

**MULTILATERAL TRADE
NEGOTIATIONS
THE URUGUAY ROUND**

RESTRICTED

MTN.GNG/NG5/W/204
19 September 1990

Special Distribution

Group of Negotiations on Goods (GATT)

Original: English

Negotiating Group on Agriculture

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE NEGOTIATING GROUP ON AGRICULTURE:
JULY 1990

Statement by Pakistan (13 July 1990)

As always, my remarks will be brief but candid.

You have indeed been able to produce an extremely useful document. We commend you for your efforts, and for your courage. We recognize that your paper is an attempt at finding a compromise which could serve as a vehicle for further negotiations. We, however, find some serious shortcomings in certain aspects of the paper. I shall organize my remarks under four different headings.

First, the question of commodity coverage. You will recall that, all along, we have expressed our concern with the continuing lack of clarity on this crucial issue. We believe that it is time, now, to have a clear understanding that the agricultural reform process shall embrace all commodities without any exception. Although this may be implicit in your paper, it is important to spell it out explicitly as well. It is in that spirit that we support the remarks made by a number of delegations yesterday who spoke in favour of a comprehensive coverage of commodities for our negotiations.

Let me in the same vein say that we have serious reservations about the concept of rebalancing and we would urge that it be excluded from further consideration because, if accepted, it could amount to shifting support from commodities which suffer from grave distortions today, to other commodities in the future, and thereby defeat the purpose of a meaningful reform.

Second, I should also stress that there is insufficient attention devoted to the element of operationally effective GATT rules and disciplines to establish the necessary basis for conduct of international trade in agriculture on an agreed and lasting basis. We have been wondering whether the intention could be simply to adopt the results achieved in the other related areas particularly that on subsidies?

. / .

Third, and let me now turn to a very fundamental aspect in your paper particularly from our point of view as a developing country. I guess it would not come as a surprise for anybody if I say that paragraphs 11 and 15 of your paper amount to a considerable dilution of the mid-term understanding on special and differential treatment where it was recognized that "Government measures on assistance, whether direct or indirect, to encourage agricultural and rural development are an integral part of the development programme of developing countries". We feel that this aspect from the mid-term review agreement has been circumscribed particularly in paragraph 11 of your paper. We feel that the mid-term understanding on special and differential treatment would need to be restored to its already agreed level so as to reflect the special and distinctive needs of developing countries.

While on the question of S&D, we do not believe that tariffication is a viable proposition in the case of a large number of developing countries. And, let me also say that the total exclusion of S&D from export competition is perhaps an omission in your paper particularly because this aspect is still being debated in the Negotiating Group on Subsidies.

And finally, the stipulation in paragraph 8(c) of your paper in the context of developing the criteria for the so-called permitted categories of policies: that to be so eligible support "must not be restricted to any specific agricultural product or product sector", is too restrictive at least in the case of the developing countries. Let me repeat again that we do not find this stipulation as either practical or enforceable. It is liable to giving rise to an unending chain of disputes which must be avoided.

We hope your paper will be suitably clarified, at a minimum in these areas, so as to enable us to use it as a basis for our further negotiations.