The Ninth Session of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement was held at Geneva from 28 October 1954 to 7 March 1955. The major part of the Session was taken up with a review of the General Agreement.

This survey deals with matters arising during the work of the Ninth Session, excluding the Review of the Agreement. The press communiqué on the review of the Agreement will be issued for publication on 22 March.

The remarks of the Chairman, Mr. L. Dana Wilgess, at the opening of the Ninth Session were issued in press release GATT/165.

In the comments that follow, a rough and ready division has been made into

(a) items arising from the operation of the Agreement,
(b) items arising from the complaints procedures,
(c) tariffs matters,
(d) administrative barriers to trade,
(e) administration of the General Agreement.
Items arising out of the operation of the Agreement

CONSULTATIONS ON IMPORT RESTRICTIONS

In accordance with the provisions of the General Agreement the Contracting Parties have held at their present Session consultations with two governments on the discriminatory aspects of the import restrictions which they apply for the purpose of safeguarding their balance-of-payments and monetary reserves. The two governments which consulted with the Contracting Parties were Australia and New Zealand.

Since 1952 consultations of this nature have been held every year, and the purpose of the consultations on import restrictions is to afford an opportunity for the exchange of views on the problems facing the countries imposing the restrictions as well as the countries whose exports are the subject of such restrictions.

In this year’s consultation, as in the past, the Contracting Parties discussed both the financial basis and the policy and administration of restrictions in question. Discussions took place on all questions on which any other contracting parties showed an interest, and the representatives of the consulting governments indicated that they took full note of the views expressed by other contracting parties and that these views, as well as certain specific requests made by other contracting parties would be conveyed to their respective governments for sympathetic consideration.

As provided for in the General Agreement the Contracting Parties, in conducting the consultations referred to above, also consulted fully with the International Monetary Fund, and the representative of the Fund participated in the consultations conducted by the Contracting Parties. In each of their consultations the Contracting Parties had before them and made extensive use of certain background material prepared in the Fund. In the case of Australia they also took into account the results of the Fund’s consultation with that country.

In this connection, it might be noted that the Contracting Parties have drawn up at this Session a fifth annual report on discriminatory restrictions, which covers the restrictions applied by 22 of the governments participating in the Agreement. The conclusions which the Contracting Parties were able to draw from the consultations mentioned above are taken into account in the preparation of that report.
In April 1951, Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Luxembourg, Italy and the Netherlands concluded a Treaty instituting the European Coal and Steel Community and a Convention containing the transitional provisions. The Treaty came into force on 23 July 1952. The establishment of the common market involves the abolition as between the six countries of import and export duties, and of quantitative restrictions on the movement of coal and steel within the six countries of the Community. The six Member States (all of them being contracting parties to the GATT) therefore submitted to the Contracting Parties a request for a release from certain of their obligations under the GATT, in particular the most-favoured-nation clause contained in GATT Article I and the rule on non-discrimination regarding the application of quantitative restrictions in Article XIII.

At the Seventh Session in November 1952 the Contracting Parties granted certain specific waivers, and it was agreed that from the date of the creation of the common market for coal products (10 February 1953) until the end of the transitional period (15 February 1958) the six countries would submit an annual report to the Contracting Parties on the progress towards the full application of the Treaty. The first annual report was submitted at the Eighth Session of the Contracting Parties.

At the Ninth Session the second annual report was submitted to the Contracting Parties and a working party was set up to consider it in detail. The complete text of the report of the working party was made public in press release GATT/217. No summary of the working party's report was issued.

After the Contracting Parties had approved the annual report of the Coal and Steel Community, the Danish delegation submitted for consideration a memorandum concerning the most recent development in the export prices of certain steel products from the Coal and Steel Community, and the conformity of these prices with the obligations undertaken by Member States of the Community. It was agreed that the matter should be included as an item of the agenda of the Ninth Session. At a later plenary session the delegation of Denmark stated that the Danish government had had bilateral talks with the High Authority of the Coal and Steel Community in order to resolve the difficulties concerning prices. These talks had not yet been concluded. For this reason the Danish government considered it preferable not to discuss at the present Session the points it had raised. In the event that the bilateral talks were not successful, the Danish government reserved the right to bring the subject of the export price policies of the High Authority of the Coal and Steel Community before the Contracting Parties at a later date.

Speaking on behalf of the six member countries of the Community, the delegate of Italy said that he was satisfied with the Danish statement and the Chairman said he regarded the matter as disposed of so far as the Ninth Session was concerned.
UNITED KINGDOM WAIVER RE ARTICLE I

At the Eighth Session in October 1953 the Contracting Parties took a Decision on the request of the United Kingdom government for facilities to relieve them of the need, under the rules of Article I regarding tariff preferences, to impose duties on duty-free goods from the Commonwealth as and when they may have occasion in the future to increase the unbound duties on foreign goods. In asking for these facilities, the United Kingdom made it clear that it was not their intention to use them for the purpose of diverting trade away from foreign to Commonwealth countries. The Contracting Parties granted the waiver, subject to procedures for consultation and, where necessary, arbitration as to whether proposed tariff changes would be likely to cause such a diversion of trade. In granting the waiver the Contracting Parties requested the United Kingdom government to furnish an annual report of action taken under the waiver.

The United Kingdom, in its report, indicated that the waiver had been used in connexion with increases made in the unbound, most-favoured-nation rates of duty on certain fresh and preserved fruit and vegetables and on certain flowers, foliage and nursery stock. The United Kingdom government had on request held discussions with governments of countries whose export trade seemed likely to be affected by the operation of the waiver, but in all cases it was agreed by the country concerned that the waiver should apply. There had been no occasion to use the arbitration procedure provided in the waiver.

AUSTRALIA/PAPUA-NEW GUINEA

At the Eighth Session in October 1953 the Contracting Parties granted to the Australian Government a waiver of obligations under Article I in order that Australia might provide certain advantages for primary products of the Territory of Papua-New Guinea when these products are imported into Australia, for the purpose of promoting the economic development of the Territory. In granting the waiver the Contracting Parties took into consideration the assurances given by the Government of Australia that the waiver would be utilized for the development of the Territory in such a manner as not to cause material injury to the competitive trade of any other contracting party. In order to safeguard the interests of other contracting parties a procedure for prior notification and consultation was included in the waiver, which may be reviewed at a future date if the economic factors affecting the production and trade of the Territory should change in such a way that the special treatment authorized by the waiver should result or threaten to result in substantial injury to the competitive trade of any contracting party.

At the Ninth Session the Australian Government furnished its first annual report on the operation of the waiver, which indicated that, in fact, no measures had been taken by Australia on the use of the waiver.
ITALY/LIBYA

At the Sixth Session in 1951 the Contracting Parties agreed to a request by Italy for authority to continue for one year to exempt from customs duties certain goods originating in and coming from Libya and imported into Italy. (Prefe-erential treatment by Italy for Libyan goods dates back as far as 1911).

At the Seventh Session in 1952, Italy supported by the (new) Government of Libya obtained authority to continue, for a further period of three years, exemption from Italian customs duties for a definitive list of Libyan exports. During this period the Italian Government will submit annual reports on the operation of the special régime and the Government of Libya will submit annual reports on its plans for economic development.

The second annual reports were presented at the Ninth Session. The Contracting Parties took note of the reports and agreed to allow an increase in the annual quota of olive oil entering Italy free of customs duty from 1,000 tons to 2,500 tons until the end of 1955.

FEDERATION OF RHODESIA AND NYASALAND BECOMES A CONTRACTING PARTY

On 29 October the Contracting Parties adopted a Declaration to the effect that the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland would henceforth be deemed to be a contracting party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Until the establishment of the Federation last year Southern Rhodesia was a contracting party, while the rights and obligations of the General Agreement in respect of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland were exercised by the United Kingdom.

On the creation of the Federation the Governments of the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia notified the Contracting Parties that as from 30 October 1953 the Federal Government had become the authority responsible for the implementation of international obligations affecting the territories of Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, including obligations under the General Agreement.

The Declaration recognizing these changes admits the Federation as a full contracting party to the General Agreement.

SOUTH AFRICA—SOUTHERN RHODESIA CUSTOMS UNION

At the Eighth Session the Contracting Parties took note of the Fourth Annual Report of the Customs Union Council and agreed to await developments in view of the establishment of the Federal Government in the Rhodesias and
Nyasaland (see above). The Contracting Parties were informed that the two governments had agreed to continue the present Agreement as a *modus vivendi*, either party being free to terminate it on six months' notice.

At the Ninth Session, the establishment of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was notified and a declaration was adopted admitting the Federation as a full contracting party to the Agreement (see above). It was stated that the Federation was now engaged in drawing up its new tariff. Until that was done, the representative of South Africa stated that no decision could be reached as to whether the present Customs Union Agreement should be retained, amended or replaced. In these circumstances, it was agreed to take note of the Fifth Annual Report of the Customs Union Council and to defer consideration of the matter until the Tenth Session.

Shortly before the end of the Session the Contracting Parties were informed that the Federation proposed to bring into effect a new Federal Customs and Excise tariff on 1 July 1955 and that it will thus be necessary to introduce at the same time a new trade arrangement with the Union of South Africa. The two governments have entered into formal negotiations for the purpose of determining their future trade relations. These negotiations opened at Cape Town on 8 February 1955.

**NICARAGUA - EL SALVADOR FREE-TRADE AREA**

At the Ninth Session the Contracting Parties took note of the Third Annual Report of the Nicaragua-El Salvador Free Trade Area and observed that the operation of the Treaty appeared to be satisfactory both to the two governments and from the point of view of the Contracting Parties.

**ACCESSION OF JAPAN**

In July 1952 the Government of Japan made a request for an opportunity to enter into tariff negotiations with the Contracting Parties with a view to acceding to the General Agreement. For various reasons it was not possible, in the intervening period, to arrange for the negotiations to be held. However, when the GATT Intersessional Committee met in August 1954 the majority of delegations supported the Japanese request to enter into tariff negotiations and the Committee recommended that arrangements should be made for tariff negotiations to be held in Geneva, opening in February 1955. Early in the Ninth Session, in October 1954, the Contracting Parties agreed that tariff negotiations between Japan and contracting parties wishing to negotiate should open in February.
In the meantime, pending the formal accession of Japan following tariff negotiations, some contracting parties declared (under a Declaration that was opened for signature in October 1953) that their commercial relations with Japan are governed by the provisions of the Agreement. By a Decision taken in January 1955 the Contracting Parties extended the validity of this Declaration until 31 December 1955, unless before that date the Declaration has ceased to have effect by reason of Japan's accession to the General Agreement.

Tariff negotiations were opened at Geneva on 21 February and at that date the following governments had signified their intention of entering into tariff negotiations with Japan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burma</th>
<th>Dominican Republic</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Tariff Negotiations Committee was set up in order to make arrangements for the conduct of the negotiations. The negotiations are expected to last about three months.

Items arising from the complaints procedures

UNITED STATES RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTS OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

At the Sixth Session in 1951, the Netherlands and Denmark supported by Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Australia, France and Canada, complained that the restrictions on imports introduced by the United States in 1951 under Section 104 of the Defense Production Act, constituted an infringement of United States obligations under the GATT, and this was agreed by the Contracting Parties.

Subsequently, Section 104 of the Defense Production Act was repealed. But subsequent developments led to the imposition of restrictions under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. At the Eighth Session in 1953, the Contracting Parties adopted a resolution which, inter alia, recommended the United States to have regard to the harmful effect of these restrictions on international trade and requested the United States Government to report at the Ninth Session on what action it had taken to remove these restrictions.

In its report to the Ninth Session, the United States Government stated that the United States had taken important steps directed towards the reduction of the maladjustment between world dairy supply and commercial demand, which underlies the need for imposing import quotas on dairy products. These steps are summarized in press release GATT/172, together with the comments of the delegates of Denmark, New Zealand, Australia, the Netherlands and Sweden.
The Contracting Parties adopted a resolution affirming the right of contracting parties affected by the United States restrictions to have recourse to the procedures of Article XXIII and recommending the United States Government to have regard to the harmful effects on international trade relations generally and on the trade of a number of countries individually of the continued application of the present restrictions.

The Contracting Parties authorized the Netherlands Government (as in 1952 and 1953) to continue to limit during 1955 their imports of wheat flour from the United States to a maximum of 60,000 tons. They also requested the United States Government to report before the opening of the Tenth Session on the action it has taken.

**UNITED STATES IMPORT DUTY ON DRIED FIGS**

In August 1952, under the Article XIX "escape clause" procedure, the United States increased its import duty on dried figs to 4½ cents per pound. The former duty was 2½ cents per pound, which was a concession granted to Turkey in the 1951 Torquay negotiations. At the Seventh Session, in October 1952, Greece, Italy and Turkey gave their views as to the effect of the United States duty increase on their export trade, and the Contracting Parties adopted a resolution by which (a) the United States Government undertook to request the United States Tariff Commission to review the facts and report on them at the Eighth Session, (b) the Turkish Government decided to apply, temporarily, certain increased rates of duty to imports from the United States, (c) the United States would consult as regards the possibility of making concessions to compensate Greece and Italy, respectively.

At the Eighth Session in October 1953 the Contracting Parties adopted a resolution noting that the United States Government was continuing its consultations with Greece and Italy, re-affirming their conviction that the most satisfactory solution would be for the United States to restore the concession on dried figs negotiated at Torquay and requesting the United States and other governments concerned to report at the Ninth Session as to further action taken.

At the Ninth Session the United States Government reported that the United States Tariff Commission had reviewed the situation again. Its report of 24 August 1954, indicated that conditions of competition with regard to the trade in imported and domestically produced figs had not changed materially. In its report the Tariff Commission noted that imports in 1953 were 7.8 million pounds, the highest level that had been reached since 1930, except for 1950 and that the estimated quantity available for export to the United States in 1954 would be equal to, if not greater than, that shipped in 1953. President Eisenhower approved this report on 11 September 1954.
Since it did not appear that a restoration of the concession would be effected within the immediate future, it seemed that the best solution would be for the United States to offer other concessions in its place. Therefore, on 13 November 1954, the United States gave public notice that it would seek to negotiate adequate compensatory concessions with the affected countries.

At the end of the Session it was stated that the United States and Greece had successfully reached agreement on compensatory arrangements and that consultations between the United States and Turkey and Italy respectively, with a view to compensation, would be undertaken.

**UNITED STATES EXPORT SUBSIDIES ON ORANGES**

At the Eighth Session in October 1953 Italy alleged that a serious effect on her export trade followed from the granting by the United States of subsidies on exports of oranges to certain countries, in particular, European countries. The delegation of South Africa also claimed that there were difficulties in marketing South African oranges in Europe owing to the effect of the United States subsidy, and the United Kingdom delegation referred to the interest of certain dependent countries in the matter. The United States delegation gave an assurance that it was fully prepared to consult with the governments concerned and would report under Article XVI.

At the Ninth Session the delegates of Italy, the Union of South Africa and Greece reported that the consultations with the United States during the Eighth Session and subsequently had not been fruitful. The delegate of the United States pointed out that subsidy payments for oranges had been reduced consistently since 1949. He hoped that with improving economic conditions, restrictions on dollar imports in traditional markets would soon be dismantled. This would provide a basis for the removal of export subsidies. (See press release GATT/171 for an extended summary of the discussion.)

The matter was kept on the agenda with a view to holding further consultations between the interested governments.

It was stated at the end of the Session that the matter was being taken up in Washington, and the delegations affected by the subsidy reserved the right to place the matter on the Tenth Session agenda if no satisfactory solution was reached in the meantime.

**BRAZILIAN INTERNAL TAXES**

This complaint, originally made by France and the United Kingdom, concerns the element of discrimination in certain Brazilian internal taxes against certain French, United Kingdom and United States exports such as cognac, aperitifs, watches and clocks, beer and cigarettes. At the Eighth
Session in October 1953, the Brazilian delegation expressed regret that owing to legislative difficulties, it had not been possible for the Brazilian Congress to consider the draft law which would remove the element of discrimination. Both French and British delegations expressed great disappointment at the continued delay and reserved the position of their governments in the matter. At the request of the French delegation the Contracting Parties decided to maintain this item on the Agenda and adopted a recommendation urging the Brazilian Government to amend the existing laws so as to bring them into conformity with the GATT and to report as early as possible on action taken.

At the Ninth Session the Brazilian delegate reported that, to his deep regret, his government felt unable at the present time to resolve the matter satisfactorily. His government recognized the right of the injured parties, such as France, to have recourse to the procedures for nullification or impairment of benefits under Article XXIII. The Brazilian Government hoped that the complaint would be settled as a result of a solution of the entire problem of the tariff structure. (Later in the Session the Brazilian delegation stated that a Bill was under consideration by the Brazilian Congress whereby the situation would be corrected in 1955.)

It was agreed that the delegations concerned would hold consultations and would report to the Contracting Parties, the item being maintained on the agenda.

**BELGIAN FAMILY ALLOWANCES**

This complaint, originally made by Norway and Denmark, later joined by Austria, Germany, Italy, Finland and Canada, concerned a special tax levied, in certain circumstances, on products imported by the Belgian public authorities. At this Session, the Delegation of Belgium reported that in accordance with the undertaking given at the Eighth Session, the Belgian Government had passed a law suppressing the tax. This law entered into force on 6 March 1954.

**BELGIAN DOLLAR IMPORT RESTRICTIONS**

This complaint, originally placed on the agenda of the Seventh Session of the Contracting Parties in 1951 at the request of Canada and the United States, concerned discrimination by Belgium against certain dollar goods in order to mitigate the damaging effects of abnormal exchange conditions. The first step towards removing these restrictions was taken at the beginning of 1953. The Belgian delegation stated early in the Ninth Session that the final step had been taken, and announced that since May 1954 Belgium had put an end to all exchange restrictions on goods imported from the dollar area.
At the Eighth Session in October 1953, the United States complained that this tax, which was levied on all imports and exports at the rate of 0.4 per cent ad valorem nullified or impaired the concessions made by France under the General Agreement. An assurance was given that the tax would be removed, and early in the Ninth Session, in October 1954, the French delegation reported that the tax had been suspended from 1 October 1954 to the end of the year.

At the end of the year the French delegation informed the Contracting Parties that the tax had been abolished, effective 1 January 1955.

**French Stamp Tax**

At the Ninth Session the United States drew attention to the fact that the French stamp tax on imports had been increased from 1.7 to 2 per cent in 1954. The French delegate explained that the tax was based on customs duty charged and was intended to defray the costs incurred by French customs clearance of imported goods, and corresponded to services rendered. It was therefore covered by the provisions of Article II:2(c) which provided that a contracting party should not be prevented from imposing fees or other charges commensurate with the cost of services rendered. He gave an assurance that the French Government was conscious of the requirements of Article II and did not intend to vary the amount of the stamp tax beyond the limit authorized.

In view of this explanation, and since there was no substantial injury to United States exports, the United States delegation withdrew the complaint.

**French Special Temporary Compensation Tax on Imports**

Under a French Decree of 17 April 1954 a special compensatory tax was introduced on certain imported goods when imported into the French customs territory. (This tax is levied on products which have been recently liberated from quantitative restrictions when imported from the Organization for European Economic Co-operation member countries.) The Italian Government, in a statement submitted in July 1954, indicated that, in their view, this measure did not appear to be in conformity with the requirements laid down in Article II:1(b) of the General Agreement, which forbids the application of charges of any kind on imported goods for which duties have been bound under the Agreement.
The Contracting Parties adopted a Decision (given in full in press release GATT/214) which stated, inter alia, that the tax had increased the incidence of customs charges in excess of the maximum rates bound under Article II and had also increased the maximum margins of preference permissible under Article I. The Contracting Parties instructed the Ad Hoc Intersessional Committee to follow closely the undertaking of the French Government to remove the tax as soon as it is possible to do so and called upon the French Government to report to the Executive Secretary before 1 April 1955.

**SWEDISH ANTI-DUMPING DUTIES**

At the beginning of the Ninth Session the Italian Government has asked the Contracting Parties to examine the methods by which the Swedish Government applied anti-dumping duties to imports of nylon stockings. In the view of the Italian Government the methods used had the effect of increasing the rate of duty which is bound under GATT and therefore there appeared to be a breach of Sweden's obligations under GATT.

The matter was examined by the Panel on Complaints and as a result the Contracting Parties recommended

(a) that the Swedish Government consider ways and means of improving the administration of the Decree of 15 October 1954 so as to minimize the delays and other impediments to the exports of Italian nylon stockings to Sweden;

(b) that the Governments of Italy and Sweden make the necessary arrangements to facilitate an enquiry by the Swedish authorities to clarify the various points of fact on which the two governments hold different views, with a view to determining whether Italian nylon stockings are being exported to Sweden at a price less than their normal value and that they take such action as may be necessary in the light of those conclusions, and

(c) that the two parties report to the Contracting Parties at the Tenth Session or, should it be necessary, to the Intersessional Committee.

**TURKISH IMPORT TAXES AND EXPORT BONUSES**

At the beginning of the Session the Italian Government made a complaint concerning action by the Turkish Government more than a year ago in levying special import taxes on certain goods, and in subsidizing the export of certain agricultural products. It was agreed to refer the matter to the Panel on Complaints, but subsequently the two delegations stated that agreement had been reached. The complaint was therefore dropped from the agenda.
GERMAN DISCRIMINATION IN COAL IMPORTS

At the beginning of the Session the United States Government drew attention to certain regulations applied by the Federal Republic of Germany which had the effect of limiting imports of coal from the United States. In the view of the United States these restrictions were inconsistent with the obligations of the Federal Republic towards the United States under the General Agreement. Consultations were held during the Session between the two delegations. At the end of the Session it was stated that consultations were continuing and in view of the willingness of the Federal Republic to find a solution, it was agreed to carry forward the matter to the Tenth Session.

Tariff Matters

TURKISH SCHEDULE TRANSPOSITION

Since 7 June 1954 Turkey has put into effect a new Customs Tariff which conforms to the Brussels Nomenclature. Turkey submitted to the Contracting Parties the text of its Schedule transposed to conform with this nomenclature and requested authority to convert specific duties contained in that list to ad valorem duties, so as to assure uniform application of her customs legislation. The matter was examined during the Ninth Session and the necessary authority was granted.

FINLAND: ADJUSTMENT OF SPECIFIC DUTIES

In view of the devaluations of the Finnish Markka in 1949 which resulted in a total increase of approximately 70 per cent in the number of Markka equivalent to the U.S. dollar, the Finnish Government sought authority to adjust the specific rates of import duty bound under the Agreement. The matter was examined during the Ninth Session and the necessary authority was granted.

GREEK LUXURY TAX AND TARIFF CHANGES

Early in the Ninth Session, on 5 November, the Government of Italy complained that the Government of Greece had made certain changes in the applications of the Greek luxury tax and the Greek import tariff which appeared to be contrary to the obligations of Greece under the General Agreement.
Consultations were held between the Italian and Greek delegations and subsequently they informed the Contracting Parties that agreement has been reached on all the matters raised by the Government of Italy.

**PROHIBITION OF IMPORTS FROM CZECHOSLOVAKIA BY PERU**

Shortly before the opening of the Ninth Session, the Government of Czechoslovakia drew the attention of the Contracting Parties to a Decree of the President of the Republic of Peru dated 11 March 1953, which prohibited imports of goods from Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovak Government, on several occasions, indicated to the Peruvian Government that this Decree contravened the obligations under the Agreement between two contracting parties to GATT. No satisfaction was received and the Czechoslovak Government therefore requested that the matter should be included in the agenda of the Ninth Session.

During the Session there were consultations between the two delegations and the delegation of Peru informed the Contracting Parties that the Decree prohibiting imports from Czechoslovakia has been abrogated by his Government and that it was hoped that trade with Czechoslovakia would be restored to normal in the near future. The Contracting Parties regarded the matter as settled and the item was withdrawn from the agenda.

**BELGIAN RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTS OF COAL**

In October 1953 Belgium intensified its restrictions on imports of United States coal. In the view of the United States Government this intensification of restrictions appeared to be discriminatory in character and inconsistent with Belgium's obligations under the General Agreement. The matter had been discussed between the two governments, but since no solution to the problem has been reached, the United States Government asked the Contracting Parties to examine the question at the Ninth Session.

At the end of the Session the United States delegate reported that his government had had bilateral discussions with Belgium which had resulted in a substantial increase in the licensing of direct imports of United States coal by Belgium for the first half of 1955. In view of certain technical difficulties which Belgium faces in connexion with coal imports from outside the Coal and Steel Community, the United States had agreed to the Belgian request for a review of the problem in the middle of 1955 when the effects of the new licensing policy are known. In the meantime the United States withdrew its complaint reserving the right to bring the matter before the Contracting Parties at a later date.
GERMAN IMPORT DUTIES ON STARCH AND POTATO FLOUR

In 1951 at the Torquay tariff conference the German Federal Government undertook to reduce their import duties on cereal starch and potato flour to the level of duties applied on these products by the Benelux Governments. In the view of the Benelux Governments this undertaking was not carried out and since discussions between the respective governments did not prove fruitful, the Benelux Governments decided to submit the question to the Contracting Parties at the Ninth Session.

The matter was examined by the Panel on Complaints, but it was not necessary for the Panel to submit definite recommendations to the Contracting Parties since the German delegation was able to make an offer which was considered by the Benelux delegations as providing a satisfactory adjustment of the matter for the time being. The Contracting Parties took note of these developments and considered this item of the agenda as disposed of.

Administrative Barriers to Trade

DISCRIMINATION IN TRANSPORT INSURANCE

At its Fifteenth Session on 16 April 1953, the United Nations Economic and Social Council adopted a resolution to the effect that certain resolutions and a study on discrimination in transport insurance by the Secretary-General of the United Nations be brought to the notice of the Contracting Parties for possible action. At the Eighth Session the Contracting Parties instructed the Executive Secretary to prepare, in consultation with governmental and non-governmental organizations, a report on the issues involved. This report was considered at the Ninth Session. It was based on material furnished by contracting parties and non-contracting parties who were members of the United Nations, in reply to a questionnaire. It discussed the nature and extent of discrimination and included proposals for international action.

It appeared from the conclusions of the report that discriminatory practices by some countries clearly affected the interests of the insurance business in others and there was some prima facie evidence of harmful effects of these practices on international trade. Some contracting parties considered that further studies would be needed and it was agreed to maintain the item on the agenda for further discussion at the Tenth Session.

The report was derestricted and is available on request.
Administration of the General Agreement

The Contracting Parties decided to convene the Tenth Session at Geneva on 27 October 1955. They also made arrangements for such intersessional meetings as may be required.
## List of Countries and Intergovernmental Agencies Represented at the Ninth Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>*Cuba</th>
<th>*Indonesia</th>
<th>*Pakistan</th>
<th>*Peru</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>*Rhodesia and Nyasaland</th>
<th>*Sweden</th>
<th>*Turkey</th>
<th>*Union of South Africa</th>
<th>*United Kingdom</th>
<th>*United States</th>
<th>*Uruguay</th>
<th>Yugoslavia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>*Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>*Indonesia</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>*Persia</td>
<td>*Peru</td>
<td>*Rhodesia and Nyasaland</td>
<td>*Sweden</td>
<td>*Turkey</td>
<td>*Union of South Africa</td>
<td>*United Kingdom</td>
<td>*United States</td>
<td>*Uruguay</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Brazil</td>
<td>*Dominican Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Italy</td>
<td>*Italian</td>
<td>*Peru</td>
<td>*Rhodesia and Nyasaland</td>
<td>*Sweden</td>
<td>*Turkey</td>
<td>*Union of South Africa</td>
<td>*United Kingdom</td>
<td>*United States</td>
<td>*Uruguay</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Burma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ceylon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Chile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>*India</td>
<td>*Norway</td>
<td>*Peru</td>
<td>*Peru</td>
<td>*Turkey</td>
<td>*United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**United Nations**
- International Labour Organization
- Food and Agriculture Organization
- International Monetary Fund

**Organization for European Economic Co-operation**
- Council of Europe
- High Authority of the Coal and Steel Community
- Customs Co-operation Council

* Contracting Party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade