20 November 1958

CONCILIATION

FRENCH ASSISTANCE TO EXPORTS OF WHEAT AND WHEAT FLOUR

Report adopted on 21 November 1958
(L/924 - 7S/46)

I. Introduction

1. The Panel for Conciliation examined a complaint by the Government of Australia that as a result of subsidies being granted by the French Government on exports of wheat and wheat flour, inconsistently with the provisions of Article XVI:3, French exports have displaced Australian trade in these products particularly in its traditional wheat flour markets in Ceylon, Indonesia and Malaya, and have thus impaired the benefits which accrue to Australia under the General Agreement. At meetings held on 29 April and 1 May 1958 the Panel heard statements from both parties concerned and then decided to suspend consideration of the complaint pending the outcome of further bilateral discussions which were then to be resumed. In September the Australian Government reported that further bilateral discussions had led to no satisfactory outcome and accordingly the Panel was reconvened during the Thirteenth Session of the CONTRACTING PARTIES. The Panel heard further statements from the representatives of Australia and France and obtained additional information from them in order to clarify certain points in its further examination of the complaint. It also heard a statement by the representative of Japan who recorded his Government's concern in the situation which led to the Australian complaint in view of its interest in the export trade in wheat flour.

2. On the basis of these statements, together with statistical data provided by both parties and the secretariat, the Panel considered:

(a) whether or not the operation of the French price equalization system for wheat and flour amounted to the grant of subsidies on exports of those products;

(b) whether in fact this had resulted in France obtaining more than an equitable share in world trade for these products inconsistent with the provisions of Article XVI:3; and

(c) further, whether and to what extent, the operation of the system had impaired the benefits accruing directly or indirectly to the Government of Australia under the General Agreement.

3. Finally, the Panel agreed on the text of a recommendation[1] which, in its opinion, would assist the Australian and French Governments in arriving at a satisfactory adjustment of the case submitted by Australia to the CONTRACTING PARTIES to GATT.

II. Facts of the case

(i) *Operation of the French price stabilization system for wheat*

4. Under French law the Office National Interprofessionnel des Céréales (ONIC) controls the production, collection, storage and domestic sale of cereals including wheat and flour and exercises a monopoly on imports and exports thereof. One of the main provisions of the legislation enforced

[1]See page 22 for the recommendation adopted by the CONTRACTING PARTIES.

by ONIC is the institution of a legal domestic price for wheat. A price is guaranteed to the producer each year for deliveries up to a maximum amount, or quantum. Quantities produced in excess of that quantum are not purchased at the basic guaranteed price and the producer receives only that price which ONIC can obtain either by selling on the world market or at concessional prices on the domestic market. The quantum includes not only quantities for anticipated domestic consumption but also a margin in excess of that for export. The producer does not, however, finally realize the basic guaranteed price since apart from taxes on all deliveries deducted to defray storage costs and other such expenses incurred by ONIC a surplus disposal tax (*taxe de résorption des excédents*) is levied on deliveries within the quantum at a highly progressive rate increasing in proportion to deliveries; the proceeds of that tax are utilized to cover ONIC's losses in the disposal of wheat surpluses either at home or exported abroad. Moreover, the ONIC receives repayments from traders and co-operatives based on the price differential for wheat delivered in excess of the quantum (*redevance hors du quantum*) and any deficit in the operations of the ONIC is financed out of budgetary appropriations.

5. With regard to exports of wheat and wheat flour the procedures are as follows:

(a) In view of the fact that world prices are lower than French guaranteed prices the ONIC makes a payment (*ristourne*) to the exporter designed to cover the difference.

(b) In the case of wheat the *ristourne* is paid on the basis of tenders submitted by exporters, the ONIC accepting the bid which involves the lowest payment; these tenders are not considered according to destination and the ONIC may reject tenders or make counter-proposals. The amount of the *ristourne* is in effect governed by current price trends in the world market for wheat.

(c) Insofar as exports of wheat flour are concerned the *ristourne* is based on the average *ristourne* paid in respect of wheat export bids during the week preceding the flour sale. Over and above this basic payment the exporter of flour also receives a bonus fixed from time to time which amounts at present to 200 francs per quintal of wheat utilized and is designed to make up for the price differential between wheat and flour in world markets and to defray additional expenses incurred in milling grain with a high moisture content. In addition a variable bonus is granted according to distance of the export market which is fixed from time to time. This bonus at present varies from 0 to 160 francs per quintal of wheat utilized.

(ii) *The development of French exports of wheat and wheat flour*

6. In both the inter-war period and the early post-war years, the volume of French exports of wheat and wheat flour respectively has been characterized by wide fluctuations (see Table 1). Since world exports of wheat and of wheat flour have fluctuated less, France's share in the world total has been quite unstable. However, it rose to much higher levels in 1954 and especially in 1955, as regards both wheat flour – particularly the latter. Disregarding effects of the crop failure of 1956, French exports of wheat now account for 7½ per cent of the world total and her exports of wheat flour represent 9 to 10 per cent of world exports.

Table 1

FRENCH WHEAT PRODUCTION AND TRADE

(thousand metric tons and percentages of world total)

Year	Production	Wheat			Flour		
		Imports	Exports	World exports %	Imports	Exports	World exports %
1934	9,213	733	348	2.5	61	199	6.9
1935	7,755	704	821	5.9	58	153	5.6
1936	6,930	526	316	2.3	53	133	5.4
1937	7,017	466	25	0.2	37	116	4.8
1938	9,400	471	71	0.5	41	83	3.2
1948	7,634	793	88	0.5	271	8	0.2
1949	8,082	593	276	1.3	36	66	2.0
1950	7,701	222	680	3.9	1	153	5.3
1951	7,116	278	510	2.1	1	232	6.6
1952	8,421	764	115	0.5	7	202	5.8
1953	8,981	239	234	1.1	12	200	6.3
1954	10,566	254	1,228	6.2	2	340	10.9
1955	10,365	232	2,277	10.9	2	488	14.1
1956	5,683	1,526	883	3.2	1	392	10.7
1957	11,020	700	923	3.6	93	322	9.1
Jan-June 1957	..	578	110	0.7	42	108	5.8
Jan-June 1958	..	132	881	7.4	57	204	9.6

Source: National statistics and various FAO publications.

7. Judging from export unit values, the prices charged for French exports of wheat flour (to destinations outside the franc zone) have in recent years been on the whole lower than those of other exporters (see Table 2). This is further confirmed by the import unit values recorded in Ceylon, Malaya (including Singapore) and Indonesia (see Appendix Table A) and by recent quotations for French wheat flour in these markets that were supplied by the Australian delegation and were not disputed by the French delegation.

Table 2

EXPORT UNIT-VALUES OF WHEAT (I) AND WHEAT FLOUR (II)
(dollars per 100 kg)

		1954	1955	1956	1957
Australia[1]	I	3.78	5.90	5.38	5.43
	II	4.30	7.65	7.30	7.14
Canada	I	4.76	6.63	6.33	6.27
	II	6.57	9.87	9.54	9.43
Germany, Fed. Rep. . . .	I[2]	..	10.45	10.79	7.39
	II	..	7.58	7.03	6.16
Sweden	I	4.92	7.54	8.14	7.35
	II	6.14	neg.[3]	8.39	neg.[3]
United States	I	4.08	6.41	6.23	6.49
	II	6.38	8.56	8.23	8.39
France[4]	I	5.35	6.17	6.36	5.37
	II	5.18	6.51	6.34	5.97

[1]Year ending June of the year stated.

[2]The volume of wheat exports is small and the export unit-value is heavily affected by the higher price of wheat for seed.

[3]Swedish exports of wheat and wheat flour were negligible.

[4]Not including exports to the franc zone which are set in relation to the price fixed for bread in the territories concerned.

Source: Based on national statistics and *OEFC Foreign Trade*, Series IV.

III. Alleged inconsistency of the operation of the French system with the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article XVI

(i) *Consideration as to whether the French system involved a subsidy on exports within the terms of Article XVI:3*

8. The Panel considered the contention of the Australian Government that the operation of the French system amounted to the grant of subsidies on the export of wheat and wheat flour. The Panel noted the view of the French representative that the French system was rather a scheme for the stabilization of domestic prices and returns to producers. In this connection the Panel referred to an interpretative note to paragraph 3 of Article XVI, in which the CONTRACTING PARTIES had recognized that in certain circumstances a system for the stabilization of domestic prices would not be considered as involving a subsidy on exports within the meaning of that paragraph; it found that even if the French system had the characteristics described in paragraph 2 of the latter interpretative note the exemption provided from the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article XVI would be precluded if operations under such a system were "wholly or partly financed out of government funds in addition to funds collected

from producers in respect of the products concerned". Accordingly the Panel addressed itself to a consideration of whether the operation of the French system involved financial contributions from the Government.

9. In the first instance the Panel noted that exporters of wheat and wheat flour were exempted from the tax of 235 francs per quintal of wheat and wheat equivalent in flour delivered on the domestic market which was levied for the financing of agricultural family allowances. Although it is questionable whether such an exemption was within the ambit of the preamble to the interpretative notes to Article XVI, the Panel did not think it necessary to make a judgment on this point since the *ristourne* which traders received represented a much higher amount.

10. According to data furnished by the French representative the average *ristourne* paid to wheat exporters during the 1957-58 crop season amounted to 1,566 francs per quintal. Exporters of flour received on the average 1,878 francs per quintal of wheat utilized, i.e. 2,608 francs per quintal of flour. As indicated in paragraph 5 (c) the former payment represented a basic *ristourne* plus a fixed and variable bonus. In the light of the above, therefore, and of the fact that the legal price for sales of wheat on the domestic market was 3,662 francs per quintal, the Panel noted that traders could obtain wheat for export at a price approximately 1,800 francs per quintal lower than that prevailing on the domestic market and that in the case of wheat flour this difference was greater.

11. As indicated in paragraphs 4 and 5, the ONIC bears the losses resulting from payments to exporters and sales of wheat on the home market at reduced prices to cover domestic bread requirements and either direct sale as livestock feedstuff or costs of denaturation for such use. The 1957 wheat harvest yielded an excess over domestic requirements amounting to 30 million quintals of which 9 million quintals were denatured and sold for feeding purposes and the remaining 21 million quintals were exported in the form of wheat and flour. A percentage breakdown of ONIC's total expenditure for that crop year shows that 50 per cent was allocated in the form of *ristournes* to wheat exporters and 22 per cent to exporters of wheat flour. The remaining 28 per cent covered losses incurred from sales on the domestic market.

12. As stated, however, the ONIC receives its revenue from three main sources, namely the surplus disposal tax (*taxe de résorption des excédents*) and repayments for deliveries in excess of the quantum (*redevance hors du quantum*) with the balance being met by budgetary appropriations. For the 1957-58 crop year the first two items provided 20 and 45 per cent of receipts respectively and the balance of 35 per cent was contributed from Government funds.

13. The Panel noted that it was not possible to apportion or link the various sources of the ONIC's revenue directly to the items of expenditure and accordingly it would be difficult to assess with any precision the share of the budgetary appropriation in the financing of exports. If it was considered, however, that the receipts were uniformly divided under the various items of expenditure then it could be claimed that for the 1957-58 crop year 35 per cent of the payments on exports were derived from Government funds. Moreover, even if it was assumed that the export losses were primarily financed by sources of revenue other than budgetary appropriations then there would still have to be a part of these losses to be covered by the latter. This situation obtained even in the favourable circumstances of the 1957-58 crop year when funds collected from the producers were relatively high as compared with the 1955-56 crop year when budgetary appropriations represented 61 per cent of total revenue and payments on exports amounted to 94 per cent of ONIC's total expenditure. In that year, therefore, the bulk of payments made to exporters was covered by Government funds.

14. Accordingly, on the basis of these considerations, the Panel concluded that the operation of the French system did in fact result in the grant of subsidies on the export of wheat and wheat flour within the terms of paragraph 3 of Article XVI.

(ii) *Consideration as to whether the operation of the French system resulted in France obtaining more than an equitable share of the world export trade in wheat and wheat flour*

15. The Panel considered whether, in the terms of paragraph 3 of Article XVI, France had granted subsidies on the export of wheat and wheat flour in such a manner as to have resulted in France having obtained more than an equitable share of world export trade in these products. The Panel noted that there was no explicit definition in Article XVI of what constituted an "equitable" share in world markets. It was recalled, however, that at both Havana and the Review Session when the provisions of this paragraph were discussed it was implicitly agreed that the concept of "equitable" share was meant to refer to share in "world" export trade of a particular product and not to trade in that product in individual markets. It was understood, moreover, that in making such a determination the CONTRACTING PARTIES should not lose sight of the desirability of facilitating the satisfaction of world requirements of the commodity concerned in the most effective and economic manner, and that due account should be taken of any special factors affecting world trade in the products under reference with particular regard to the exporting country's share of world trade in those products during a previous representative period.

16. In the first instance, the French representative drew attention to France's established position in world trade as an exporter of wheat and wheat flour. Although curtailed in immediate post-war years as a result of damage incurred during the war, France was again assuming its traditional rôle. This *de facto* status of France as an exporter of wheat and wheat flour has been recognized by the International Wheat Agreement under which export quotas have been accorded to France. Moreover, France's share in the exports of wheat and wheat flour among the five major exporting countries (United States, Canada, Argentina, Australia and France) was considerably less in proportion to her production as compared with the others.

17. The Panel noted that French exports of wheat and wheat flour began to rise in 1954 in absolute quantity to levels very substantially exceeding the quantities exported in any year since 1934 and have since remained considerably higher than in pre-war or post-war years. This increase in the absolute quantities of wheat and of wheat flour exported by France also represents an increase in France's share of world exports, especially as regards wheat flour.

18. The Panel further considered whether this increase in France's share of world exports, particularly of wheat flour, could be attributed to the operation of the French subsidy system. The facts above mentioned in paragraph 7 (and also in Appendix Table A) show that French exporters have been able to quote prices for wheat flour lower than those quoted by other exporters, whether at f.o.b. or c.i.f. values. Moreover, judging from export unit values, the price charged by French exporters for wheat flour has in recent years barely exceeded that charged for wheat. While this seems to be the practice followed also in some other European countries, e.g. in Germany, flour is exported even more cheaply than wheat, the export price for flour charged by Australia, Canada and the United States does exceed the export price of wheat by 30 to 50 per cent (see Table 2).

19. In these circumstances, it is reasonable to conclude that, while there is no statistical definition of an "equitable" share in world exports, subsidy arrangements have contributed to a large extent to the increase in France's exports of wheat and of wheat flour, and that the present French share of world export trade, particularly in wheat flour, is more than equitable.

IV. Alleged nullification or impairment of benefits accruing to Australia under the General Agreement

20. On the basis of statistical data before it the Panel considered whether and to what extent the operation of subsidies granted by France on the export of wheat and wheat flour had caused injury to Australia's normal commercial interests, and whether such an injury represented an impairment of benefits accruing to Australia under the General Agreement.

21. The Australian representative contended that the effect of the French subsidies had been such as to impair benefits Australia expected under the General Agreement, viz., the assurance that its export trade would not face subsidies going beyond the limits permissible under Article XVI. It was pointed out, in particular, that on the basis of statistical data (see Appendix Table B) French exports of wheat flour had displaced normal Australian exports to markets in Southeast Asia, especially Ceylon, Malaya (including Singapore) and Indonesia. Furthermore, the losses suffered by Australia included not only direct damage to the flour milling industry, but also a reduction in the domestic supply of by-products, such as bran and pollard, and finally adverse effects upon Australia's transport facilities for exports of other goods to the Southeast Asian markets, since wheat flour was used as a "bottom cargo".

22. On the basis of statistics on the Australian wheat situation (see Appendix Table C) the French representative expressed the view that Australia's claim was not well founded since the deterioration in her position in Southeast Asian wheat flour markets was not due to French deliveries but to inability to supply as a result of two consecutive short crops. Even the reduced wheat and wheat flour exports of Australia could only be effected by reducing stocks to excessively low levels and even by recourse (though on a limited scale) to imports.

23. On the basis of the statistics submitted and of the explanations provided by the Australian and French representatives, the Panel arrived at the following conclusions:

(a) French exports of wheat flour to the three Southeast Asian countries rose substantially in recent years and accounted for a growing share in France's total wheat flour exports which rose from 13 per cent in 1953-54 to 34 per cent in 1957-58. Australia's exports to these markets fell substantially during this period and their share in Australia's total export of wheat flour declined from 64 per cent in 1953-54 to 50 per cent in 1957-58.

(b) In the three Southeast Asian markets combined, French supplies represented a greatly increased proportion of total imports of wheat flour, accounting for 0.7 per cent in 1954 and 46 per cent in the first half of 1958. The share of Australian supplies, on the other hand, fell from 83 per cent in 1954 to 37 per cent in the first half of 1958.

(c) While other suppliers of wheat flour have recently begun to play a larger part in the Southeast Asian markets, and although it is difficult to estimate to what extent such incursions as these are displacing traditional exporters, it is nevertheless clear that French supplies have in fact to a large extent displaced Australian supplies in the three markets.

(d) As regards the contention of the French representative that the reduction in Australia's exports to these markets was due to limited supplies, it is clear that Australia could not have maintained her combined exports of wheat *and* wheat flour at normal levels in 1957-58. However, Australia could have effected her traditional exports of wheat *flour* in spite of the crop failures, owing to measures taken by the Australian Wheat Board to set aside a quantity of wheat considered necessary to keep up normal exports of flour; this was substantiated by the declaration of the Australian representative that there were no contractual commitments for the export of wheat in the form of grain. Actually, the growth of French subsidized exports to Ceylon and other Southeast Asian countries and the

consequent displacement of normal Australian flour exports resulted in the wheat thus available for transformation into flour being exported *as wheat* to other markets.

(e) Since it is obviously more profitable to export wheat flour rather than wheat, Australia has suffered a direct damage which could be evaluated by applying the price difference between wheat flour and wheat to the quantity of Australian exports that were displaced by French exports. It would, however, be difficult to assess this displacement quantitatively with any precision. In addition to this direct damage, there were other incidental adverse effects upon Australia which cannot be measured. Thus, Australia has suffered indirectly by the reduction in the domestic supply of the by-products of flour milling and by the reduction in transport facilities for other Australian export goods to the Southeast Asian Markets.

24. The Panel then directed its attention to the question of whether the damage apparent in recent years was likely to recur or be prolonged. In this connection it noted a statement by the French representative that France had concluded no important new contracts for sales of flour to this area since 1957 and that deliveries in 1958 were mostly the result of contracts entered into the previous year. Furthermore, it was estimated that the French wheat harvest for the year would not be as large as in previous years, and that there was a probability that there would be less available for export, whether as wheat or flour, in the near future. In this connection the French representative stressed that his Government's policy was in fact to reduce wheat production in favour of coarse grains as feedstuffs to promote the livestock industry, and to that end regulations had been announced in October 1957 which would gradually lower the basic production price for wheat from 3,350 francs per quintal to 3,200 francs by 1961, and thus the quantities available for export should be reduced. The Panel noted, however, the recent decision by the French Government to increase the quantum on which the guaranteed price is paid from 68 to 72 million quintals and considered that this decision might to a certain extent counteract the effects of its long-term policy.

25. Although the Panel recognized that the French Government's policy would tend to reduce the effects of the system on patterns of world trade, it considered, nevertheless, that the operation of the system was such that when climatic circumstances were favourable there might be substantial quantities of wheat in excess of normal domestic consumption requirements. Although the ONIC disposes of part of the surplus on the domestic market, the nature of French wheat was such that with its high moisture content, it was not capable of being stored for long periods. Moreover, storage and drying facilities were inadequate and it was inevitable that a substantial part of any sizeable surplus would have to be disposed of on the world markets. The French system appears very flexible in the sense that the amount of subsidy on wheat and flour exports may be increased without any government limitation in order to meet terms of competition on different markets. Also experience has shown that French wheat and flour exports have been regularly quoted at prices below those tendered by other suppliers and that there was no inherent guarantee in the system that it would operate in such a manner as to conform to the limits contemplated in Article XVI:3.

26. Before concluding its report the Panel wishes to draw the CONTRACTING PARTIES' attention to the general state of disequilibrium in the Southeast Asian flour markets, which its examination of the case before it has revealed. It had noted that substantial shifts had taken place as to source of supplies; France, for instance, had once exported large quantities of flour to what formerly constituted French Indochina. In the years 1951-54 that market had received 50,000-60,000 tons annually from France. For various reasons, particularly owing to non-commercial supplies from other sources, however, French flour exports to that market had fallen to zero by 1957. Accordingly, French exporters had been forced to seek alternative markets in the region, thus resulting in incursions on the traditional markets of other exporters. Moreover, other European countries became or returned as occasional and sporadic suppliers of substantial quantities of flour to those markets. This had further contributed towards the general state of disequilibrium which is apparent. In view of this situation, therefore, the Panel considered

that so long as trade in flour with this region was likely to be affected by other than strict commercial considerations and the agriculture policy of a number of countries enabled exporters to obtain substantial assistance from their governments, it would be necessary for some arrangement to be arrived at to take due account of the interest of traditional suppliers. The most practical method of achieving this end thus avoiding any further disorganization of the flour markets in this region, appears to the Panel to be inter-governmental consultations.

27. In the light of the considerations set forth in Sections III and IV of this report, the Panel submits the following draft recommendation[1] for the consideration of the CONTRACTING PARTIES.

[1]See page 22 for the recommendation as adopted by the CONTRACTING PARTIES.

APPENDIX

Table A

UNIT-VALUE OF WHEAT FLOUR IMPORTED INTO CEYLON, MALAYA AND SINGAPORE AND INDONESIA

	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958 first half
Ceylon (Rs. per cwt.)	*22.9*	*20.4*	*19.3*	*22.4*	*19.1* [1]
Total					
of which from					
Australia	23.0	20.1	19.0	21.9	22.3
Canada	23.8	25.6	27.9	25.3	-
France	22.2	19.4	18.0	22.2	16.1
Germany, Fed. Rep. of	-	-	-	-	16.5
United States	*	*	*	24.6	41.4
Belgium-Luxemburg	22.2	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	22.9	-	*	-	-
India	24.2	*	-	-	-
Malaya and Singapore (Mal. $ per ton)					
Total	*325*	*300*	*294*	*311*	*319* [2]
of which from					
Australia	321	296	291	306	320
Canada	387	375	374	395	377
France	293	256	264	295	288
Germany, Fed. Rep. of	-	-	254	280	278
Netherlands	212	420	-	-	-
United States	331	289	330	386	386
Japan	307	308	308	298	294
Indonesia (Rs. per kg.)					
Total	*1.3*	*1.1*	*1.1*	*1.2*	*1.1* [3]
of which from					
Canada	1.4	1.7	1.5	1.6	-
United States	1.4	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3
Australia	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.1
Netherlands	-	1.4	-	1.4	-
France	-	-	-	1.0	1.0

[1]January-July [2]January-June [3]January-May *Quantities negligible

Table B

TRADE IN WHEAT FLOUR OF FRANCE AND AUSTRALIA WITH CEYLON, MALAYA (INCLUDING SINGAPORE) AND INDONESIA

	FRANCE				AUSTRALIA				OTHER SUPPLIERS				TOTAL
	French export returns		Importers' returns		Australian export returns		Importers' returns		Importers' returns		of which Germany		Importers' returns
	'000 tons	%	'000 tons	%	'000 tons	%	'000 tons	%	'000 tons	%	'000 tons	%	'000 tons
Ceylon													
1954	35.3	13.0	3	1.5	202.8	28.6	146	71.9	54	26.6	-	-	203
1955	65.7	15.3	76	34.9	102.0	17.5	134	61.5	8	3.7	-	-	218
1956	66.2	12.9	52	28.1	105.0	17.4	120	64.9	13	7.0	neg.	-	185
1957	33.6	17.0	37	19.0	160.4	23.7	128	65.6	30	15.4	neg.	-	195
1958	76.9	18.1	99 *	75.0	47.2	10.8	2 *	1.5	31 *	23.5	14 *	10.6	132 *
Malaya and Singapore													
1954	-	-	-	-	128.5	18.1	119	93.7	8	6.3	-	-	127
1955	-	-	-	-	149.5	25.7	126	92.6	10	7.4	-	-	136
1956	15.2	3.0	19	12.3	123.1	20.3	119	76.8	17	10.9	1	0.6	155
1957	9.6	4.9	10	6.9	108.0	16.0	112	77.8	22	15.3	1	0.7	144
1958	18.1	4.3	29 *	19.0	115.4	26.5	98 *	57.5	37 *	23.9	7 *	4.5	155 *
Indonesia													
1954	-	-	-	-	124.9	17.6	98	89.0	12	10.9	-	-	110
1955	-	-	-	-	86.6	14.9	108	88.5	14	11.5	-	-	122
1956	-	-	neg.		161.3	26.7	151	76.6	46	23.4	-	-	197
1957	-	-	9	5.8	104.8	15.5	97	62.2	50	32.1	-	-	156
1958	48.8	11.5	65 **	49.2	57.1	13.1	62 **	47.0	5 **	3.8	-	-	132 **
Sum of countries listed													
1954	35.3	13.0	3	0.7	456.2	64.3	363	82.5	74	16.8	-	-	440
1955	65.7	15.3	76	16.0	338.1	58.0	368	77.3	32	6.7	-	-	476
1956	81.4	15.9	71	13.2	389.4	64.4	390	72.6	76	14.2	1	0.2	537
1957	43.2	21.9	56	11.3	373.2	55.2	337	68.1	102	20.6	1	0.2	495
1958	143.8	33.9	193	46.1	219.7	50.4	153	36.5	73	17.4	21	5.0	419
Other destinations													
1954	235.8	87.0			253.6	35.7							
1955	362.4	84.7			244.4	42.0							
1956	430.2	84.1			215.6	35.6							
1957	153.9	78.1			303.1	44.8							
1958	280.9	66.1			216.1	49.6							

Note: Exporters' data refer to years ending 30 June.
Importers' data are for calendar years.

* First half at annual rate.
** Five months at annual rate.

Table C

AUSTRALIA: WHEAT SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION
(thousand metric tons)

	1952/53	1953/54	1954/55	1955/56	1956/57	1957/58	1958/59
Stocks at beginning of crop year[1]	460	1,026	2,583	2,585	2,292	1,127	(324)[2]
Production during crop year	5,313	5,389	4,589	5,318	3,674	2,640	
Total	5,773	6,415	7,172	7,903	5,966	3,767	
Domestic disappearance for crop year	1,971	2,003	1,852	2,011	2,136	2,068	
Balance at 1 Dec. for export and for carry-over	3,802	4,412	5,320	5,892	3,830	1,699	
Imports	-	-	-	-	-	41	
Exports	2,776	1,829	2,735	3,600	2,703	(1,416)[2]	
of which wheat	1,613	1,074	1,777	2,650	1,830	(953)[2]	
wheat flour . . . . . (wheat equivalent)	1,163	755	958	950	873	(463)[2]	

[1]Crop year beginning 1 December.
[2]Figures in parentheses are provisional estimates.

Sources: *World Wheat Statistics*, International Wheat Council, London, May 1958.
The Wheat Situation, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Canberra, March 1957, and various issues of *Monthly Bulletin of Overseas Trade Statistics*, Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Canberra.