label or wrapper attached thereto to be marked with information which would enable the product to be traced at any time, which was important for hygiene and safety control purposes. Some delegations expressed the view that the reference to "the establishment number" was inappropriate and unnecessarily restrictive since the term was not defined either in the draft standard or in the Recommended General Standard for Food Labelling and since all manufacturers of corned beef and other canned meat would not necessarily have an establishment number. The Committee noted that the provisions included in Sections 6.6.1 and 6.6.2, and in particular the use of an establishment number represented general practice in relation to canned meat products and that some of the provisions might be required by legislation or international practices, e.g. those connected with meat inspection. However, the Committee considered that it would be preferable to elaborate a provision which did not refer to an establishment number especially as provision for lot identification had already been endorsed in some of the Recommended Standards for Fish and Fishery Products, e.g. canned tuna, canned shrimps and prawns and Canned Pacific Salmon, as follows:

"6.6 Lot Identification

The following provisions apply to marking on the container itself and not to marking on any label or wrapper attached thereto:

The container shall be permanently and indelibly marked in code or in clear so as to identify the manufacturer and the country, place and date of manufacture."

The Committee noted that the effect of the provision would be similar to that of the provision elaborated by the Codex Committee on Processed Meat

Products and that where an establishment number was available it could be used to identify the manufacturer and the place of manufacture. The Committee also noted that ISO code R 90/1959 dealt with the question of international codes for designating countries of origin.

The Committee decided to delete the present section 6.6 and replace it by the provision noted above dealing with lot identification.

The labelling provisions of this standard were endorsed as amended.

General Points covering all endorsements, where appropriate.

6. Concerning the name and address, the Delegation of Sweden indicated, as a general point, that according to their legislation the name and address of the manufacturer or packer always has to be printed on the label of a food product.
7. As a general point, the Committee noted that when Codex Commodity Committees propose changes in the wording of the labeling sections of their standards, which differ from those in the General Standard, their reports should clearly indicate the reasons for such deviations.
8. The labelling provisions for the declaration of the syrup strengths of canned mandarin oranges and canned pears were endorsed tentatively subject to the resolution of the problem of various syrup strengths at the Ninth Session of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables.
9. Similarly, the Delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany drew attention to the fact that it could not endorse the labeling provisions for artificial colour and flavourings in a number of the products, pending the decisions of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables at its Ninth Session.
10. As a general point, the Delegation of Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Sweden drew the Committee's attention to the fact that they used the weight of the ingoing product at the time of the filling as a measure of net contents as well as the net weight of the total product.
11. The Delegate of Japan stated that, in its view, the standards should provide for a mandatory declaration of the date of manufacture in the labelling provisions for each food to be considered for endorsement.
12. It was recommended that the word "specific" be deleted in the preamble to all these standards since it implied that all the subsections quoted in the labelling provisions were specific provisions whereas some of them were general provisions common to all labelling provisions in Codex standards. A number of delegates supported this idea, pointing out that the repetition of the same phrases was not useful, although some delegates felt that it was advantageous to have all the positive requirements listed in the labelling provisions of each standard.
13. Referring to the declaration of Vitamin C, the Delegation of Sweden pointed out that according to their legislation the type and amount of vitamins contained in the product, must be declared if a claim about vitamins appears on the label.

#### Canned Mandarin Oranges

14. After taking note of the above general reservations, the Committee on Food Labelling endorsed labelling provisions of the standard for canned mandarin oranges.

#### Canned Pears

15. The labelling provisions in the Codex Standard for the canned pears were endorsed by the Committee. The Delegation of Australia pointed out the inconsistency in requiring the name of the variety of pear juice when this differed from the name of the variety of pears, while there was no requirement to name the variety of pears when the variety of pears and the variety of juice was the same.

#### Tomato Concentrate

16. The Delegate of Canada raised the question of the fact that the mandatory name of the product appears to be only Tomato Concentrate (8.1.2) and yet, under 8.1.2, other names are permitted to replace this name. It was indicated that this nomenclature was carefully worked out by the Commodity Committee and is closely tied in with the compositional requirements for this product. The Committee then endorsed all the labelling provisions for this standard.

#### Canned Peas

17. It was pointed out by the Delegation of Trinidad and Tobago that it would be necessary for them to make a deviation in the acceptance of this standard as to the name of the product since the product known as Green Peas applied to a different botanical species in their country. The other possibility was the development of another name for the product to be regarded as "an equivalent description used in the country in which the product is intended to be sold."
18. The Observer from the International Organization of Consumers' Unions, was of the opinion that drained weight rather than net weight was more informative for peas packed in brine. The technical difficulties of determining drained weight were pointed out and it was indicated that it depended on the maturity of the peas, which would require adjustments of the label statement during a packing season. The labelling provisions for canned peas were endorsed by the Committee, unchanged.

#### Vinifera Type Grape Juice

19. The Delegation of Canada asked why the declaration of the presence of sulphur dioxide was listed under 9.6.5 under "Additional Requirements" rather than under 9.2, "List of Ingredients". The Committee noted that sulphur dioxide was listed under Section 6 of the standard and not under ingredients and, therefore, it was agreed to retain the original draft.
20. The Committee agreed to revise 9.2.1 for the sake of clarity so that it would read "a complete list of ingredients shall be declared on the label in descending order of proportion, except that water added for reconstitution of juice according to paragraph 2 of this standard need not be declared". A number of delegations did not see the necessity for this revision of 9.2.1.

21. As a general point in this and the following fruit juice standards, the Committee: noted the objections of the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland to the requirements for the listing of 1 ascorbic acid as such, in the list of ingredients.
22. With regard to the section on Country of Origin, the Committee considered that Sub-section 9.5.2, which had been derived from the General Standard for Food Labelling, did not appear to apply to the specific problem of reconstituted juices. Several delegations were of the opinion that the reconstitution of fruit juice did not change the nature of the product and, therefore, could not be considered as a form of processing, whereas others were of the contrary opinion. It was therefore agreed that the Joint ECE/Codex Group of Experts on the Standardization of Fruit Juices was the appropriate group and requested it to consider in detail, in the light of the above statements, what the declaration of country of origin should be for a reconstituted juice and also for blends of mixtures of juices from concentrates of different origins. The Committee noted that the other standards for fruit juices which had been advanced to step 9 of the procedure contained the same provisions as appeared in the present standard and therefore agreed to endorse the whole section relating to the Country of Origin, noting that the standard would be considered by the Commission at its next session at Step 8. The Delegations of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Switzerland, and Japan, although they were willing to take into consideration the section on Country of Origin, had reservations about endorsing these provisions.

#### Concentrated Apple Juice

23. The Delegation of Argentina indicated that in connection with paragraphs 8.1 and 8.7, their legislation required that the volumes of water needed to be added to a concentrate to reconstitute the juice must be stated on the label. The labelling provisions in this standard were endorsed by the Committee, with the usual general provisions .

#### Concentrated Orange Juice

24. The labelling provisions in this standard were endorsed by the Committee, subject to the usual general reservations which appear in paragraphs 6-13 of this report.

#### Vinifera Type Concentrated Grape Juice

25. The labelling provisions in this standard were endorsed by the Committee, subject to the general reservations expressed in paragraphs 6-13 of this report.

#### Infant Formula

26. After considerable discussion on section 9.2 "The Name of the Food", in order to make the use of this generic name more specific and to cover all possible difficulties which might arise from nonspecific designation of this food, the section was amended to read as follows:

"9.2.1 The name of the product shall be "Infant Formula" of any appropriate designation in accordance with national usage".

" 9.2.2 In addition, the name of the product, shall be qualified by a designation of the essential nature of the food to indicate if it is

- (a) based on milk (see section 3.3 of the standard) or
- (b) free from milk and milk products or
- (c) free from soya products or
- (d) free from other products of similar nutritional or allergenic importance."

However, some delegations said that the original wording of the name of the food in the standard was satisfactory.

27. The Committee endorsed the special provisions for listing vitamins and minerals, noting that this was the normal way of listing such ingredients. The Delegation of the United Kingdom indicated its opposition to the decision to endorse these provisions in 9.3.1 as it was not convinced that it was necessary to depart from the normal procedure laid down in the General Standard for Food Labelling under which ingredients must be declared in descending order of proportion. The United Kingdom Delegation's suggestion that if any departure was justified in a particular case it would be essential for the information and protection of the consumer that there should be specific control over the way in which the ingredients should be listed. The United Kingdom added that it would have preferred to see any special provision for a declaration to be elaborated on the following lines:

"A complete list of ingredients shall be declared on the label in descending order of proportion except that added vitamins or added minerals may be listed separately in descending order of proportion or in alphabetical order."

28. Under the heading "Declaration of Nutritive Value" (9.4), the Delegation of Poland raised the point that in their opinion the standard needs a declaration that the product meets normal nutritional requirements of infants up to a stated age. The Delegation of Sweden pointed out that in their country, nutritional values must be expressed per 100 grams of weight and not by volume, and that calories likewise must be expressed per 100 grams.

29. Concerning the country of origin, the Delegation of Poland indicated that in their opinion, the country of origin should be declared in all cases.

30. It was also agreed that, under the Section "Additional Requirements" should appear the statement under 9.S dealing with lot identification, that is, "the date of manufacture or the date of expiry shall be declared in clear". In addition, the Delegation of the Netherlands was of the opinion that proper storage instructions for the unopened food package should also be given. (See 9.9 - Information for Utilization).

Endorsement of Labelling Provisions at Step 7 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Milk and Milk Product Standards - Processed Cheeses

31. The Chairman of the Committee in reviewing the present situation as regard to these standards, recalled the previous decision of the Committee not to endorse the labelling provisions of these standards unless a complete list of ingredients was declared on the label. It was noted that the Joint FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products at its Fourteenth Session had reconsidered this problem and had made a compromise proposal which was contained in paragraph 56 of its

report (CX 5/70-14th). The Committee agreed that the reasons advanced for the non-declaration of certain ingredients were not sufficient to warrant exemption from the general provisions of a complete list of ingredients and reiterated their decision that all ingredients must be declared on the label. In this connection, the Delegations of Denmark and the Netherlands drew the Committee's attention to Section 3.2(a)(j) of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged foods which allowed for an exemption from a complete list of ingredients and which they considered was applicable in this case.

Endorsement of the Labelling Provisions at Step 5 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Milk and Milk Product Standards - Yoghurt

32. The Committee agreed that as the standard still contained provisions which have not yet been clarified, such as the heat treatment of yoghurt, it would be premature to consider it in detail at the present moment- However, the Delegation of Poland stated that they considered that the "fat content" should be declared as a percentage fat in figures rather than by using descriptive words. The Committee pointed out that a full declaration of ingredients would be useful in products of this nature as well as an indication as to whether the specific names of food additives or class names should be used.

Advertising of Food

33. The Committee had before it the document CX/FL 72/7 and its Annexes dealing with advertising. After considerable general discussion of the question of the advertising of foods, and in particular as to whether the Committee should develop a Code of Practice for Food Advertising, most delegations thought that to develop a Code of Practice for Food Advertising at this point in time should not be proceeded with, although the interest of the Committee in the question of advertising remained. Some delegations pointed out that advertising has a role to play in consumer education. The Committee also agreed that, for the time being, a general guideline with respect to advertising should be developed, and adopted the proposal by the Delegation of Sweden which read as follows:

"Food shall not be described or presented in any form of advertising in a manner which is contradictory to the General Principles laid down in Section 2 of the Recommended General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods."

It was agreed that this general guideline should be applied to all foods, whether they were pre-packaged or not. The Observer from the International Chambers of Commerce indicated that his organization would be willing to consider the inclusion in their code, in the section relating to special categories of products, appropriate paragraphs on foods. The Committee noted with interest this aspect of the work of ICC in the continual development and review of the Code of Practice for Advertising. The Committee agreed that a useful discussion had taken place on the subject of food advertising and agreed that in principle all advertising relative to food should be consistent with the General Principles of Food Labelling as contained in Section 2 of the General Standard.

34. The Delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany drew the attention of the Committee to the problem of a special kind of advertising, that is, the entry in a mail-order catalogue of a description of a food and asked that at some future

date the Committee should consider how this should be regulated, particularly since such catalogues are circulated internationally.

#### Draft Code of Practice for Advertising of Infant Foods

35. The Committee noted that the consideration of Draft Code of Practice for Advertising of Infant Foods was to be considered under Item 7 (b) of the Agenda (as contained in Document CX/FL 7 2/10). The Committee agreed that their general decisions relating to advertising of foods were equally applicable to this subject and expressed its appreciation of the work of IOCU in preparing this document.

#### Claims

36. The Committee had before it a working paper on claims (CX/FL 72/6) with its Annexes which gave the background to the problem.

The question of claims was discussed in considerable depth by the Committee. In connection with the General Principles in Section 2 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods, some delegations considered that, in their opinion, these provisions were not sufficient to cover the problem of claims or assertions. These delegations felt that an additional paragraph in Section 2 to cover this matter would be appropriate. As an example, the following tentative suggestion was made:

"When a label mentions a particular property concerning the food to which it is attached, this property must be able to be proven by the person who makes the claim. By 'a particular property' is meant claims concerning properties giving rise to effects favourable to health."

However, other delegations considered that the negative control in Section 2 was adequate to cover this question and that no addition was necessary.

37. Some delegations considered that it was necessary to define what was meant by a claim and also to define certain specific categories, such as dietetic and therapeutic claims. The following examples of possible definitions were tentatively suggested:

"'A claim' means an assertion on a label of a food that a food has special qualities or properties normally not found in a food of that kind and calculated to enhance its nutritive, dietetic, therapeutic or organoleptic value or to make the food more attractive in any other way to the consumer. It includes assertions of selectivity in choice of raw materials and of special care in harvesting, handling, or processing designed to produce a better quality of product (but not simply good hygiene practice). It does not include meaningless superlatives."

"A 'dietetic claim' means a claim which relates to the fact of presence, at higher than normal level, or of absence of a particular substance by reason of which the implication arises that the food is suitable for a special dietary purpose."

"A 'therapeutic claim' is a dietetic claim which asserts suitability for a disease, disorder or physiological condition."

38. The Committee agreed that it was desirable to devise controls for certain claims of a particular nature rather than claims in general. The following specific areas of claims were cited:

Claims which deal with normal constituents of foods, such as,  
energy, fat carbohydrate, amino acid, alcohol and protein content;

Other claims such as,

health in its widest aspect; vitamins and minerals;  
weight reduction and slimming;

reduction in calorie, starch or carbohydrate content;

foods for particular diseases, e.g., diabetes;

the use of the term "natural";

"organic" food;

religious or ritual preparation of foods.

It was recognized that the elaboration of criteria for the justification of claims of this nature would also be desirable and that steps should be taken to develop such criteria, taking into account the work of other special Committees, such as the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committees on Nutrition and, in particular, the work of Codex commodity committees such as the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses. These criteria should also take into account the needs of the consumer for factual and meaningful information. Several delegations considered that where statements or claims were made for products of a particular nature, then these statements should be as uniform as possible.

39. The Committee agreed that Governments should be invited to comment, in the light of the above discussion, on:

a) the need, if any, for a revision of Section 2 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods, and on possible wordings for such revision (see para. 36);

b) the wording for the definition of 'claim' and possible categories of claims (see para. 37 above);

c) the possibility of developing within the framework of the Codex Alimentarius criteria for the justification of claims in the areas specified in para. 38 above, to suggest any other areas, and to comment on the possibility of developing uniform statements concerning these claims for use in Codex standards.

#### Date-marking

40. The Committee had before it document CX/FL 72/6 and its Annexes I and II the latter of which contained a paper on date-marking of a general nature from Norway, which was of similar intent to the Background Documents A, B and C prepared by the Federal Republic of Germany, the International Organization of Consumers' Unions, and Sweden, respectively. The Committee also had before it a re-issue of document CCFL/63/11 which was a memorandum from Sweden concerning storage directives for pre-packaged food" presented to the Fourth Session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling.

41. After considerable discussion, the Committee was of the general opinion that some form of date-marking in clear was desirable for certain types of food products.

42. The Committee also agreed that the primary purpose of date-marking in clear is to assist in providing consumers with a fresh product of good quality. (It was the opinion of several delegations that date-marking in clear was only intended as an indication of quality and not as a guarantee of quality or as a means of health control.) It was noted that control measures, such as lot identification, for which codes or open dates might be used, allowed for the possibility of recalling the foods, to ensure the fitness of food for human consumption and to assist in the rotation of stock.

43. The Committee discussed in detail the many various types of date-marking. It was generally recognized that it would be desirable to limit the number of options which could be used on the labels of foods to which Codex standards apply. Many delegations were of the opinion that the types of date-marking might be restricted to five, namely,

- (1) date of production or manufacture;
- (2) date of packaging;
- (3) "sell-by" or "pull" date;
- (4) date of minimum durability;
- (5) expiry date or estimated last consumption date.

Some delegations expressed the view that the date of manufacture or the production date with one other type of date-marking would be adequate, whereas other delegations favoured using only one specific form of date-marking. Several delegations pointed out the difficulties of adopting a common system of open date-marking in some countries, bearing in mind such problems as differences in climate, transport, etc. These delegations stated that in their opinion the only possibility at the moment was an open date of manufacture for international trade. The Committee agreed that the various types of date-marking should be listed and defined to facilitate discussion at a future session of this Committee.

44. The Committee recognized that the type of date-marking on prepackaged foods was closely linked with the type of food which should be date-marked in clear. It noted that the two main categories of foods with respect to date-marking could arbitrarily be defined as "long" life and "short" life products.

45. As regards long-life products, these are stable for long periods of time when kept properly, e.g. heat-sterilized canned foods. For these products some delegations thought that a date in clear was essential but a number of delegations were of the opinion that a date of manufacture or packaging was the only type of date which could be used to inform the consumer of the age of the food. Other delegations felt that on long-life products an open date is not necessary. It was also recognized that many of the products for which standards were being elaborated by the Codex Alimentarius Commission fell within this group.

46. The Committee noted that short-life foods were Usually highly perishable pre-packaged foods,- often with a life of less than 30 days. This category includes many fresh animal products such as meat, eggs, fish, dairy products,

etc., and in certain cases extends to semi-preserved foods. For these types of foods, it was recognized that a date of manufacture or packaging was not necessarily sufficient or meaningful in informing the consumer regarding the freshness of the product and that for these products, other types of date-marking (sec para. 43) might be needed. Some delegations were of the opinion that dietary, infant and baby foods required open date-marking because of the possibility of deterioration of the nutritive value of the products, even though there may not be a loss in overall quality. The Delegation of Sweden pointed out to the Committee that the difference between long-life and short-life food products frequently depends on how the products have been stored.

47. The Committee then considered the need for storage instructions on the labels of certain food products whose freshness and quality are largely dependent upon the conditions under which these products are held.

Some delegations were of the opinion that storage instructions should only be used when necessary to ensure that the food be kept so as to maintain its quality. In the opinion of many delegations, storage and handling instructions would be needed for a number of foods.

48. The attention of the Committee was drawn to the significant changes which had taken place in recent years in the positions of some governments, and increasing consumer awareness regarding the problem of date-marking. Several delegations indicated that it was the intention of their governments to introduce open date-marking for pre-packaged food products and in this connection the Delegation of Austria requested that the Codex Committee on Food Labelling compile a document containing information on measures planned by member countries in the field of date-marking to assist in the harmonization of legislation on this matter.

Taking into account the discussion up to this point, the Delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany proposed the addition of a new section to the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods dealing with the subject of date-marking and storage instructions in a general way and which read as follows:

"If a date is indicated on a label or on a container, it shall be stated in clear. It shall be understandable to the consumer which date is applied.

The above paragraph does not apply to date-marking intended to be used exclusively for control purposes.

Date-marking shall be supplemented by storage instructions if quality or durability depends on maintaining certain temperatures or meeting other conditions."

The Delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany pointed out inter alia that the indication of an open date for control purposes would be possible in spite of the wording in the second paragraph of its proposal, if a Codex Commodity Committee decides so in accordance with Section 5.1 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods.

Although some delegations expressed themselves in agreement in principle with the suggested amendment, the Committee agreed that it was not timely to propose such an amendment and consider all its possible implications.

49. The Committee agreed to request the Commission to recommend to all Codex commodity committees that they should carefully consider the need for using open date-marking in relation to the particular products for which they were elaborating standards. It was further agreed that the Codex Committee on Food Labelling, when endorsing the labelling provisions of standards, would verify that the problems of open date-marking and storage instructions had indeed been considered by Codex commodity committees.
50. The Delegation of Austria requested that the Commission be asked to inform other international organizations, such as GATT, EFTA and EEC, working in the field of non-tariff trade barriers, of the work being done by the Commission on date-marking. The Committee noted that this did not only apply to date-marking but is equally applicable to all decisions within the Codex Alimentarius Commission relating to international standardization which are available, in any event, to these international bodies.
51. After the discussion of date-marking the Swedish delegate stated that, although his delegation agreed to the results the Committee had achieved on these questions, the purpose of date-marking should, from the Swedish point of view, be more specific and be defined, as it appeared in the Swedish Background Document C with the following clarifying revisions:

"The purpose of this kind of labelling is to give satisfactory information about the correct way to keep or store fresh foods and other perishable foodstuffs and, with this as guidance, inform about the date until which such products can be used by the consumer without risk of being unfit for human consumption."

Reflecting this purpose, the Swedish delegate suggested that "date-marking" should have the prefix "durability", or "keeping-life" as it aims to inform about the main fact the average consumer wants to know and that is:

"How long does a certain food keep fit for consumption?"

#### Net Contents

52. The Committee had before it a Working Paper (CX/FL 72/8) on Approaches to Determining Net Contents for Enforcement Purposes, which included statistical sampling plans and an Annex containing previous comments of governments on tolerated discrepancies between the label declaration of content and actual content. There was also a background document which discussed the definitions of the correct label marking of net contents and dealt in detail with the statistics entitled "Acceptance Sampling of Packaged Commodities" by G.E. Anderson of the Canadian Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. A number of delegations expressed their appreciation of the paper which set forth in a reasoned way the assumptions behind common practice in their countries.
53. It was pointed out that in the original drafting of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Food, when the topic of net contents had been discussed at the Second Session of this Committee (ALINORM 66/22, para. 23) that the following statement explaining this provision appeared:

"The requirements for the declaration of net contents shall be deemed to have been complied with when the net contents from an adequate

sample of the containers meet, on the average, the net contents declaration, provided that there is no unreasonable shortage in an individual container."

This question was raised again at the Fifth Session of this Committee and it was interpreted as a need to define more precisely the terms used in the above quotation, such as "adequate sample" and "unreasonable shortage".

54. The working paper attempted to solve these problems. The first question put to the meeting was whether the Committee would confirm that net contents meant average contents and not minimum net contents, Since the proposed definition of the correct declaration of net contents of a lot of packaged goods, suggested in the working paper, qualified the average in order to define "unreasonable shortage", by requiring the selection of statistical parameters, a number of delegations were not convinced that the Codex Committee on Food Labelling was the competent body to discuss this problem. In addition, they pointed out that this proposal differed from national practice in many cases.

55. It was indicated that the proposal applied to shipments in definable lots at the point of import. However, at the Fourth Session of this Committee (ALINORM 69/22, para. 29) -

"The Committee again concluded that, in general, the declared net contents be present at the time of retail sale but decided not to put that phraseology in the general standard."

This statement apparently appeared in that report in response to the requests of a number of countries which enforce this matter at the retail level on individual samples where the statistical approach involving assumption of uniform lots is not possible.

56. Although many countries reaffirmed that they would be prepared to accept net contents on an average basis as indicated in the Second Report of this Committee (ALINORM 66/22, para. 23) others did not. It was decided that this was such an important matter of principle that it should be brought before the next meeting of the Commission with a note of the previous conclusions of the Committee in order that a clear decision be made. On the basis of that decision, the Commission should then decide whether the matter should go before the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling. It was also suggested that, if any future work were envisaged, statistical sampling schemes could be developed for various types of food products depending on their degree of homogeneity, and from such schemes developed by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling, Codex commodity committees could select the appropriate plan for their specific products.

#### Other Business

57. The Delegation of Norway drew the attention of the Committee to the consequences of international regulation on food labelling which may have a restrictive effect on trade. They pointed out that there is a need for better co-ordination between countries of similar language so that manufacturers could use uniform labels for such countries. This problem was relevant to the many minor variations in regulatory detail, such as, the question of size of type. The Delegation of Norway was of the opinion that this problem was vital to the work of

the Codex Alimentarius and therefore requested that the attention of the Commission be drawn to this matter.

58. The Delegation of the United States of America suggested that consideration be given to the possibility of including a statement in the general principles of the General Standard for Labelling of Prepackaged Foods to the effect that pesticide residues complying with legal tolerances should not be required to be listed on the label or to accompany the produce when sold at the retail level. This question was raised in connection with the requirement for the declaration of pesticide residues in certain countries resulting from post-harvest pesticide treatment on citrus fruits, e.g. the use of diphenyl. The Delegation of the United States of America was of the opinion that such a declaration created non-tariff barriers which favour those countries with shorter shipping distances. The Delegation of the U.S.A. considered that no distinction should be made at retail between pesticide residues resulting from post-harvest treatment and those resulting from pre-harvest treatment when the pesticide residues were perfectly safe and within the permitted legal tolerances. Some delegations indicated that in their country these products were considered to be preservatives and subject to labelling requirements for food additives. The Committee noted that definitions of pesticide residues, food additives and contaminants are presently under consideration.
59. The Delegation of Denmark suggested that the Committee should consider and discuss at some future date the merits of nutritional labelling. It was recognized that this was connected to some extent to the problem of claims which may be made for nutritional value. The Delegation of Denmark felt, however, that there was a distinct difference between these types of claims and an internationally uniform designation of the labelling of the nutritive content of foods.
60. The Delegation of Denmark also raised the question of the problem of unit pricing of foods.. Many delegations pointed out that unit pricing was a matter which applied to many non-food products and expressed doubt as to whether pricing fell within the scope of this Committee.. It was also noted that the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods made no reference to prices or to the way in which they may be presented on the label. The Delegation of Switzerland indicated that a mandatory declaration of unit pricing for products sold in non-standardized sizes, whether imported or sold on the domestic market, would soon become legislation in their country.
61. The problem of new class titles for ingredients, such as seasonings, condiments and phosphates, was raised by the Delegation of Denmark. It was noted that the Codex Committee on Food Additives had considered at its recent session a class name for phosphates and had not reached any conclusions. Some delegations considered that the generic name "phosphates" could be included in the list of class titles for ingredients when the Codex Committee on Food Additives obtained data as to the exact technological possibilities of the use of these substances, and a precise definition as to exactly which substances were to be covered. The Committee agreed that the attention of the Codex Commodity Committees should be drawn to the need for stating clear and cogent reasons for any new class titles which they may suggest.

62. The Delegation of Denmark proposed the addition of the following paragraph to the General Principles of the General Standard on the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods.

"Pre-packaged foods shall be labelled with such additional mandatory information as the evolution in food merchandising and processing requires, and which the Food Labelling Committee recommends, and the Commission approves."

The Committee appreciated this point of view and took note of the general meaning behind the proposal.

63. The Secretariat drew the attention of the Committee to the request of the Codex Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate (ALINORM 72/10, para. 5 9), that the question be examined as to whether very small units should be exempted from a complete declaration of ingredients on the label.

It was also pointed out that this was a problem which was not exclusive to chocolate products but also concerned many other commodities. The Delegation of Sweden stated that according to their legislation, small units weighing less than 25 grams did not require mandatory label declaration. The Committee decided to invite governments to comment on this problem and agreed that this would be a matter for consideration at its next Session.

64. The attention of the Committee was also drawn to the Report of the Joint ECE/Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on Frozen Foods at its Eighth Session (ALINORM 72/25, para. 68), in which the problem had been raised as to whether the addition of salt should be declared on the label in close proximity to the name of the product.

It had been noted that many delegations had considered that it was not sufficient to declare the addition of salt in the list of ingredients, but that certain consumers suffering from various health disorders needed to know explicitly whether the product contained added salt.

It had been further noted that this was a general problem which not only concerned quick-frozen foods, but related to many other products.

The Committee considered that for ingredients of this and of similar nature, a declaration in the list of ingredients was sufficient, but agreed to keep the matter under review.

#### Date, Place and Agenda for- Next Session

65. The Chairman of the Committee considered in the light of the discussions, that there were sufficient matters of substance together with the normal endorsements to warrant the holding of a full-scale meeting in Ottawa next year. It was also recommended that the North American meetings on general subjects should be held consecutively. Among the items which might be considered at the next meeting would be the following:

claims

date-marking

endorsement at Step 8

consideration of labelling provisions in standards at Step 5

as well as the possible consideration of items postponed from earlier meetings or brought up at this meeting such as the labelling of bulk containers; advertising food in mail-order catalogues; small unit labelling; work on harmonizing non-technical detail (such as size of type); nutritive labelling and class titles.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS \*  
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS  
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

\* The Heads of Delegations are listed first; Alternates, Advisers, and Consultants are listed in alphabetical order.

Les chefs de délégations figurent en tête et les suppléants, conseillers et consultants sont énumérés par ordre alphabétique.

Figuran en primer lugar los Jefes de las delegaciones; los Suplentes, Asesores y Consultores aparecen por orden alfabético.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION  
MEMBRES DE LA COMMISSION  
MIEMBROS DE LA COMISION

ARGENTINA  
ARGENTINE

Jorge B. Riaboi  
Economic and Commercial  
Counsellor  
of the Argentine Embassy  
56 Sparks Street  
Ottawa, Ontario

AUSTRALIA  
AUSTRALIE

Mr. J.L. Smith  
Assistant Secretary  
Department of Primary Industry  
Canberra A.C.T.

AUSTRALIA (contd.)

Dr. Robert H.C. Fleming  
Director, Food Administration  
Department of Health  
P.O. Box 100  
Woden, A.C.T. 2606  
Canberra

Mr. R.C. McCarthy  
Food and Drug Advisory Committee  
Department of Public Health  
158 Rundle Street  
Adelaide

AUSTRIA  
AUTRICHE

Dr. Klaus Smolka  
Secretary,

Federal Economic Chambers of  
Commerce, Section,  
Food Industry  
1031 Zaunergasse 1-3  
Vienna

Dr. Guenter Schimmel  
Austrian Federal Economic  
Chamber  
c/o Austrian Trade Delegation in  
Canada  
401 Bay Street  
Suite 2008  
Toronto, Ontario

BELGIUM  
BELGIQUE  
BELGICA

M.M. Fondu,  
2060 Merksem, (Fédération des  
Industries Alimentaires)  
Borrewaterstraat.

BRAZIL  
BRESIL  
BRASIL

Mr. Jose Pinto da Rocha  
Director - Substitute.  
Divisão de Inspeção de  
Produtos de Origem  
Animal Ministerio da Agricultura  
Brasilia - DF

Mr. J.C. Aguiar Gay  
Embassy of Brazil  
450 Wilbrod Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1N 6M8

Mr. S. Arruda  
Secretary  
Brazilian Embassy  
450 Wilbrod Street  
Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. P.A.L. De Aguiar  
Confederação Nacional Da Industria  
50, R. Nilo Peçanha  
Rio De Janeiro, Guanabara

Mr. Lima Dos Santos  
Head, Fish Inspection Section  
Division of Food Inspection  
Ministry of Agriculture.  
Esplanada dos Ministérios  
Bloco 8, Brasília - DF

CAMEROON  
CAMEROUN  
CAMERUN

M. Jean-Bosco Mbeng  
Ambassade du Cameroun  
8 5 Range Road  
Ottawa, Ontario

CANADA

Mr. H.W. Wagner  
Chief,  
Food Division  
Standards Branch  
Department of Consumer and  
Corporate Affairs  
Standards Building  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OC9.

Mr. D.M. Adams  
Secretary-Treasurer  
Meat Packers Council of Canada  
5230 Dundas St. W.  
Islington, Ontario

Mr. G.E. Anderson  
Assistant Director  
standards Branch  
Department of Consumer and  
Corporate Affairs  
Standards Building  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OC9.

Dr. J.T. Annis  
Assistant Director  
Meat Inspection Division.  
Canada Department of  
Agriculture  
Sir John Carling Building  
Central Experimental Farm  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OC5

Mr. Elmer Banting  
Canadian Food Processors  
Association  
Suite 1409  
130 Albert Street  
Ottawa, Ontario, K1P 5G4

Dr. C.M. Blackwood  
Director, Inspection Branch  
Fisheries Service  
Department of the Environment  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OH3

Mr. R.M. Bond  
Inspection Branch  
Fisheries Service  
Department of the Environment  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OH3

Mr. D.H. Burns  
Agriculture, Fisheries & Food  
Products,  
Department of Industry, Trade and  
Commerce  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OH5

Dr. D.G. Chapman, (Chairman)  
Director, Food Advisory Bureau  
Dept. of National Health and Welfare  
Health Protection Branch  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OL2

Mr. W.C. Christner  
Grocery Manufacturers of Canada  
220 0 Yonge Street  
Toronto, Ontario

Mr. K.H. Dean  
Chief, Processed Products Section  
Fruit and Vegetable Division

Canada Department of Agriculture  
Room 4 79  
Sir John Carling Building  
Central Experimental Farm  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OC5

Mr. J.G. Dickins  
Production Director  
The Rowntree Co. Ltd.  
217 Markland Drive  
Etobicoke, Ontario

Dr. C.K. Hetherington  
Director  
Meat Inspection Division  
Canada Department of Agriculture  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OC5

Mr. A. Hollett  
Health Protection Branch  
Department of National Health  
and Welfare  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OL2

Mr. J.R. Jackson  
National Dairy Council of Canada  
36 5 Laurier Ave. W.  
Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. H.K. Leckie  
General Manager  
Meat Packers Council of Canada  
5233 Dundas St. West  
Islington, Ontario

Mr. Leonard G. Lee  
National Dairy Council of Canada  
36 5 Laurier Avenue W.  
Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. O.M. Linton  
Chief,  
Regulatory Programs  
Inspection Branch  
Fisheries Service  
Department of the Environment  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OH3

Mr. J.H. McGeough  
Packaging and Labelling Committee

Meat Packers' Council of Canada  
Packaging Co-ordinator, and  
Department of Government  
Approvals Swift Canadian Co., Ltd.  
30 Weston Road  
Toronto, Ontario

Dr. G. Meilleur  
Meat Inspection  
Health of Animals,  
Sir John Carling Bldg.  
Central Experimental Farm  
Department of Agriculture  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OC5

Mr. Phil Moyes  
Vice-President  
Grocery Products Manufacturers of  
Canada  
Suite 504  
797 Don Mills Road  
Don Mills, Ontario

Mr. W.O. (Bill) Munns  
Canada Packers Ltd.  
2200 St. Clair Ave. W.  
Toronto, Ontario

Dr. T.K. Murray  
Chief, Nutrition Research Division  
Health Protection Branch  
Department of National Health and  
Welfare  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. Carl Ross  
Research Manager  
Canadian Cannery Ltd.  
Research Centre  
1101 Walkers Line  
Burlington, Ontario

Mr. C.G. Sheppard  
Advertising Specialist, Food Division  
Standards Branch  
Department of Consumer and  
Corporate Affairs  
Standards Building  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OC9

Mr. J. P. Sherk  
Chief  
Merchandising Section  
Canada Department of Agriculture  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OC5

Dr. J.D. Sproule  
Assistant Director  
Meat Inspection Division  
Health of Animals Branch  
Canada Department of Agriculture  
Sir John Carling Building  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A OC5

Mr. R.J. Sweeney  
Kraft Foods Ltd.  
Technical Director  
8600 Devonshire Road  
Mount Royal, Quebec

Mr. Thomas G. Willis  
International Liaison Service  
Department of Agriculture  
Sir John Carling Building  
Ottawa, Ontario, K1A OC5

Mr. H.G. Winnett  
Assistant Director of Quality Control  
Campbell Soup Company Ltd.  
60 Birmingham Street  
Toronto 14, Ontario

#### CUBA

Mr. Ricardo Escartin  
Primer Secretario  
700 Echo Drive  
Ottawa, Ontario

#### DENMARK DANMARK DINAMARCA

Mr. Ludvig Madsen  
Delegate  
Danish Embassy  
85 Range Road  
Ottawa, Ontario

Mrs. Anne Brincker  
Food Technologist  
Danish Meat Products Lab.

Howitzvej 13  
2000 Copenhagen F.

Dr. Jens Funch  
Section Leader  
National Food Institute  
Mørkhøj Bygade 19  
DK 2860 Søborg

A. Haugaard-Hansen  
Veterinarian  
Assistant Head of Office  
Agricultural Council  
Axeltorv 3  
1609 Copenhagen V.

Mr. Mog. Kondrup  
Food Technologist  
Chief of Secretariat  
Isalesta  
Vesterbrogade 1  
DK-1620 Kobenhavn V.

#### FRANCE FRANCIA

Mr. C. Castang  
Service de la Répression des  
Fraudes  
42bis, rue de Bourgogne  
Paris 7

#### GERMANY, FED. REP. OF ALLEMAGNE, REP. FED. ALEMANIA, REP. FED.

Dr. Dieter Eckert  
Ministerialrat  
Fed. Ministry of Health  
Bonn-Bad Godesberg  
Deutschherrenstrasse

Dr. W. Shultheiss  
6146 Alsbach  
Schlosstrasse 5

Dr. Hans B. Tolkmitt  
29 Ohnhorststr  
2000 Hamburg 52.

#### JAPAN JAPON

Mr. Yoshio Sato  
Consumer Division  
Enterprise and Marketing  
Department

Economic Affairs Bureau  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
Tokyo

Mr. Shogo Itoda  
Premium and Representation  
Fair Trade Commission  
Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-hu  
Tokyo

Mr. Shintaro Sasaki  
2nd Secretary  
Embassy of Japan  
Suite 1005, Fuller Building  
75 Albert Street  
Ottawa, Ontario

MEXICO  
MEXIQUE

M.V.Z. Rafael Sánchez-Lara  
Sub-Director General de Control de  
Alimentos y Bebidas  
Secretaría de Salubridad y  
Asistencia  
Av Chapultepec 284  
México 5 D.F.

Ingeniero Químico Ricardo Delgado  
C.  
Comité Consultivo Sobre Normas  
Alimentarias de la Secretaría de  
Industria y Comercio  
Monte Albán 569 - México 13 D.F.

Ing. Marcial Ibarra  
La Fontaine 57  
México D.F.

Dr. Eduardo R. Méndez Jr.  
Presidente, Comité de  
Normalización de la Industria  
Alimentaria  
Calle Chicago 162  
México 18, D.F.

MOROCCO  
MAROC  
MARRUECOS

Mr. Mohamed Senhaji  
Chief of Division  
Office de Commercialisation et  
d'Exportation

45 Avenue des F.A.R.  
Casablanca

Mr. M. Trachen  
O.C.E. Delegate to the U.S.A.  
Commercial Attache  
597 Fifth Avenue  
New York, N.Y. 10017  
U.S.A.

NETHERLANDS  
PAYS-BAS  
PAISES BAJOS

Dr. P.H. Berben  
Chief Health Inspector  
Ministry of Public Health  
Dr. Reyersstraat 10  
Leidschendam  
The Hague

Mr. M.H. Brodhaag  
Royal Netherlands Embassy  
275 Slater Street  
Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. M.J.M. Osse  
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries  
Agricultural Industries and  
International Trade  
1<sup>e</sup> v.d. Boschstraat 4  
The Hague

Mr. A.M. Ruoff  
V.N.O.  
Prinses Beatrixlaan 5  
The Hague

Dr. L. Schippers  
Hoofdproduktschef  
Akker Couwgewassen  
Stadhoudersplantsoen 12  
The Hague

NORWAY  
NORVEGE  
NORUEGA

Dr. Olaf R. Braekkan  
Government Vitamin Laboratory  
Directorate of Fisheries  
P.O. Box 187  
Bergen

Mr. Petter Haram  
Counsellor

Ministry of Fisheries.  
Oslo

Mr. Harald Pedersen  
Managing Director  
Norwegian Cannery Association  
Box 327  
Stavanger

Mr. John Race  
Norwegian Codex Alimentarius  
Committee  
P. Box 8139  
Oslo-dep. Oslo 1.

PHILIPPINES  
FILIPINAS

Mr. Celestino B. Santos, Jr.  
Commercial Analyst  
Philippine Embassy  
130 Albert Street  
Suite 607  
Ottawa, Ontario

POLAND  
POLOGNE  
POLONIA

Dr. F. Morawski  
Chief of Section  
Ministry of Foreign Trade  
Quality Inspection Office  
9 Stepinska, Warsaw

SWEDEN  
SUEDE  
SUECIA

Mr. Bengt Augustinsson  
Head of Law Division  
National Swedish Food  
Administration  
Fack  
S-10401 Stockholm

Dr. Brita Ågren  
Head of Section  
National Swedish Food  
Administration  
Fack  
S-10401 Stockholm

SWITZERLAND  
SUISSE  
SUIZA

Dr. Emile Matthey  
Chef du Contrôle des Denrées  
Alimentaires  
Service fédéral de l'hygiène publique  
Haslerstrasse, 16, Berne

Dr. G.F. Schubiger.  
Société d'Assistance Techniques  
Produits Nestlé  
P.O. Box 88, (Case Postale 88)  
CH-1R14, La Tour de Peilz

TOGO

Mr. Peter Primus Kluga-O'Cloo  
Chef de la Division de l'Alimentation  
et de la Nutrition  
Ministry of Rural Economy  
Boîte Postale 282  
Lomé

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO  
TRINITE-ET-TOBAGO  
TRINIDAD Y TABAGO

Dr. Michael G. Lines  
Deputy Chief Chemist  
Assistant Director of Food and  
Drugs Chemistry  
Food and Drugs Division  
115 Frederick St.  
Port-of-Spain  
Trinidad, West Indies

UNITED KINGDOM  
ROYAUME-UNI  
REINO UNIDO

Mr. L.G. Hanson  
Principal, Food Standards Branch  
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries  
and Food  
Great Westminster House  
Horseferry Road London S.W.1

Mr. L.C.J. Brett  
Unilever House  
Blackfriars  
London EC4

Mr. A.A. George  
Department of Trade and Industry  
(Standards Weights, and Measures)  
Abel House

John Islip Street  
London SW1

Mr. A.W. Hubbard,  
Superintendent  
Food and Nutrition Division  
Laboratory of the Government  
Chemist  
Cornwall House  
Stamford Street  
London SE1, 9NQ

Mr. Frederick Lawton  
4, Lygon Place  
Ebury Street  
London SW1.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE  
ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA

Mr. Lowrie M. Beacham, BF-40,  
Special Assistant for International  
Standards  
Bureau of Foods  
U.S. Food and Drug Administration  
200 "C" St. N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20204

Ms. Joan Zeldes Bernstein  
Assistant to the Director  
Bureau of Consumer Protection  
Federal Trade Commission  
7th & Penn. St.  
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Richard C. Bruner  
Director  
Administrator  
ICCAP Inc.  
953 W. Foothill Blvd.  
Claremont, California 91711

Mr. J. Gitlitz  
Executive Vice-President  
American Advertising Federation  
1225 Connecticut Ave. N.W.  
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Robert W. Harkins  
Grocery Manufacturers of America  
1425 K. St., N.W.  
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Paul M. Karl  
I.F.G.  
246 Meadowbrook  
Wyckoff, N.J. 07481

Mr. Robert C. Liebenow,  
President, Corn Refiners  
Association, Inc.  
1001 Conn Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Albert H. Nagel  
Food Standards Coordinator  
General Foods Corp  
Technical Center  
250 North St. White Plains  
N.Y. 10625.

Mr. Taylor M. Quinn  
Director, Division of Regulatory  
Guidance  
Bureau of Foods  
U.S. Food and Drug Administration  
200 C. St. S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20204

Mr. A.T. Rhoads  
Director, Government Relations  
American Frozen Foods Institute  
919 - 18th Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C- 20006

Mr. W.D. Riley  
Assistant Director  
Creative Services  
General Foods Corporation  
250 North Street  
White Plains, N.Y. 10625

Mr. Charles Safran  
Director, Marketing  
Grocery Manufacturers of America  
1425 K St. N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Mr. J.B. Stine  
Kraft Foods  
500 Peshtigo Ct.  
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Mr. Ronald Tolley  
Head, Food Regulation & Standards  
Div.  
National Canners Association

1133 - 20th St. N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20036

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS  
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES  
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC  
COMMUNITY (EEC)

Mr. Gilbert Castille  
Administrateur Principal  
Commission des Communautés  
Européennes  
200, rue de la Loi  
1040 Bruxelles, Belgium

COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC  
COMMUNITY (EEC)

Mr. Michael Graf  
Administrateur  
Secrétariat Général du Conseil des  
Communautés Européennes  
170, rue de la Loi  
1040 Bruxelles, Belgium

INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. S.A. Weitzman  
Food and Drug Law Institute  
1750 Pennsylvania Avenue  
Washington D.C.

INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. J.C. Braun  
Secretary  
Advertisng Standards Authority  
1 Bell Yard  
London W.C.2.

Mr. Robert E. Oliver  
President, Canadian Advertising  
Advisory  
Board  
159 Bay Street  
Toronto 1, Ontario

INTERNATIONAL DIETETIC FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. V. Schultheiss  
Schlosstrasse 5  
6164 Alsbach  
Federal Republic of Germany

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF GLUCOSE  
INDUSTRIES (IFG)

Mr. Paul M. Karl  
246 Meadowbrook  
Wyckoff, N.J. 07481  
U.S.A.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF MARGARINE  
ASSOCIATIONS (IFMA)

Mr. L.C.J. Brett  
IFMA  
Raamweg 44  
The Hague  
The Netherlands

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF

Mr. George A. Pollak

CONSUMERS  
UNIONS (IOCU)

Head, Foods Division  
Consumers' Union of U.S. Inc.  
256 Washington Street  
Mt. Vernon, N.Y. 10550  
U.S.A.

Mrs. Maryon Brechin  
National President  
Consumers' Association of Canada  
27 Elmcrest Road  
Etobicoke 651  
Ontario, Canada

Mrs. Colette Joy  
Consumers' Association of Canada  
University of Ottawa  
112 Waller Street  
Ottawa, Canada

SECRETARIAT – CANADA

Dr. D.M. Smith  
Head, Office for International Food  
Standards  
Food Advisory Bureau  
Health Protection Branch  
Department of National Health and  
Welfare  
Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0L2

SECRETARIAT - FAO

Mr. L.W. Jacobson  
Food Standards Officer  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards  
Programme  
FAO  
00100 Rome, Italy