

RESTRICTED

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

SR.12/4
29 October 1957

Limited Distribution

CONTRACTING PARTIES
Twelfth Session

Page 19

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva
on Tuesday, 22 October 1957, at 2.30 p.m.

Chairman: Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon)

Subjects discussed:

1. Meetings of Ministers - Procedures
2. Consultations under Article XII:4(b):
Reports on Consultations with Denmark,
Norway, Sweden, Italy, Greece and
Austria
3. United States Import Restrictions on Dairy
Products
4. United States/Agricultural Adjustment Act
5. Belgian/Import Restrictions
6. Italy/Libya Waiver

1. Meetings of Ministers - Procedures (L/708, sec. I(c))

The CHAIRMAN said that several delegations had asked him whether the intention was that during the Ministerial discussions, Ministers should address themselves to the various topics listed in the proposed agenda one by one, or should make a general statement encompassing them all. He suggested that a procedure combining the two should be followed, i.e. that Ministers in their initial remarks should feel free to refer to all the topics, but with the possibility of speaking again on individual topics, particularly those referred to in paragraph (iii) of the proposed agenda.

A discussion followed, in the course of which Mr. VILLADAO (Brazil) suggested that, in view of the number of Ministers that would be present, it might be advisable to consider limitations to the speaking time allowed to each speaker; Mr. STENDENAT (Austria) and Mr. GARCIA OLDINI (Chile) thought that some flexibility should be maintained, and that to set time-limits would be inadvisable. Miss SEAMAN (United Kingdom) pointed out that her Government's Minister, who could only make a short stay in Geneva, would like to hear as

many Ministers as possible present their views on the matters included in the agenda, and his own remarks would therefore probably not be lengthy; other Ministers might well be in the same position.

The CHAIRMAN noted the views expressed by representatives, and said that it would be for the Chairman of the Ministerial meeting to decide.

In reply to a question by Mr. WESTERMAN (Australia), the Chairman stated that while in principle the time available during the Ministerial meeting would be mainly for speeches by Ministers, any representative who was authorized to speak on behalf of his Minister might of course do so; his general understanding was that other delegates would, if possible, refrain from making statements during the short time available, and wait to do so until the CONTRACTING PARTIES resumed the normal work of the Session. There would be two plenary meetings daily during the Ministerial discussions.

The CONTRACTING PARTIES approved the procedure suggested by the Chairman.

2. Consultations under Article XII:4(b): Reports on Consultations with Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Greece and Austria (L/644 and Add.2)

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the CONTRACTING PARTIES to the report of the Consultations Committee on the consultations held in June, and suggested that they should now consider the reports on Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Greece and Austria; the reports on Germany and the Netherlands would be considered at a later meeting.

Mr. COZZI (Chairman of the Consultations Committee) introducing the reports, recalled that the Committee had been appointed in accordance with the decision of the CONTRACTING PARTIES at their Eleventh Session to review the situation regarding import restrictions maintained under Article XII by various countries in the light of the economic situation and the economic policy of governments, and taking as a basis the results of consultations between the contracting parties concerned and the International Monetary Fund. He thanked the Fund for its co-operation and the great contribution it had made to the progress which had been achieved. He considered that the consultations had been very profitable; not only had they afforded an opportunity for contracting parties to become better acquainted with the problems which led governments to impose restrictions, and the difficulties which such restrictions might in turn create for other countries, but also they had achieved practical results, for several consulting countries had announced new liberalization measures. He thanked all the contracting parties which had taken part in the consultations for the high degree of co-operation that had been achieved.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Cozzi and congratulated him and the Committee on the results achieved so far.

Many delegates, including the representatives of the United States, Canada, Brazil, Australia, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom, commended Mr. Cozzi for his able chairmanship of the Committee and thanked the Fund for its co-operation, which had made an invaluable contribution to the success of the consultations.

Mr. HEBBARD (International Monetary Fund) and Mr. COZZI (Chairman of the Consultations Committee) thanked the contracting parties for their kind words.

Mr. ADAIR (United States of America) was gratified at the success of the consultations, which had been proposed by his delegation. The frankness which the consulting countries had shown in informing the Committee of their situation accounted in great part for the success of the consultations; some countries had been able to announce the relaxation of restrictions, and he hoped that the experience of the consultations would serve the CONTRACTING PARTIES well in their activities under the revised text of the General Agreement.

Mr. WARREN (Canada) supported the remarks of the United States representative. The consultations caused each country to examine its own restrictions and consider whether they were really essential. No doubt the consulting countries would keep in mind the recommendations in the report, recognizing that the dismantling of restrictions was of real value both for themselves and for other contracting parties.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil), while realizing the importance of the consultations, felt less optimistic about the results that might be achieved, perhaps because there were two international organizations - the GATT and the Fund - operating in a field in which it was difficult to divide responsibility. Trade restrictions adopted by governments to meet balance-of-payments difficulties did not require prior approval by the GATT, and were frequently imposed after consultation with the Fund, of which most contracting parties were also members, and with the authorization of the Fund. It must be borne in mind that most balance-of-payments difficulties stemmed from the international trade situation, for which a government imposing restrictions could not be held solely responsible, and the restrictions imposed aggravated the international trade situation still further. A realistic approach to the problem was necessary, and recommendations should perhaps be made to other countries as to ways of assisting the contracting parties in difficulties. It had to be realized that disequilibrium was chronic in the underdeveloped countries, and it was beyond the power of the governments to solve the problem alone.

Mr. SMITH (Australia) recalled that his delegation had given strong support to the proposal that consultations should be held and was pleased with the results. The consultations had given to countries which, like Australia, were far removed from the European scene, an opportunity to

appreciate the extent of liberalization and of the restrictions still maintained. Realistic consultations would be of special significance under the revised text of the General Agreement.

Mr. GUNDELACH (Denmark) said that at the Eleventh Session his delegation had accepted the proposal for Article XII consultations in the hope that they might lead to a better mutual understanding of the underlying problems. No substantial progress could be achieved in this field unless it was realized that the real causes which compelled governments to maintain balance of payments restrictions included circumstances and policies of other countries. His Government was resolved to do away with all restrictions as soon as possible, and realized the importance in that respect of a suitable international policy and of alternative corrective measures. Protective measures and bad creditor policies in other countries, however, had a decisive influence on Denmark's ability to increase exports, which was an essential condition for the solution of balance-of-payments difficulties. If the consultations had led to a better understanding of the true mutual character of the balance-of-payments problem, one of the main objectives of the consultations would have been served.

Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan) recalled that his delegation had been one of those which had supported the proposal to hold consultations, and he was gratified at the success achieved. He shared the satisfaction of other representatives at the relaxation of some restrictions and the improvements in the level of restrictions announced by certain countries during consultations. The countries so far consulted represented comparatively developed economies and were in a position to report improvements. This might not be the case with some countries who were still to be consulted. In his address at the opening of the Session the Chairman had referred to the position that it had not been possible for the less developed countries to participate to an appreciable extent in the expansion of world trade or in the opportunities offered by recent progress towards multilateralism. The balance-of-payments difficulties of those countries remained as chronic as they had been for many years past. The fact that less developed countries had not found it possible to relax restrictions or advance towards freer trade should not therefore be construed as indicating a lack of appreciation of those principles, although some of those countries might even be obliged to enforce tighter controls. When approving the procedures for the consultations, the CONTRACTING PARTIES had fully recognized that the under-developed countries had additional problems which required special consideration. Due weight should be given to these factors while consulting with those countries.

Miss SEMAN (United Kingdom) agreed with the Danish representative that the consultations had greatly strengthened mutual understanding of the difficulties facing the countries which still imposed restrictions and of the responsibility of other contracting parties to assist in the solution of those difficulties. The consultations enabled the country being consulted to take advantage of the accumulated wisdom of other contracting parties and to

realize the importance both for its own trade and for the trade of the other contracting parties of eliminating restrictions as rapidly as possible. The basic documentation provided by the Fund and the secretariat would continue to be of great value to the governments concerned.

Mr. GARRICA-CLDINI (Chile) supported previous speakers who had referred to the collective responsibility of contracting parties vis-à-vis those which were in balance-of-payments difficulties. If the under-developed countries received the assistance they deserved, the solution of their problems would be greatly facilitated. The report only concerned more highly industrialized countries, but even in their case, he felt that if they were assisted in developing their exports, their balance-of-payments problems would diminish and eventually disappear. That aspect did not seem to have been considered in the consultations, although the decision to hold them had been taken in that spirit, and he hoped that in future it would receive all the attention it deserved.

Mr. ADAIR (United States of America) indicated that he would have further comments to make later in the consultations.

The CHAIRMAN invited comments on each of the six reports.

There being no further comments, the CONTRACTING PARTIES approved the reports on the consultations with Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Greece and Austria.

3. United States Import Restrictions on Dairy Products (L/711/Add.1)

- The CHAIRMAN referred to document L/711/Add.1 which contained a request by the Government of the Netherlands that this item be added to the agenda.
- The CONTRACTING PARTIES agreed that the item be included on the agenda.

Mr. HOGWATER (Kingdom of the Netherlands) expressed regret that United States import restrictions on dairy products had remained substantially unchanged during the past year. His Government's attitude towards this problem was well known and he referred to the statements made by his delegation at previous sessions. Concessions granted by the United States to the Netherlands had therefore remained impaired, in the sense of Article XXIII, to virtually the same degree as in previous years and in view thereof his delegation was instructed to request an extension for another year of the authorization to apply a limit of 60,000 metric tons per annum on imports of wheat flour from the United States. With respect to the procedures to be followed he suggested that this request be referred to the working party considering the Agricultural Waivers.

The CONTRACTING PARTIES agreed to this procedure.

4. United States Waiver/Agricultural Adjustment Act (L/687)

The CHAIRMAN referred to the Third Annual Report by the Government of the United States (L/687), which had been submitted in accordance with the Decision of 5 March 1955, granting a waiver in connexion with import restrictions imposed under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. ADAIR (United States) introduced the report and summarized the salient points therein. The report showed that for 1957-58 import controls would be in effect for the same six commodity groups as in 1956-57, except for two modifications made in the controls on dairy imports. Subsequent to the preparation of the report, contracting parties were notified that the President, on 9 September 1957, had proclaimed quotas on the imports of tung-oil for the remainder of the 1957-58 crop year and for the three crop years ending 31 October 1960. The annual import quotas permitted during these periods were set out in document L/692.

Mr. Adair said that the report also gave detailed information on a number of measures taken by the United States Government with a view to the solution of the problem of surpluses. These actions included downward adjustments in price support levels, reduction of the area to be planted through mandatory controls and by means of the Soil Bank programmes in which many farmers had participated, and also large domestic and foreign consumption expansion programmes. With respect to price support adjustments the report disclosed reductions in the support price for wheat, upland cotton, manufacturing milk and butterfat. Concerning acreage reduction he pointed out that the combined effect of the mandatory acreage restrictions and of the Soil Bank had been to reduce gradually the acreage of wheat planted from 83.9 million acres in 1949 to 49.7 million acres in 1957 and that of cotton from 27.9 million acres in 1949 to 14.2 million as estimated on 1 July 1957. As an example of the importance of the consumption expansion programme, Mr. Adair pointed out that in the marketing year 1956-57 the United States Government had made available, on a grant basis, a total of 977.4 million pounds of dairy products to domestic and foreign people in need.

Mr. GUNDELICH (Denmark) congratulated the United States delegation on the comprehensive report it had submitted which would serve as a useful basis for discussion and enable an adequate assessment of the situation to be made. His delegation, however, would wish to put forward a number of questions on details and interpretation, but this could best be done in the working party which he presumed would be set up. He recalled that his delegation had continuously been concerned with protection of domestic industry combined with subsidization which tended to lead to surpluses in production entering the export field and thus by distorting the normal pattern of international trade, to threaten the interests of traditional exporting countries such as Denmark. His Government had always attached a keen interest to the possibilities

of relaxation and abolition of existing quantitative restrictions on United States' imports of agricultural products, in particular dairy products, and he noted with regret that the report gave little ground for optimism with regard to progress in this field. Indeed, during the past year the number of dairy products for which import restrictions were in operation had been increased.

Mr. Gundelach expressed his satisfaction with the fact that the support price for wheat had been successively reduced. However, he pointed out that the support prices for liquid milk and butterfat had not been changed in 1957-58 despite the fact that when these support prices were raised in 1956 the United States delegation had explained that it was due to the fact that the Soil Bank Programme had not been put into operation as early as expected. The Programme was now in full operation and although it had resulted in continuous decreases of cattle stocks and the number of dairy farms, total production of milk, as a result of improved yields, had continued to increase. His delegation appreciated the measures taken by the United States Government to stimulate consumption of dairy products but was of the opinion that rising production in recent months had tended once again to aggravate the surplus problem. A permanent solution could only be achieved by a curtailment of production through successive reductions of the support level or by an increase in per capita consumption in the United States through the reduction of prices of dairy products to the consumer.

Mr. WARREN (Canada) recorded his delegation's appreciation for the comprehensive report submitted by the United States Government and for the evidence it showed of the efforts being made in the United States to deal with the problem and to meet the requirements of the waiver decision.

Mr. HOOGWATER (Kingdom of the Netherlands), while expressing his delegation's appreciation of the comprehensiveness of the report, stated that the attitude of his Government towards this problem was well known and had been adequately stated by the representative of Denmark. Although his delegation was cognizant of the fact that the United States Government took fully into account the need to restrict to a minimum any damage to third countries resulting from its agricultural policy, the fact remained that despite such precautionary measures injury still accrued. His delegation, therefore, supported the proposal by the representative of Denmark that the report be referred to a working party for detailed examination.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Australia) observed that from the point of view of his delegation the situation was much the same as last year. Once again a comprehensive report had been submitted and once more it was to be noted that there had been no relaxation of the restrictions since the first report. This was particularly so in the case of dairy products the quotas for which remained at very low levels. In this connexion Mr. Richardson cited the quota for butter, which remained at approximately 350 tons per year, a figure which represented an insignificant proportion of total United States consumption of that product. His delegation felt that there should be a review of

existing quota levels, particularly those of butter, with a view to giving exporting countries some prospect of sharing in the increased consumption of dairy products in the United States which was recorded in the report. He supported the establishment of a working party to consider these questions.

Mr. LANG (New Zealand) recalled that at the Ninth Session when consideration was being given to the United States' application for the waiver, his delegation had expressed the view that the waiver should be regarded by the United States as a temporary shelter beneath which the process of dismantling the structure of agricultural protection could be carried out rather than as an authority to continue and even intensify the restrictions. At the same time, however, the New Zealand delegation had stated that while it was hoped that this would be the case, that hope had too slight a basis for agreement and accordingly his delegation had voted against the waiver. Events have shown how realistic it was not to have been too hopeful. Although he would not comment on the report as a whole at this stage, he stated that New Zealand's attitude to one section of that report - dairy products - was well known. He referred to the statement in the report which recorded the fact that during 1957 restrictions were imposed on butter oil and exylone "because of the efforts of foreign exporters to develop markets in the United States for products with high butterfat content which were not subject to import controls", and invited contracting parties with aspirations of exporting competitive products to the United States with a view to building up an export market to note its implications. His delegation attached great importance to United States policies in this field and accordingly supported the setting up of a working party to examine the report in detail.

Mr. VAILADAO (Brazil) said that his delegation had taken note of the progress made in relaxing the restrictions during the two years the waiver had been in force. While his delegation was fully aware of the motives underlying the necessity for the waiver, it was to be hoped that the problems would eventually be resolved.

The CHAIRMAN stated that general opinion was in favour of the Third Annual Report being referred to a working party. Before deciding on the terms of reference, however, the next item could be taken up as the CONTRACTING PARTIES might wish to refer that question to the same working party.

The CONTRACTING PARTIES agreed to this procedure.

5. Belgian Waiver/Import Restrictions (L/640 and L/672)

The CHAIRMAN referred to the statement submitted by the Belgian Government on the measures to be developed for the elimination of the restrictions (L/640) and to the Second Annual Report (L/672) submitted under the Decision of 3 December 1955.

Mr. STUYCK (Belgium) introduced the report and explained that the first part thereof related to the progress made towards the elimination of quantitative restrictions. This section set out the products on which restrictions

had been eliminated and also the products subject to relaxation measures. The latter group detailed several cases where there had been some flexibility in the application of seasonal import prohibitions. In spite of the efforts made by the Belgian Government some contracting parties might feel that the results obtained were not as much as they had hoped for, but his Government had done everything in its power to comply with the obligations it had assumed. He reminded contracting parties of Belgium's traditional liberal import policy and while not encountering balance-of-payments difficulties his Government had, nevertheless, found itself constrained to maintain "hard-core" restrictions on importations of agricultural products for structural reasons analogous to those in other countries. In Belgium the problem of quotas was linked to that of maintaining adequate farm output and in this connexion he pointed out that since 1956 while sale prices were stable cost prices had increased. Further information on this point was to be found in Part III of the report.

He recalled that with a view to completing the elimination of the restrictions it was decided to harmonize Belgium's agricultural policy with that of the Netherlands and to this end the Committee on the Harmonization of Agricultural Policies had been requested to study the different problems and to submit a report to the session of the ministerial commission to be held in the Autumn of 1957. The Working Parties of this Committee are enumerated in Part II of the report. He considered, therefore, that the Belgian Government had in the past two years taken all necessary steps to comply with the obligations it had accepted under the waiver.

Mr. GUNDELACH (Denmark) recalled the dissatisfaction that his delegation had expressed last year at the fact that the CONTRACTING PARTIES had not been provided with a plan for the progressive abolition of the restrictions as foreseen in the Decision of 3 December 1955. Although further information had been furnished in L/640 and L/672 a genuine plan for the abolition of the restrictions was still lacking and his delegation would, therefore, like this matter to be taken up by a working party. He had noted in the report that the progress reported this year was again of very limited scope. Further information on the system applied, however, might dispel some of his delegation's misgivings. At the Tenth Session the Danish delegation had especially opposed the inclusion in the waiver of those commodities for which Belgium was a net exporter. When protection of agricultural production led to the creation of surpluses very often export subsidies would be granted to dispose of such surpluses and, apart from the provisions in the General Agreement concerning export subsidies, such a policy would be in clear conflict with the basic assumptions on which the waiver was granted. Mr. Gundelach cited recent examples of the results of such a policy with regard to exports of eggs and cattle from the United Kingdom and stated that at that time the Belgian Government had supported the Danish complaint to the CONTRACTING PARTIES.

Mr. OAKLEY (Australia) recorded his delegation's disappointment both at the apparently slow progress which Belgium was making towards the elimination of the restrictions on the products covered by the waiver and at the lack of

precise information in the report submitted. He recalled that at the Eleventh Session the working party which examined the First Annual Report had requested the Belgian Government to include in future annual reports more detailed information of several points. The first of these was on the programme for progressive relaxation and while the report referred to proposals for liberalization of potatoes, cauliflowers, cherries, eggs for hatching and day-old chicks, there was no indication as to when this liberalization might be achieved and no mention was made of specific proposals for liberalizing other commodities covered by the waiver. On another point, that of reasons for maintaining particular restrictions, the criterion used was the relation between costs of production and sales returns and Mr. Oakley wondered whether the restrictions would in fact be removed as required by the waiver if such a criterion were adhered to. Further, the Belgian Government had not supplied, as requested, details of commitments under bilateral agreements regarding the import into Belgium of products covered by the waiver and the response to the request for more detailed information on import quotas and administrative regulations had not provided the type of information his delegation would have wished to have on these matters.

His delegation considered therefore that the Belgian Government could have gone further towards providing the more detailed information requested at the Eleventh Session. The imminent establishment of the European Economic Community did not in any way modify the obligations assumed under the waiver by Belgium.

It had been noted from the statistics of imports and exports in 1955 and 1956 furnished by the Government of Belgium, that in some instances imports of products covered by the waiver were lower in 1956 than in 1955 and that Belgium continued to be a substantial exporter of some products. In the case of eggs in shell imports fell from 14 million units in 1955 to 11 million units in 1956, while exports showed a remarkable increase from 62 million units in 1955 to 145 million in 1956. The Australian delegation found it difficult to understand how import restrictions could be justified in circumstances such as these. He supported the Danish proposal for the establishment of a working party to study the report and expressed the hope that the Belgian delegation would furnish such additional information as might be necessary to enable the CONTRACTING PARTIES to be informed of the progress and development of measures taken by the Government of Belgium in accordance with the conditions of the waiver.

Mr. WARREN (Canada) expressed disappointment at the reports submitted. He had noted that the information provided on the measures to be developed for the elimination of the restrictions dealt only with the elimination of the restrictions against imports from The Netherlands. Further he had noted that restrictions on some products had been eliminated only for imports from The Netherlands. He supported the proposal that the report be examined further by a working party.

Mr. ADAIR (United States) had been pleased to note the removal of restrictions on two items and seasonal relaxations on others. His delegation, however, would like to have additional information on the reasons for maintaining particular restrictions and on the development of a programme for the elimination of the restrictions. He therefore supported the suggestion for further discussion by a working party.

The CHAIRMAN said that it seemed from the discussion that there was general support for referring the Belgian report to a working party for further study.

The CONTRACTING PARTIES therefore agreed to refer this matter, together with The Netherlands' complaint and the United States waiver to a working party on Agricultural Waivers to be established with the following membership and terms of reference:

Chairman: Mr. Bertram (Rhodesia and Nyasaland)

<u>Membership:</u>	Australia	Denmark	Indonesia	New Zealand
	Belgium	Dominican Republic	Italy	Peru
	Canada	France	Luxemburg	South Africa
	Cuba	Germany	Netherlands	United Kingdom
		Ghana		United States
				Uruguay

Terms of reference:

1. To examine the Third Annual Report by the United States Government under the Decision of 5 March 1955, and to report thereon to the CONTRACTING PARTIES.
2. To consider the complaint by the Government of The Netherlands concerning the maintenance of restrictions by the United States on imports of dairy products and to report thereon to the CONTRACTING PARTIES.
3. To examine the reports of the Government of Belgium (L/640 and L/672) under the Decision of 3 December 1955, and to report thereon to the CONTRACTING PARTIES.
6. Italy/Libya Waiver (L/698 and L/703)

The CHAIRMAN invited the CONTRACTING PARTIES to consider the Fifth Annual Reports submitted in accordance with the Decision of 9 October 1952, as extended by the Decision of 25 November 1955, by the Governments of Italy and Libya.

Mr. PARBONI (Italy), presenting the report by the Italian Government (L/698), noted that in the past three years the level of Italian imports of Libyan products to which special treatment was granted under the waiver

had increased substantially. His delegation had been happy to find that the Libyan Government, in its 1957 report, had also noted the importance of that development for its external trade and hence for its economic development, since it signified that Italy was fulfilling its obligations vis-à-vis the United Nations. In 1956, trade factors had prevented a more rapid increase of trade with Italy. He drew attention to the statistics attached to the report, which showed that in the past year imports from Libya under special customs treatment represented 1.38 per cent of total imports of the same products from other countries. It was therefore clear that the granting of special customs treatment caused no appreciable damage to the trade interests of other contracting parties.

Mr. MUSA (Observer for Libya), presenting the report by the Libyan Government (L/703), indicated that in accordance with the request made by the CONTRACTING PARTIES at their Eleventh Session, his Government had prepared this year's statistics in a different form. As stated in the report, the poor olive crop in 1956 had caused a decline in exports, but the prospects for 1957/58 were good and a considerable surplus of olive oil for export was expected... Following agricultural expansion and the introduction of a system of Government inspection and grading prior to shipment, the volume of exports of edible groundnuts had increased by 36 per cent in 1956/57 as compared with 1955/56 to become Libya's most important export in terms of value. It was hoped that the development programme, details of which were given in the report, by improving the quality of Libyan agricultural products would lead to increased exports to overseas countries. Increasing quantities of goods were being offered for export in processed or semi-processed form, although the volume of exports to Italy might decline as a consequence. His Government did not doubt, however, that in view of the close trade relations between Italy and Libya and the proximity of the two countries, Italy would continue to maintain a dominant position in Libyan trade. The progress already achieved, despite adverse climatic conditions and competition from more advanced exporting countries, justified his Government's belief that Libya's external trade would continue to expand and permit his country, in the near future, to take a larger part in international trade on a competitive basis. In conclusion he thanked the CONTRACTING PARTIES for their sympathetic consideration of Libya's need for outside assistance, and the Italian Government for the active part it had played.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the representatives of Italy and Libya for their Governments' reports.

The CONTRACTING PARTIES took note of the Fifth Annual Reports by the Governments of Italy and Libya.

The CHAIRMAN noted that, in accordance with the Decision of 25 November 1955, the situation would be reviewed by the CONTRACTING PARTIES in 1958.

The meeting adjourned at 5.20 p.m.