Mr. Chairman, we in New Zealand are very much aware that the significance of this sixth round of GATT trade negotiations cannot be measured only by the trade concessions and benefits registered at its close. The distinguished representatives who have spoken before me have left no one in doubt of the implications of the Kennedy Round for political relationships among important areas of the international community. We have been reminded too of the importance of these negotiations for the General Agreement itself. We find ourselves in broad agreement with the consensus which seems to have emerged: that these negotiations cannot be allowed to fall below the high expectations which the world has set upon them. Not least is this so in respect of the trade of the developing countries. In "another place" in Geneva representatives of industrial countries have made much of the contribution both direct and indirect, which the Kennedy Round can make to meeting the legitimate economic aspirations of the developing countries. Can anyone seriously contend that we in the GATT have recently given the developing countries much cause to believe this?

There are two broad guidelines which in our view the Trade Negotiations Committee needs to keep constantly in mind. First, that the Kennedy Round is essentially a multilateral exercise - its benefits must be seen to be conferred on all the participants; and secondly, that it is an all embracing negotiation - no aspect of world trade of interest to the contracting parties can be left out; no problem, however difficult of technical solution, however embarrassing in terms of domestic politics, can be by-passed.
These are very broad statements; it may be said that such aims cannot be achieved even though they are no more than was decided last May and having been, in effect, reaffirmed here today and yesterday.

And certainly we must not delude ourselves that any perceptible progress has been made since then. Others have commented on disparities and other problems in the tariff field, (and we shall undoubtedly be hearing much more on this subject) but I would like to say a brief word now about the area of most importance to New Zealand - about negotiations on agricultural products.

It was agreed a year ago that agricultural and primary products should be included in the negotiations and that the objective should be to provide for acceptable conditions of access. Considerable work has been done since in the Agricultural Committee. The results of this work could never be described as encouraging. We are asked merely to "note" that no agreement has yet been reached. Two alternative proposals for negotiating rules for agricultural products outside the commodity groups lie on the table. Neither gives any assurance of new trading opportunities in the major markets and potential markets, for temperate foodstuffs; neither matches the rules of general or automatic application in prospect for industrial goods. But one does offer scope for negotiation. The other, when one cuts away the philosophy and the rationalizations, seems to promise nothing more than a continuation of present policies - in practical terms a freezing of measures which strictly limit access to markets for agricultural products in competition with domestic production.

This same doctrinal approach to the problems of world trade in agriculture has also marked some of the work in the Meat and Dairy Groups, where our main trading interests lie. We must say bluntly that if negotiations were to take place on this basis we find it hard to see how there can be improved market opportunities for New Zealand. And there is no point in trying to conceal the fact that progress has been stalled in agriculture not just because of a difference in the approach to negotiating techniques. There is at issue a basic question of policy. Several representatives yesterday spoke of the international division of labour and its application to international trade in agriculture. The question is whether the industrialized countries of the world are prepared to meet competition from efficient producers of agricultural products. No one denies that this is a difficult political problem; but let us face it honestly and not pretend that proposals which are tantamount to a maintenance of the status quo are really measures of liberalization of benefit to all members of the international trade community.
The time has come, Mr. Chairman, when it is simply not good enough to go on talking about "problems having been identified", "issues crystallized", "useful exchanges of views" and so on. For a country such as New Zealand, with only 3 per cent of its export trade in manufactured goods, it is obvious that trade negotiations, however broad in scope and imaginative in conception, are worthless unless they lead to real benefits in agriculture. For us to retain our faith in the Kennedy Round and indeed in the GATT itself we must see very soon the prospect of governments entering into negotiations which have as their objective the creation of "acceptable conditions of access". For us, the measure of their acceptability will be our preparedness to offer concessions in the New Zealand tariff. It is in this sense that we interpret reciprocity.

I may have sounded pessimistic but progress so far has been small. For our part we believe that the tasks which the GATT set itself last May are fully within the capabilities of the Contracting Parties. Certainly there are no technical reasons why we cannot succeed. What is required as has often been said, is the will to succeed. Without this will - backed by fundamental decisions within governments - no programme of international action, whether in the GATT or anywhere else, can succeed.