

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

UNRESTRICTED

E/CONF.8/C.III/SR.13.Rev.1
21 November 1949

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON ROAD AND MOTOR TRANSPORT

COMMITTEE III ON ROAD TRAFFIC

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Saturday, 3 September 1949 at 10 a.m.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. MELLINI (Italy)

SECRETARY: Mr. AMBROZEK

Contents:

DRAFT PROVISIONS FOR INSERTION IN A CONVENTION
ON ROAD AND MOTOR TRANSPORT PREPARED BY THE
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE (Item 4 of the
Conference Agenda) (Continued)

Annex 4 (Articles 28-33) pages 2 - 8

DRAFT PROVISIONS FOR INSERTION IN A CONVENTION ON ROAD AND MOTOR
TRANSPORT PREPARED BY THE ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE
(Item 4 of the Conference Agenda) (Document E/CONF.8/3)(Continued)

Annex 4 (Article 28)

Referring the Committee to Paragraph (a) of Article 28, Mr. THIROT (France) proposed that the sign II,A.5 should represent a motorcar viewed from the back, and not, as in the present proposal, from the front. Such a change would be logical in view of the fact that other proposals of the Working Group provided for the use of a vehicle viewed from the back.

He explained also that in France signs indicating a double speed limit, one for freight vehicles, the other for private motorcars, were extremely common. Although the practice was to show the vehicles concerned from the front, they would be more clearly distinguishable one from the other were they shown from the rear; that was another reason for uniformly portraying the vehicles from the back whenever appropriate on the signs provided for in Annex 4.

Mr. BLOM-ANDERSEN (Denmark) thought that clarity was more important than logic in the matter, although he considered that it was probably more natural to portray the car as seen from the front. He thought the symbols should be retained as proposed, in order to emphasize the distinction between freight and private motor vehicles.

The CHAIRMAN was inclined to favour the proposal of the representative of France, but asked the representative of the Netherlands to give his views on the subject.

Mr. von HEMERT (Netherlands) considered that it would be better, as a matter of principle, to retain the prescriptions of the 1926 Convention, according to which the vehicle was viewed from the front. In any case it would be sufficient, in his opinion, to obliterate the two white points representing the vehicle's headlights, in order to give the impression that the vehicle was being viewed from the back.

Mr TAYLOR (United Kingdom) said that since it would constitute only a minor variation of the symbol any country, wishing to adopt the French proposal should be permitted to do so. But whenever a double speed limit was used he agreed that both the vehicles shown on the sign should be portrayed consistently.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the symbols adopted in 1926 should be retained, but that the right of individual countries to make small modifications such as showing the vehicle viewed from the back, should be admitted. He further suggested that in the case of a sign indicating different speed limits for passenger cars and goods vehicles, the symbols should portray both vehicles from the front or both vehicles from the rear.

The representative of France signified his acceptance of the Chairman's proposal, which the Committee then adopted.

Article 28 was adopted.

Article 29

Mr. von HEMERT (Netherlands) asked whether any representatives were in favour of the inclusion of an additional sign, similar to that provided for by sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 1 of Article 29, but relating to maximum weight per wheel. There being no support for it, he withdrew his proposal.

Mr. EKBERG (Sweden) asked why, in the sign illustrated by Fig.II,A.10, the letter "m" (denoting "metres") had been included, whereas it had been omitted from Fig.II,A.11.

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) reported that so far as the United Kingdom was concerned nothing more had been found necessary than the plain figure "30" for the sign described in sub-paragraph (e) (II,A.14). He hoped that the provision in sub-paragraph (e) would not be made mandatory, since such a step would oblige his country to add an inscription to the many thousands of speed limit signs in that country.

Mr. HOMAYOUNFAR (Iran) and Mr. von HEMERT (Netherlands) associated themselves with the remarks of the United Kingdom representative.

At the suggestion of Mr. THIROT (France), the Committee agreed to adopt a speed limit sign containing only the figure, leaving it to the discretion of countries to supplement this by an inscription if they thought fit.

The Committee further agreed that the unit of measurement should be indicated on both of the signs II.A.10 and II.A.11.

Replying to a question by the CHAIRMAN, as to whether he wished that sign II.A.15 should indicate the end of all restrictions, Mr. FRAENKEL (Israel) replied that he would be satisfied by a slight amendment to sub-paragraph (f) of paragraph 1 of Article 29, namely, the insertion after the words "reverse side of sign II.A.14": the words: ", II.A.8, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14."

Mr. ZACH (Czechoslovakia) said that if the sign "END OF SPEED LIMIT" (II.A.15) was to indicate the finishing point for all restrictions, serious confusion would be liable to arise, since drivers might not know precisely to which restriction the universal de-restricting sign referred.

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) and Mr. BLUM-ANDERSEN (Czechoslovakia) supported the Czechoslovak representative.

Mr. PETIT (Belgium) pointed out that it had already been suggested at an earlier meeting, that sub-paragraph (f) of paragraph 1 of Article 29 should be combined with sub-paragraph (e).

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Special Group be instructed to make a single sub-paragraph of sub-paragraphs (e) and (f) of Article 29.

This was agreed, and the Committee adopted Article 29

Article 30.

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) asked whether it would be permissible for the United Kingdom to use the word "Halt" instead of

the word "Stop", since the former had already been used for many years in his country.

Mr. ZACH (Czechoslovakia) wondered whether, since the word "Stop" was universally understood, and was, moreover, an English word, the United Kingdom representative might not be able to agree to its retention.

The CHAIRMAN also pointed out that the word "Stop" was universally employed in the United States of America.

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) withdrew his request, and said that the United Kingdom authorities would do their best to introduce the use of the word "Stop".

Article 30 was adopted.

Article 31

Mr. BLOM-ANDERSEN (Denmark), speaking on his own behalf and on that of the representatives of Israel, Norway, Sweden and Turkey, proposed that any country which desired to do so should be permitted to retain the "Parking prohibited" sign (a capital P crossed with a bar), as laid down by the 1931 Convention. Although he realised that the Working Party had desired to eliminate the difference between the conceptions of "Parking prohibited" and "Restricted waiting", he, and those associated with him, believed that there was nevertheless an essential distinction between the two, and that signals indicating both categories should be permitted. Foreign visitors to any country which adopted both signs would be unlikely to find themselves in serious difficulty, since they would have a good general idea of the meaning of each.

Mr. THIROT (France) pointed out that the decision of the Working Party was the result of long deliberations, which had had the aim of reducing the number of signals to the minimum. He thought the case mentioned particularly suited to such reduction, since there appeared to him to be great difficulty in distinguishing the idea of "restricted waiting" from that of "prohibited parking". He asked the representative of Denmark what precise advantage he saw in the retention of the

"barred P" sign, especially as, under the new proposals, the length of the period during which waiting was prohibited could be indicated by an inscription on the sign.

The CHAIRMAN thought that individual countries might be permitted to retain the old sign, but that any country doing so should ensure that it was used strictly in the sense of the 1931 Convention.

Mr. von HEMERT (Netherlands) recalled that the Working Party of the Economic Commission for Europe had agreed that any signs proposed should be absolutely clearly defined. It was for that reason that it had decided not to include the "barred P" sign. So far as he was concerned, however, he would be prepared to re-admit it, but only on condition that its meaning was accurately defined.

Mr. PETIT (Belgium) associated himself with the remarks of the French and Netherlands representatives, and said that both types of signal were used in Belgium. The Belgian authorities had originally attempted to define a "waiting car" as a stationary car with the driver at the wheel, and a "car parked" as one left empty. Since nowadays the majority of cars were in the hands of owner-drivers, and as a consequence, usually empty while waiting, the dual definition had lost much of its value; there was, in effect, only one type of "waiting car" nowadays. He would therefore be prepared to accept either sign.

At the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. DUTOIT (AIT/FIA) explained that his Organization had received no objections to the proposed suppression of the "barred P" sign.

Mr. BARIM (Turkey) said that in his country a distinction was still maintained between the two categories of waiting, since in the old and narrow streets of Turkish cities it was essential to use both a "No Stopping" sign, meaning that no stopping whatsoever was permitted, and a "No Parking" sign, indicating that drivers had permission to stop momentarily, for the purpose of taking up or setting down passengers.

Mr. HOMAYOUNFAR (Iran) suggested that, so far as was practicable, the old sign prescribed by the 1931 Convention should be retained.

Mr. BLOM-ANDERSEN (Denmark), replying to the earlier requests for a definition of "Parking", said that his definition coincided with that given on page 3 of Document E/CONF.8/27 (Proposals submitted by the Government of Israel).

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) said that he was prepared to accept the sign proposed in Document E/CONF.8/3, and that the United Kingdom would not in future use the "barred P" sign. He could, however, agree that other countries should be allowed to retain it.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee adopt the "RESTRICTED WAITING" sign, as shown in the Working Paper (II,A.18), but that individual countries should have the right to introduce or retain the old sign laid down by the 1931 Convention.

This was agreed.

Article 33

Mr. EKBERG (Sweden) pointed out that "Direction to be followed" signs in Sweden consisted of a black arrow on a yellow background, in accordance with the provisions of the 1931 Convention. He asked whether Sweden could not be allowed to retain that colour scheme.

Asked by the CHAIRMAN whether he would insist on that point, even if it found no support among the Committee, he replied in the affirmative.

Mr. BRUNE (Union of South Africa) explained that blue and green were unsuitable colours in the climatic conditions peculiar to South Africa, and that signs painted in them would require very frequent renovating. It would therefore be much appreciated if in his country black could be used instead of blue, and some other colour instead of green.

The CHAIRMAN asked for the views of representatives of other countries with similar climatic conditions.

Mr. SEN (India) said that there were few blue or green signals in India, so that the effect of climate on them was not accurately known, although presumably the results observed in South

Africa would apply to India also. India would, however, be prepared to experiment with the colours proposed by the Working Party.

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) said that his colleague the Technical Adviser to the Government of Southern Rhodesia had had the same experience as the representative of South Africa in respect of the effect of the climate on blue or green paint.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that some latitude should be accorded to South African countries, provided that any modification was consistently applied, and that the symbol was left white inside.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

Mr. FARAKER (Observer for the Government of Australia) asked for a similar dispensation in the case of Australia.

This was also agreed.

With reference to sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 2 of Article 33, Mr. von HEMERT (Netherlands) submitted a drawing showing a slightly modified shape for the arrow in signal Fig. II,B.1.

This was adopted as an optional alternative.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.