

(d) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES, CONSUMER AFFAIRS AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION AND MINISTRY OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI KAMALUDDIN AHMED) : (a) No such import licence has been issued to Meltron under the current Export & Import policy, 1992-97 effective from 1.4.1992.

(b) to (d). Do not arise.

11.00 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till twelve of the clock

11.00 hrs

Lok Sabha reassembled at Twelve of the clock

(MR. SPEAKER *in the chair*)

CLARIFICATION SOUGHT BY HON. MEMBERS ON THE STATEMENT MADE BY MINISTER OF COMMERCE RE: URUGUAY ROUND OF TALKS.

[*Translation*]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Dunkel proposals were discussed in this House for eleven hours. Nation-wide concern is being expressed regarding Dunkel proposals, considered to be against India's interests. The Government had given assurance in this House that the

feeling of the House would be kept in view; anything which was not in the nation's interest would not be accepted and attempt would be made to obtain as much concessions as possible. It was also thought that talks would also be held with the opposition parties and the expert groups working in this field. It is unfortunate that India signed the Dunkel proposals without having it improved and without getting any concessions. Earlier, it was approved by the Cabinet and you are aware of the situation created there after in the House. Yesterday the Commerce Minister from which two things were revealed. First, the Government have shown its helplessness. Either we would accept GATT or remain outside it. Whatever concessions were thought to have been obtained, were not achieved. Through you I want to seek clarification from the Government on few points.

Firstly, we want to know clearly from the Government the quantum benefit that the GATT proposals approved by the Indian representative on Government's recommendations would fetch us. We want to know explicitly in which area we would benefit and the extent thereof. In what way, our trade will increase and other areas will show some progress. The Government should clearly explain the extent of increase in the field of agriculture, textiles, machinery and services.

Secondly, whole nation including the rural areas are concerned on account of seeds. Regarding that we were given two points in GATT. Either we accept the patents or the sui generis system. We have accepted the sui generis system, and the Government has claimed that the rights of the farmers to retain seeds and their transaction have been

safeguarded. But they have clearly stated that there would be no right to sell the seeds. That is to say the farmers would have no right to multiplication of seeds, and whatever little rights that the farmers are said to enjoy from which document of GATT is it derived? Regarding the assurance given to us in the field of seeds, I would like to borrow as to where is it mentioned in GATT agreement. We do not want to keep the people in dark regarding this. Any relief available under the Sui generis system is related to plant breeders' rights, which would be given by the multinational companies. Therefore, we want to know this thing clearly from the Government.

Thirdly, back loading period, in the field of textiles was ten years. This is included in the GATT agreement. Multi-fibre arrangement is there which means the quota system would continue for ten years. It was said that attempts would be made to achieve an improvement, but 10 year period has not been changed. They said America tried to extend the 10 year period to 15 years, but we remained to keep it upto 10 years. We are discussing Dunkel Proposals. Through you, I would therefore like to know from the Government clearly the provisions under which we are to get relief. Lastly, I would like to know through you whether we should remain to GATT or withdraw from it. The question is of bringing the ideology to the notice of the entire country. If we benefit by remaining in GATT, then we should do so. But GATT is going to affect our sovereignty because after approving it, we would have to bring changes in our laws; specially due to TRIP, Intellectual, Property Rights, we would have to amend our patent laws immediately.

It has been said that by remaining in GATT we get the, most favored nation' sta-

tus. it has also been said that due to GATT we will have security. But my submission is that on the one hand we would have to change our existing laws, on the other hand America will not be needing changes in any laws. 'Special 301' will remain as it is. Therefore, through you I would like to know clearly from the Government as to what benefits we will have from GATT, in which field and in what manner we would be benefitted?

[English]

SHRI SOBHANADRESESWARA RAO
VADDE (Vijayawada): Through you I would like to seek some clarifications.

MR. SPEAKER: We have discussed this matter for eleven hours. May I request you to please be very brief?

SHRI SOBHANADRESESWARA RAO
VADDE: I have to just seek clarifications on three points Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Please first hear me. You have made your contribution. I think all of you had enough time to speak. Now please put questions, so that you get clear answers.

SHRI SOBHANADRESESWARA RAO
VADDE: I will not explain things, but I will put points straight away.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE
(Bolpur): May I seek a clarification? We are very happy that we are able to now put some questions to get clarifications. This is not an ordinary routine matter. Everybody understands it. The country wants to know it. We find many ordinarily knowledgeable people also do not appreciate what are the ramifications of this agreement. Because these are

of a complex nature. Therefore when there are doubts and people are asking us questions - I must confess I am no expert economist at all - I cannot answer them because I do not have clear myself. I can tell you, people in important positions also do not know the exact scope and the ambit of what has been agreed to. We want to put specific questions; but there should be answers. The earlier discussion is of no effect because at that time we did not know many things.

MR. SPEAKER : You were not here in the morning. We has said that we will start the discussion at 12 noon and continue for two hours. Two hours should be more than sufficient.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I may not be so articulate to meet the Commerce Minister's knowledge about these aspects. But we will try to put it.

SHRI SOBHANADRESSWARA RAO VADDE: I will only put some points for clarification Sir. Firstly, the hon. Commerce Minister was telling that we have freedom to evolve our own sui generis system. Earlier the note from the Commerce Minister has stated that though Dunkel Draft does not specify any particular model of sui generis system, it has to be understood that it has to conform to the UPOV Convention, an international convention which has met to protect the plant breeders' rights. So I want to know from the hon. Prime Minister whether the sui generis system which the Government wants to bring forward will have a completely independent nature or they will conform to UPOV Convention; if so, whether it will conform to UPOV 1978 Convention decisions or 1991 Convention decisions. If the Government evolves a sui generis system in tune with the

1978 UPOV decisions, my information is that those decisions will be valid up to 1995 after which those will not be valid and the decisions of 1991 will come into effect. So we want this very important point to be clearly clarified.

The second point is, the sale from farmer, from a farmer of this village to a farmer of the neighboring village is the life line of Indian agriculture through which 60 per cent of the seed requirements of farmers are being met. I would like to know whether this particular right will continue in further or not, whether the Government has placed any particular text of its own thinking that this is our sui generis way in which we are going to protect plant breeders' rights and whether the Government has placed in before the GATT negotiations table. If so, let the Government take the MPs into confidence and place it here.

Regarding the market access it is the IMF which has to decide as to whether this country is having any difficulty in the balance of payment position or not and whether the per capita income of this country is below 1,000 dollars or not. The frequent statements by the Hon. Finance Minister say that we have come out of a very grave financial difficulty and we are having a satisfactory foreign exchange reserve May I know whether this will amount to overcoming the balance of payment positions? (*Interruptions*) I am only making point, Sir, I am not making any speech.

Sir, earlier also I have brought it your notice that on 5.6.93, a new report appeared saying that the IMF has evolved the per capita income of India to be 1255 dollars, taking into account the people's purchasing

capacity. It is the IMF which will be deciding this particular aspect. May I know whether our Government has sought any clarification from the IMF as to how it has arrived at that figure?

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: As per our Government's statistics, our per capita income is only around 330 dollars. So, I want a clear clarification from the hon. Minister

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Surya Narayan Yadav.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: I am concluding. Sir. I would not make a speech. May I know whether the Government has sought a clear clarification from the IMF in this regard?

Finally, I would like to know only one thing. The Government is telling that we need not have our commitment in regard to reduction of subsidies. Okay, we accept it. Why then the Government and particularly the Hon. Finance Minister is telling day in and day out that this Government is determined to do away with the subsidies?

MR. SPEAKER: We are not discussing the entire gamut of financial and economic aspect now. Shri Surya Narayan Yadav. I am not allowing these kinds of things.

[Translation]

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV (Saharasa): Mr Speaker, Sir, I am also a Member of the Standing Committee and the

committee, which has been constitute by the entire House, has the representatives of all the political parties and we have unanimously decided that we will not participate in this agreement.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : No let us be very clear. This is misinforming the House. The report says something different. The report says that we should.

[Translation]

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV : Sir, it has already been laid in Rajya Sabha (Interruptions)

[English]

MR SPEAKER: The copy is with me.

[Translation]

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV: Sir I withdraw my words.

Statement of the Government and indications given by GATT have caused confusion all over the country. Has the Government got facts and figures regarding advantages and disadvantages the country is going to get from GATT? The Government should also State the probable percentage of gains and losses that will accrue to the farmers and the industrialists? None will tolerate ruining of cultural heritage which is being done by the Government in the name of financial crisis. During elections, the Hon. Prime Minister had announced not only once but thousand times that no agreement detri-

mental to the interests of the country will be signed. Therefore, now I would like to know from the Hon. Prime Minister about the percentage of gains and losses that will accrue to the country by signing this Treaty?

[English]

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARIYA (Jadavpur) : Sir, I will keep myself confined to the responses to the statements made by the Hon. Commerce Minister. The first question that I would like to ask or the clarification that I would like to seek is regarding the question of the changes that will have to be made in the laws of the country following the signing of the Dunkel Draft. I want to know exactly what land laws, what labour laws will have to be changed.

Apart from the patent Act, that will have to be changed to consequence of the signing of this treaty.

In the statement of the Commerce Minister, it has been said that India's aggregate subsidy works out to a substantial negative figure thereby providing a very large scope for further augmentation of agricultural subsidies. If Government were to choose to raise the subsidies from the current levels, I feel that this is a very misleading statement because the GATT Treaty specifies that the Government, which is subsidising below the minimum level, connote increase the subsidy offered.

I think, this is an extremely misleading statement that has been made by the Minister. It should be clarified.

Then, it has been said that the reduction

in export subsidies in agriculture by developed countries will make Indian agricultural exports more competitive in world markets. I would like to know in the face of the facts that the Indian Government subsidises exports at a very low rate and there are other developed countries which subsidise exports at a very high rate, so even if the level of their subsidy is reduced, to what extent would it be of benefit to us?

In the statement regarding patents, he has said

"A country like ours which does not presently recognise the product patents in the field of drugs, food products and chemicals, has been allowed a transition period of 10 years for establishing a product patent regime for such items."

He has conveniently forgotten that there is a clause for pipeline protection which, in fact, was one of the negotiating points with India. Unless this pipeline protection clause is removed, then, this ten-year leave is of no use at all to us. So, I would like to have a clarification that.

It has been said about compulsory licensing that the Government would be able to undertake licensing for non-commercial public use as well as to prevent situations of either inadequate availability or exorbitant pricing. I would like to know what exactly has been said in the Dunkel Draft Text regarding compulsory licensing. Is it not true that compulsory licensing is going to be allowed only under very stringent circumstances and only with the permission of the patent-holder? The permission of the patent-holder absolutely necessary for compulsory licensing.

There is one more point (*Interruptions*). [Translation]

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Sir.

MR SPEAKER : Many hon. members would like to speak on this issue.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV I would like to submit that on this issue many hon. members.

MR SPEAKER: Mr. Minister has already made the Statement.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Please listen to me. I would like to submit that it is a very serious issue. Therefore, how can the hon. members ask all the questions in such a hurry.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, we will raise our hands on this issue.

[English]

We want questions to be answered. (*Interruptions*) The questions raised by Shrimati Malini Bhattacharya are very very important. You cannot deny that.

MR SPEAKER: Questions are important. (*Interruptions*) You need not read the statement made by the Minister.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What is the statement ? (*Interruptions*) The statement is a useless statement.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Mr Speaker, Sir, please don't make so haste on this issue.

MR SPEAKER : Mr Sharad Yadav, I am going to give you time. Time will be given. There is no need to read out the written text.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Kindly see that every question that Shrimati Malini Bhattacharya has put is most important. (*Interruptions*) You tell me which one is an unimportant question?

MR. SPEAKER: It is important. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: She is being into She is being interrupted. (*Interruptions*)

MR SPEAKER: You need not read out the statement. (*Interruptions*)

MR SPEAKER: Ask the question.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA : This is regarding something which has not been mentioned in the statement at all. It is a question which I had raised earlier also. This is about Article 18 in part (iv) of the Original GATT Treaty.

It gives some protection to developing countries like ourselves. I would like to know the status of Article 18 exactly. It must be stated here as to what status that Article would have under the present treaty. Thank you.

[Translation]

SHRI JAGMEET SINGH BRAR (Faridkot): Mr. Speaker Sir, as you have stated 11 hours discussion on has already taken place on this issue, I would like to seek only a small clarification from the Government on one point only because the framers throughout the country are anxious on this issue. I believe that there has been discussion on elimination of agricultural subsidy and at the same time there has been great apprehension about.....

[English]

There will be a possible break-down of the PDS.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker : The hon. Minister has already given reply on this issue when you were not present here.

[Interruptions]

MR. SPEAKER : He has replied on this 3 or 4 times.

[English]

SHRI JAGMEET SINGH BRAR: Dunkel allows upto 10 percent subsidy on agriculture. But there is three per cent negative subsidy. Will the Government, after the signing of this agreement, be able to give 10 per cent subsidy to the framers of our country? I would like to know this from the hon. Minister.

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the main objective of this multipurpose trade agreement is to allow

affluent nations of the world to control Indian consumers market.

Yesterday, the hon. Minister of COMMERCE stated that export of India will go up by \$200 crore. I would like to know the name of consumer commodities exempted from custom and excise duties to affluent nations, coming to control the Indian market. What will be the impact of these exemptions on the resources of India and to what extent the import bill will go up in comparison to our export bill, which will definitely disturb directly the position of the Balance of Payment of India?

Anti-dumping laws, which are already in force, especially in regard to steel and fertilizers, are directly going to the affected adversely. I would like to know as to what extent India has made compromise in this regard?

Thirdly, U.S.A. has asserted that under Super 301 India has not amended its Patent laws in conformity with the laws in force in America. I believe that's why in October, USA, as a sort of sanctions against India, enhanced 15 per cent duty on the articles imported by America from India. Under the circumstances prevailing today. I would like to know what would be the fate of Indian articles after the efforts made by U.S. A. by imposing increased custom duties as a form of sanctions against India under Super 301?

Newspapers are reporting that scientists of Agricultural Research Centre of Bangalore after relinquishing the centre are joining multinational companies at higher salaries and thus they are gradually being tempted towards Multinational Companies. This will directly affect adversely the Agricultural Research Centre. I would like to know, what Government propose to do to

check exodus of the scientists?

[English]

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (Hooghly) :

All along the period of negotiations, this Parliament has been kept in the dark. Although outside, experts, former diplomats and many others have been expressing their serious reservations and presenting their viewpoints in the interest of the country, this august House has either been misinformed or disinformed. It was nothing short of withholding information from the House. I may mention the latest attempt of misinformation. When the hon. Commerce Minister initiated the discussion, he said that there is a misapprehension....

MR. SPEAKER : Please seek clarifications.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I am coming to it Sir, You yourself asked this question then. THE COMMERCE MINISTER stated that there was a misapprehension that everything was going to be concluded by 15 December and that that was not correct. This is what he said at that time. So far as we understand, now it is already closed. I charge this Government and my charge is that the Commerce Minister has deliberately misled the House. There is no scope at all for improvements or changes. (Interruptions).

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Then again, this House has been taken for a ride. In the background paper itself, it has been stated that it is not the time to take a final view and that they are seeking changes, improvements and understanding. In spite of the fact that the hon. Member had given their valued viewpoints and alternatives, the Government remained unresponsive.

MR. SPEAKER : Please ask your

question. I am allowing only clarification. This is becoming a speech!

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I am seeking clarifications only Sir. On the seeds issue, I myself had posed a question as to whether the Indian framers would have the right to market and sell. This question was deliberately avoided.

MR. SPEAKER : That question has already been asked by others. Please come to the next question.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : But it has not been answered. I am coming to other points in respect of textiles, it is very disappointing to note that because of the pressure of the United States, India has agreed to open up its markets for synthetic textiles of the United States of America and we have also agreed to cut down the import duties to the level of 90 per cent. With these imports, our textile industry is going to be in doldrums.

I am again coming to the question of American laws. The United States said that they were satisfied that the new agencies would not have power to overcome the US trade laws. They have institutionalized their right to cross-retaliate as per the provisions of superclauses. The American Government has stated that the new agency would have no right....

MR. SPEAKER : Others also want to seek clarifications. Please be very brief.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Let them clarify about the market access, about seeds, about pipeline protection about import as substitution by local manufacturers and so on. All these questions have been avoided by hon. Commerce Minister. The sovereignty of this country is being compromised and the

House is kept in the cark. Let them clarify.

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA (Alleppey) : Sir, it is assumed that in the Services Sector, India is going to gain a lot. We have an abundant source of skilled persons who can move out and render their services. I have been told that in the final agreement, there were a lot of changes and access to banking, insurance and telecommunication sectors was given a go by the developed countries. I would like to know the current position is respect of services sector.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore) : I am a bit nervous as to what you are going to legitimately allow as a clarificatory question.

MR. SPEAKER : A statement has been made by the Minister. If you have any doubts or if you have any other questions, you may ask.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Inevitably, when the debate took place, many Members raised certain points and questions which were very relevant and which, some of us feel, have not been adequately clarified in the statement. Inevitably, some of those points may have to be raised again. If you say that it is already debated, then I cannot do anything.

Sir, this overall multilateral agreement, as it is described in this Statement has been crystallized for adoption and ratification by the Governments of 117 countries. Is it possible for any country, outside this multilateral agreement, to carry on imposing unilateral sanctions or embargoes on any country or is that regime over now once this multilateral agreement has been reached?

Just now some apprehensions have been expressed about the things like Super

301. There are trade embargoes enforced in different parts of the world against certain countries which have been targeted for by the USA for trade embargo. I would like to know from the Minister whether this means - with the Uruguay round being completed now - that no country however powerful can continue to impose unilateral trade sanctions whether it is Super 301 or any other country. We cannot do anything outside this agreement but can USA do anything outside this agreement, we would like to know.

Secondly, Sir, while remaining within the GATT and without trying to get out of it, I would like to know whether this option of trying to work out some common strategy along with other developing countries was explored by the Government of India at all or not. Out of these 117 countries, I would like to know how many are classified as the developing countries and how many are developed countries. I think - it is not clarificatory, of course, I am making a charge - that the Government of India has broken ranks with the developing countries whereas they were expected to play a leading role.

Only last week the Prime Minister was host to Dr. Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe and Dr. Mahathir Mohammad of Malaysia. This had expressed certain views, which of course we have read in the Press, where they had very much emphasised the point that the countries of the South should try to get together in order to resist the kind of unfair pressure which is being sought to be brought on them by the richer and developed countries. They said these things, but we did not say anything. We are silent on this issue. I would like to know why we are silent? Is that option being closed deliberately by us? We do not want to go into that kind of thing. There is a distinguished Secretary of the South-South sitting here. Of course, nowadays he

is speaking about North-North, very different to what he used to say and write earlier on.

As regards the question of majority, I believe that the majority of the countries are developing countries. Why the Government of India has never explored the possibility of trying to bring them together to work out some kind of common strategy in their own interest?

I had raised a point in my submissions during the debate, but no reply has come. After hearing me on that day, Seaker, Sir, you asked the treasury benches to go into the Constitutional aspect of the points raised by me and to tell us their viewpoint. In the meantime certain petitions have been filed on this point in different High Courts of different States.

MR. SPEAKER. I said that everybody should study the Constitutional issue.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : it is a Constitutional right of the State or State Governments to deliberate upon the matters which come within their exclusive jurisdiction, matters which are reserved as State-subjects. The point was, when you are entering into an international treaty, whether you can - you being in the Union Government - try to ignore the rights of these States, not to consult with them or not to take their consent and trespass and transgress into an area which is exclusively reserved under the Constitution for the State Government. We are living in another federal structure. I would like to know whether the Government is trying consciously to upset this federal structure and provoke all kinds of opposition and trouble with the States.

We will be in great trouble. Mr. Jyoti Basu had asked a question and he had written a letter last year to the Prime Minister

saying that nothing should be finally agreed without consulting the State Government. But I am told and I want a clarification on this whether any reply was given to him or not and if not they not. It is a serious matter. Now the High Courts are looking into them. Let us see, what have to say on this.

Then, Sir, Mr. Chidambaram, here while speaking in the House, had quite obviously admitted that prices of drugs, pharmaceuticals and medicines are going to go up steeply. But he had also said that 40 per cent to 45 per cent increase is likely to take place. So, I would like to know from the Commerce Minister how we are going to protect the interests of the people in this country, if they are subjected to a regime in which they will have to pay very high prices for medicines, life-saving drugs and all that. Even at their present prices, most of the people in this country are not able to afford them. Is this to be taken as a gain, a gain that we are getting out of this agreement or is it a total loss? I want to know about this.

Then, Sir, I want to ask something about these seeds. I had raised it that day also. I am not talking about ordinary seeds which they say that the framers will have every right to go on. They can store them. They can exchange those seeds. They can use them after one crop and so on, but they cannot use them for any commercial purposes. They cannot sell them. But, what about the higher varieties of seeds which modern science is developing every day and which should be accessible to our framers also? Hybrid seeds, high-yielding seeds and other types of specialised seeds are not covered by this undertaking at all and they will have no access to these seeds. Those seeds will all be in the godowns of companies, multinational corporations like Cargill and all that. We are supposed to fight them. How can our framers afford to buy from these companies.

those important varieties of seeds at exorbitant prices? They would not be able to do it. So, will we not suffer? Will our agriculture not suffer? I want to know what is the reply to that question.

Finally, of course, it is an admitted fact and as Mr. Chidambaram had described, it is a cruel and unequal world. He had said a very true thing. We know that the playing field is not level. We are operating on a playing field where the powerful nations, with their disposal, are in a position to invade our markets. They are wanting them because of their own recession. So, access to our markets will be made much easier under this agreement. For example, I want to know from him whether we are under any compulsion now not to increase our own export subsidies. Are we allowed to increase export subsidies or will they be prevented? Are we allowed to raise import tariffs, if in some particular commodity or line we find that entry of those goods into our country, under lower customs tariffs are likely to have a very deleterious effect on our own domestic industries? So, you finish off our own indigenous industries which had been built up over the years with so much sacrifice and suffering. Are we allowed to do it viz. those import tariffs cannot be raised at all? They must be allowed access to our markets. I only want to have some answers to these questions, if the hon. Minister would enlighten us. I have got no time to go through this statement, otherwise, I would show that in every paragraph, in their own diplomatic language, there are expressions of reservations, of apprehensions, of discontentments with things that they had to agree to. It is written here, of course, in a very polite language, but we know what it means. It means that the Government of India is well aware of the fact we are going to be at a great disadvantage and our economy is going to be opened up and mortgaged to these

developed countries and stronger countries.

Therefore, finally, I would like to know - now after the 15th of December and upto the next day, next year, April or January or sometimes they say another one year; I do not know - when the final signing has to be done by us? Whether within this period - even if it is not a multilateral negotiation, but dealing with our main trade partners; they have got certain trading partners in the world with whom we have most of our trade, unequal trade perhaps, just as the multi fibre agreement says. We have agreed to allow the import of industrial fabrics much more. What is the meaning of the industrial fabrics? Will you please clarify it? Does it not mean those fabrics made out of these artificial fibres, man-made fibre? (Interruptions) Obviously, that is what they are interested in flooding our market with; and, though this multi fibre agreement has given us that much relief that it will be phased out within ten years instead of 15 years, but the Government have agreed that within this period, the import of what they call industrial fabrics from these countries will be stepped up: it will be allowed to come in greater quantities. And what will be the impact of that on our textile industry?

Please clarify some of these questions.

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA (Balasore): ! I want to know categorically a few clarifications. India is rich in three resources originally - forest resources, mineral resources and oceanic resources. In the Dunkel proposal, regarding these resources, what is the reflection of business? And how steps are being taken to protect biodiversity and mineral ores of our country properly and valued in the Dunkel proposal?

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri): I would like to have some clarifications from the hon. Minister of Commerce only on two points. Is

it a fact that India chose to keep a low profile in the second half of Uruguay-Round of Talks as reported in the press? A more active, high level, high level intervention by India could possibly have reaped more dividends. Is it true? Is it also true that we are unable to get more concessions on movement of skilled and unskilled labour and in the matter of trading cut through our exports and also in the quicker elimination of textile quota embargo? How would these affect the export of our traditional products like coir, which may even be included in the multi fibre and cashew, etc.

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADEV: (Jhanjharpur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know as to who is to fix the support price of foodgrains of the farmers, and whether the Price Commission, set up by the Government is likely to be wound to whether the food grains will be sold at international prices or some other prices? Who is going to fix the price of the paddy which is produced by the small, medium and marginal farmers?

MR. SPEAKER : Is there any problem in the matter of fixing prices?

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADEV: What policy has been adopted for fixing prices under this agreement? Is there any indication in this agreement to make the country self-reliant in this regard? The propaganda being made on Television is nothing but to ruin the ancient Indian culture. Indian rural and agricultural heritage is going to be certainly ruined what measures are going to be taken by the Government to protect the Indian Culture under this agreement? It is being said that the prices of life saving drugs or other ordinary drugs, being used but the poor are going to increase under this agreement, to by 40 to 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker: You may please mention the names of the medicines whose price are likely to increase and conclude.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV : It is my last question. There is no doubt that the multinational companies are coming here for business purposes. They are coming here to raise international market for their products. Our own will be finished. I would like to know the indications given in this agreement to overcome the problem of unemployment.

[English]

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum) : I have only one question to ask. Various concerns have been expressed, some of them are genuine and some of them are not. My only question is, as the concern has been expressed, if most of the conditions are disadvantageous to the country, the only option left out for this country is to opt out of the GATT Agreement. If that is so, what would be the impact and if we are to go in for bilateral agreement, how will it affect our interests?

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Gobichettipalayam) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the general apprehension is that the Dunkel Package, as it is in the present form, is highly detrimental to the interest of our country in many areas. Government has to convince the Members, as to how the Dunkel Draft is not going to affect the interest of the country.

Nothing new has come out in the statement of the Commerce Minister which he made yesterday. He has talked about certain benefits from the expansion of the world trade through Uruguay Round Agreement. I do not say that India should remain out of GATT but my contention is that before signing the agreement, some modification must be made in the areas of

agriculture, textile and Intellectual Property Rights.

MR SPEAKER : Your written statement is very comprehensive and very good. I think it replies all questions you are putting in.

SHRI P.G. NARYANAN: Government has to take the Parliament into confidence and reveal as to what is happening actually. Till date it is not known whether India has approved this Draft or not.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): Just one line preface first. It does seem that if the major group objects to any portion of the issues under the GATT then those subjects fall outside GATT as you have discovered. But it seems, if we object to it, it is the country which has to be out and not the subject. Under these circumstances, what is the mystifying is that there is scope for discussion; What is the mystifying date of 15th of December? That has a constraint that unless it is passed by 15th of December, unless the Agreement is initialled, certain dominating countries of the world will not be able to place it before their own representative Houses. If that be so, how is it claimed that there is still scope for further negotiations and further modifications, if these are to be placed before the Houses of those countries who are the major negotiators and have to be sanctioned, if they require six months' notice? I want clarification on that.

The second question that I want to ask is about the drug prices which I raised yesterday also. I want a categorical answer from the Hon. Minister What is his anticipation about the rise in the prices of drugs of the patented variety? Shri P. Chidambaram had mentioned that they would rise by about 45 per cent. But Press reports say that it will be more than two to three times. What is the estimate of the Government about this?

The third question which has come out is, that we are very keen in terms of GATT to have the Most Favoured Nations' treatment and it is also said from the United States which is a major partner, that there would be two sets of nations, one is of the Most Favoured Nations and another of the Most Most Favoured Nations. is it true and if that be so, how do we derive that kind of an advantage?

The hon. Minister is also the Deputy Chairman of the Planing Commission. Has there been any exercise which indicates - because of this free trade regime being introduced — what are the domestic industries which would be mauled and which would be wiped out? When the ho. Minister says that there are gains, what exactly does he mean by 'gains' and if there are gains in those terms what would be the quantum of losses in the economy?

The next question is what Shri Indrajit Gupta also mentioned.

MR SPEAKER: You need not mention it again.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : I am illustrating it. Despite the existence of an embargo of the United Nations the United States continued with its embargo on Cuba.

MR. SPEAKER : That question had been asked by more than one Member.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: The United States continued with its embargo on Cuba despite a unanimous condemnation in the United Nations and the question is despite the Multi-Trade organisation what are the instruments which will prevent them from imposing sanctions.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): My first clarification is with regard to process of negotiations. I am certain that at various stages of the talks the Government of India must have suggested some amendments or some alterations in the Draft. I would like to know from the hon. Minister exactly what drafts what alterations, formulations and amendments were submitted by us.

MR SPEAKER: He had explained them in his reply.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: He has not. That has not been touched.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: We would like to know exactly what we had asked for and what we got. Have we got nothing? If we got something left him tell us precisely with to each amendment, alteration presented by us as to whether it was accepted or not.

Secondly, we had a forum for economic negotiations the Group-77. I would like to know whether during the last one year the authority of that Groups-77 was at all invoked by the Government at any stage.

My third question is about exports. The hon. Minister has suggested here a figure of US \$ 1.5 to 2 billions annually in addition to the normal growth as the possible increase in our exports. We would like to know from the hon. Minister the basis on which he has arrived at these figures, sector-wise and market-wise because we want to understand where does the potential for growth lie in terms of this GATT Agreement.

My final question is, has the hon. Minister done this exercise that supposing we opt out of the GATT what is the quantum of loss that we would suffer in terms of our exports?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Chandigarh): I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the reference to the market areas in the field of textiles, cast some sort of mandatory obligations on the country to make some imports. Secondly, I want to know whether it is a fact that a very powerful multinational firm in the United States has accused President Clinton of selling out of the American interests in the field of textiles which would ultimately gain some supremacy for our country?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, It was made clear in the Background Paper prepared by the Commerce Ministry itself and - I am quoting from it:

" India is seeking improvements, changes and understandings in certain areas and the final view will require to be taken on the results of the negotiations at the conclusion of the Uruguay Round."

This was the solemn statement submitted before the House also. Now, I would like to know whether you have got any improvement, any change for the better in our favour or any understanding in our favour since the preparation of this Background Paper. And if so, which are those improvements, changes and understandings in our favour? Or is it that in spite of no benefits, changes or improvements being obtained we have signed because it seems to be the impression I get from the statement of the hon. Ministry, it could have been worse and, therefore, we have no alternative but to sign although all our efforts to seek changes have failed. I would like to know those areas in which you have asked for it.

Sir, other things have already been touched, I would like to know only one thing on the increase in export of 1.5 or 2 billion

dollars, as mentioned by you. I am not repeating the question. I would like to know what would be the increase in imports as a result of the globalisation and as a result of this agreement. Further, I would like to know whether it is a general agreement now and what will be the ultimate position.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Mr Speaker, Sir, you said that discussion on this subject had been going for the last 11 hours and no further discussion would be allowed. But it has remained under discussion in various countries for eight years and this agreements the result of their discussion to which our country is also a signatory. I think time of 11 hrs is not sufficient for such an impression issue because more and more questions are being raised everyday in this regard. Therefore, I would like to give you some suggestions. But before that, I would like to seek some clarifications regarding the statement of the Hon Minister

MR. SPEAKER. Sir, the Hon Minister made a statement yesterday; you may also have a copy of it in your hand. Page 4 of it is worth mentioning. The very first sentence of it exposes the Government to such an extent that in my view they should resign immediately on moral grounds; They say :-

[English]

"As regards the agreement on Trade Related Investment Measures, the position is that the Government retains its sovereign right to decide what type of foreign investment it wishes to allow into the country".

The Government retains its sovereign right. That means in other places you have

surrendered your sovereign right.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER, Sir, it is a very serious matter.

[English]

Sir, I am not indulging in semantics. To me, this betrays the whole exercise that has been done and the whole sell out of the country has occurred. This betrays- you call it a Freudian slip or you call it by any other name. The Government retains its sovereign right.

[Translation]

And what is that retention. For a minute, we may suppose that the sovereign right has been retained here. Please read the next sentence.

[English]

"Condition can also be imposed regarding fulfillment of export obligations to balance the outgo and inflow of foreign exchange by such ventures". That is to say, what type of foreign investment is to come. The next sentence is, I quote:

"The only requirement under the agreement is that once a unit has been allowed to come into the country it will be treated at par with other indigenous units in terms of regulations and policies".

[Transaation]

Everything is over. Nothing is left. Which companies are going to come has become clear. Nunz will come, Super Market area hss come who are selling potatoes, onions

and bananas etc of our own country.

[English]

13. 00 hrs.

Companies like Kentki Chicken and MacDonald are coming. Pepsi Cola Company has already arrived with hundred percent equity. Sauce and papad producing companies are also coming. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not joking. I am speaking seriously. We take many things lightly in this House. There is no area of take many things lightly in this House. There is no area of business likely to remain unencroached by foreign companies. I am happy that for the first time the hon Minister thought over it and made a statement. I do not know; there may be some officer in the Ministry who is against all these things and he might have been instrumental in presenting the real picture before the parliament and the country while writing a statement in this regard. Though I am not certain about it, but such things do happen at times.

MR. SPEAKER Sir, the situation has reached a point where our sovereignty has almost been surrendered I would therefore, like to know the correct position

[English]

AN HON MINISTER : Ask the question also.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Question is the sovereignty of the country.

[Translation]

Through you, would like to ask some concrete questions from the Hon Minister While the Hon Minister was making his statement he said in the first paragraph that the present system.

"Such a system confers the benefits of Most Favoured Nation (MFN) Treatment to all members."

[Translation]

If all the member countries meted out the most favoured treatment, then I fail to understand as to what is special for you.

[English]

We are being pushed into a new regime. The Government is literally acting as a part of this whole international establishment.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : For that, you will have to have a very theoretical approach of thought as to what is the most favoured nation.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Yes, we will have to have that approach.

MR SPEAKER : We are aware of some basic things about that and we have to base our discussion thereon.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I do accept it. What I mean to ask is what special is likely to be achieved if our country joins hand with 117 nations.

Now I would like to raise the next point which I had raised the day before yesterday also during the course of discussion and which was not replied to by the Home Minister. He, however, did mention that our trade would rise up from 1.5 billion dollars to 2.00 billion dollars and moreover he also expressed the hope that our export would increase. I would like to know the source from where he obtained such data. Is his

data based on the information laid down in 40 page pamphlet of O.E. C. D. ? I am seeing that the newspapers of India have also been presenting such things through their leading articles and the Government is also making similar statements, but the home Minister has not replied as to what is the source of the data presented by him. Has this data been received from GATT? In which particular document is that mentioned? Do you have the break up in that regard as to which particular trade is going to increase and to what extent? The Government have to its credit sustained efforts of 8 years. Can the Government state on the basis of its efforts of 8 years as to how did it present the data of 270 billion dollar. According to what is said to be the O.E.C.D. document the amount is likely to reach the figure 2 thousand billions after 10 years hence. It has also been mentioned in the document that the same has been prepared for the purpose of holding internal discussion. That should not be taken seriously. Then, from which source have the Government obtained that data? What is its basis?

MR SPEAKER, Sir, I am not going into details. When a few colleagues of ours were asking about P.D. S., they were not given proper reply. The Government have suffered a loss of 25 per cent in P.D. S. last year.

MR SPEAKER: I would repeat that he has said in his reply that it is not applicable for P.S. S. or for distribution. It is applicable on production.

[English]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: It is already getting dismantled.

MR SPEAKER: That is altogether a different thing.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: What is left then?

MR. SPEAKER: Will that agreement have some impact thereon or not? That is the question.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: It will have no impact.

MR. SPEAKER: He said that it is not applicable to distribution. It is applicable to production.

[English]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Under the IMF conditionalities, you have already started dismantling the PDS.

[Translation]

This is my allegation. I would also like to know about textiles. There was some scope in textile sector, but this Government could not do anything. Not only that, we have also just received the report of the Parliamentary Committee. It has been stated therein that during the evidence it was revealed that none of the measures taken by the Government could succeed. You have said in your statement that some countries tried to put pressure on us by saying that textile market would be a very difficult market for us. They argued that unless our country opens textile market for those countries, there would be no change in their policy. I would like to submit that textile producers themselves are Americans. They are going to import cloths after exporting their manufactured goods to Latin America under NAFTA. They are the members of the European Community.

They want to sell the products of their mills in Hongkong, Singapore and in poor countries of the third world. Now, how can India be kept away from that trap ?

It is said that situation will totally change within 10 years but many of us, sitting here will not be alive by then.

SHRI VILAS MUTTEMWAR (Chimur) :
May you live long.

Shri George Fernandes : All right, you good wishes many help me to live long. I would like to know the reason as to why the Government did not do anything in regard to generating employment opportunities in those areas where was possible. The hon. Prime Minister is present here. Weavers in his constituency are committing suicide. I would give him their names.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Here you are not supposed to deliver speech.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Will you not consider even this point ?

The matter belongs to the area which provides the largest number of employment opportunities in the country. Shri Venkat Swami is sitting here. He is working hard, but his labour is not being acknowledged since his views do not fit in with the new industrial policy of the Government.

MR. SPEAKER : You are supposed to ask questions only.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I would like to assert that the textile policy of the Government is a total failure. I ask whether the Government would think over a measure to bring the country out of that situation or are

we to follow the path dictated by Americans.

Now, I would like to know about 1 or 2 rights of the hon. Minister. Southerland is a prominent name in GATT. Next important. Persons is Mr. Anwarul Hoda whose interview has been published in The Business Today in the edition of 7 to 21 December.

[English]

The question put to him was :

"If the Uruguay Round does not conclude on time what will be its impact on the world economy?"

Mr. Minister, I would want you honest response to the reply which Mr. Hoda has given. His reply was :

"The the world will lose an important opportunity to strengthen and liberalise the trading system. This will affect the world economy in four major ways.

One-the industrialised West, especially the U.S. and the European Community, will find it difficult to climb out of its recession.

Two-East European economies will face hurdles in their reforms programme.

Three the trend in favour of creating regional trading blocks like the North American free trade zone and the E.C. will strengthen. And

Four-the trend towards protectionism will grow.

[Translation]

Please tell me do you agree with this thought ? What benefit and loss we will have from this ?

This is the Report of the Parliamentary Committee. It contains not only the conclusions of the committee Members but also has several view point given demand evidence. If a reply is not given in this regard in the House today, it may cause great harm.

MR. SPEAKER : Instead of asking about evidence, please ask about the conclusions.

[English]

You are asking opinion on opinion. Let us come to the conclusion.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Yes, Sir. Now, I come to the conclusions. I quote from paragraph 116. It says :

"The Committee is of the view that the Dunkel proposals would discriminate against Indian agriculture. The subsidies have to be limited to an upper bound of 10 per cent of the value of the output for developing countries. This may have grave implications for the poor resource farmers, because with increasing cost of energy and other inputs the sectorwise subsidy may exceed this limit."

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (Mayiladuturai) : Now, the sectorwise subsidy has been dropped.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : We want a clarification because this report was submitted to the House three days ago...*(Interruptions)***

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : All these things are not going on record.

(Interruption)...

SHRIGEORGE FERNANDES : Sir, now I read paragraph 119 of the report.

[Translation]

The next conclusion of the Committee is very complicated. The Finance Minister has come in time.

[English]

"The Committee is of the opinion that the issue of applicability of the provisions regarding minimum access for imports to India is not very clear. While the Commerce Ministry claim that India is in balance of payments crisis which it will continue to have in the near future, the Finance Ministry has been claiming that the crisis on the balance of payments front is a thing of the past, If the view of the Finance Ministry are to hold, India will have to import the minimum volume of imports that the Dunkel proposals stipulate."

[Translation]

What is your opinion in this regard ? We are aware of their opinion, but what is the opinion of the Ministry of commerce ?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Fernandes, according to Shakespeare, "Brevity is the soul of wit." So, please be brief.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : If we do not ask for a reply today, when else will we do so ?

[English]

I will now read paragraph 240 of the report. It says :

"The Committee is of the opinion that the integrated dispute settlement mechanism as provided for in the MTO is heavily loaded against developing countries like India. They can easily be subjected to cross-retaliation, despite the safeguards that the Dunkel Text provides. The Committee, therefore, is of the view that such provisions which will have far reaching implications should be accepted."

[Translation]

This is the opinion of the Parliament.

[English]

In paragraph 241 it says :

"The Committee is of the further opinion that in the existing scheme of Dunkel proposals regarding cross-retaliation, the developing countries like India have no means to retaliate against the developed countries. Further, the provisions regarding compulsory arbitration and the arbitrator's award need to be defined in unambiguous terms."

[Translation]

What you have to say in this regard ?

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to give some suggestions before concluding my speech. A Ministerial level meeting is yet to be held regarding GATT. But we oppose it, because we hold a firm opinion that we should not sign the GATT agreement and should remain outside it. While expressing this opinion, I am giving my suggestions.

1. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar has just said that several amendments have been made in the final draft of the Act of 20.12.1991 will day before yesterday. If it is true then I would not like to ask questions, but to give

suggestion.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : There will be reply also.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I want that the final draft of the Act alongwith all the amendments should immediately be Caid in the House.

2. We should be given the opportunity to go through all the appendices, which are in small print and contain thousands of pages.

3. The Government should make a statement in regard to the areas where we are getting benefits and the areas where we are at a loss due to this agreement.

4. The hon. Minister should also give an official statement regarding its effect on the prices of drugs and medicines.

5. It should also be stated as to which are the areas where 200 billion dollars will be earned, which is being repeatedly said here and which areas will involve imports. This issue was raised here by Shri Somnath Chatterjee.

6. The Parliament is going to adjourn on 24th. I would suggest that all the documents should be laid before the Parliament and in the month of January, special meeting can be held for two, three or more, days if necessary, for holding discussion on the Dunkel proposals only. So, a special sitting of the House can be called for, so that this House and this country can give its firm opinion before the ministerial level meeting is held.

7. The hon. Prime Minister is sitting

here. He told about G-77 and NAM 259 countries of the world are today members of United Nations and out of them, 117 nations are involved with GATT. Bicalateral talks can be held with the rest of the countries, who are not in GATT and our views can be presented to them. The Government should, therefore, immediately call a meeting of these countries in Delhi or at any place, and bear the needed expenditure, but a firm view should be placed before the world. It is the responsibility of our country to lead all those nations, which require leadership today, and it should accept that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, these are my 7 suggestions.

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH (Sheohar) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the 18th and 19th century, the developed countries of Europe and America used to exploit the underdeveloped countries with their gunboat diplomacy and used to rule them. The same is being done today by GATT, World Bank and IMF. It is not known why our country has become so helpless that even the meeting of G-77 has not taken place since last year. The Government has not initiated any step to give lead in this regard.

Secondly, our friends have asked about its effect on drugs. What you have to say in this regard ? A doubt has been expressed regarding the life saving drugs, particularly for cancer, leprosy and AIDS. The patents for these drugs have not yet been prepared. These are in the pipe-line and are waiting for the GATT agreement. It is apprehended that when the patents will be implemented, these drugs will be so costly, that these will be beyond the reach of the commonman of the country. So, what the Government is going to do in this regard ?

I want to know particularly about one

thing. Shri Balram Jakhar is the Union Agriculture Minister and also a big farmer. He had made promises that the agriculture would be protected. I would like to know whether the farmers of our country can export their agricultural produce to America ? Whether they can export fruits such as Oranges, Maltas, Grapes and Mangoes, which grow in your area also, to the countries of Europe and America ? They cannot do so. Will the Government take any initiative in this regard and whether this point will be discussed in the Ministerial level meeting ? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhuani : I too would like to speak on this issue.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Bhogendra Jha ji, I am repeating that whenever debates is any going to conclude, you start your speech. A senior Member like you should help me but you always create difficulties for me. Now it is difficult to give you an opportunity to speak, but not allow you is also difficult. Therefore, I am giving you an opportunity to speak. Secondly, if any minister speaks here, he speaks as a representative of the Government and if the Prime Minister wants to interview on a particular point he can do it, whenever he so desires. But if you want a reply in detail and on technical matters then Shri Pranab Mukherjee would reply.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, while discussing this agreement, whether this fact has been kept in view not that the three fourth of the farmers of this country are small and marginal farmers and those who are big farmers. *(Interruptions)...*

MR. SPEAKER : All are aware of these statistics.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA : I am coming to the point. Our biggest farmer is the smallest

as compared to that of North-America and Europe. So he cannot continue farming without subsidy, seeds and electricity. I would like to know whether this fact has been kept in mind that if they are unable to compete then they would be rendered unemployed after selling their land and the agriculture of the country that we have achieved by implementing land-celling Act will be ruined. Secondly, we have a patent law. I would not like to go in details of the patent law. If the Parliament refuse to amend it, the Government cannot dare to do that. What would be its consequences? Do the Parliament and this country have this right? Would our Prime Minister like that the Parliamentary system should be a failure? ... (*Interruptions*) .. There is no reference in the election manifest that Congress Government would sign the Dunkel Proposals... (*Interruptions*)... Is the Government ready for a new mandate? It is a question of our sovereignty as well as of economy. I would like to know whether the country is ready to face that situation? Again if there are any impurities in the seeds, who would have the powers to decide that, which authority will monitor the implementation of this agreement... (*Interruptions*)..

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : (Barh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Prime Minister should intervene.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER : You show me the rule under which the Prime Minister has to intervene. I will see it. If you are really serious about it, you will hear the hon. Minister. If you just say something, I am not accepting it. (*Interruptions*)...

[*Translation*]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Is the Prime Minister not going to speak on it should say something.

MR. SPEAKER. Mr. Nitish Kumar, Please sit down.

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE) : I would like first to clarify some of the issues which have been raised by the hon. Members. Particularly one point was raised by Shri George Fernandes earlier also and I think I gave the reply and he should be satisfied. What is the basis of the calculation on which I am saying that about 1.5 to 2 billion dollars gain would be there.

It is not very difficult now-a-days to get the figures of the world-wide Wall Street, For example in 1992 the total world trade was 3,38,000 billion US dollars.

Now, if you just take into account that as a result of the reduction of rate of tariff which has been aimed at and attempted by these discussions, if you try to calculate it on the basis of one percent increase, two per cent increase, three per cent increase-according to the UNCTAD study, the latest trend, the average annual growth is six to six-and-a-half per cent-from there, you get the figure. I need not go for any certified copy from anybody. This piece of information is available and on the basis of that, if we place our share of the overall world trade around one per cent, it may come to \$1.5 billions or it may come to \$2 billions. But that is not a very moot point in the debate. This is just a piece of information that I wanted to share with the hon. Members.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Is there no sectoral allocation? (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to make one request. I have listened with patience to all the clarifications which hon. Members wanted to seek. I will try to clarify it.

MR. SPEAKER : Let me stand up for a minute and say something. Well, I

congratulate the Members for the good speeches and the good questions they have asked. I would request you to patiently hear the reply.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : I would like to cover each point. If there is any omission, let the hon. Members ask me. I have nothing to hide here because this is a matter with which all of us are concerned.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : You cannot hide also !

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : But surely I can remove your misinformation. One point has been debated here repeatedly. The primary concern which was debated here on three matters, rather four matters, related to agriculture and our concept of food security. And the one point raised was whether our farmers would not get the support which they are getting from the Government today to carry on their agricultural programme as reflected in the subsidies which we are providing to them. What has been the improvement now ? The improvement has been as a result of the negotiations that earlier the 10 per cent was compartmentalised to product-specific and non-product specific. Now, it has been clubbed together. As a result of the clubbing together and the threshold level remaining at 20 per cent-10 plus 10- the scope of providing subsidies has increased substantially. Therefore, the question is whether the Government would be in a position to give this subsidy or not. It does not depend on what international obligations you are having. It depends on the capacity of the Government to give subsidy or not to give. If the Government has its capacity, it can give. To what extent can it give? The total subsidies which we gave in the base year of 1986-1989, taking the international price calculation into account, it is minus Rs. 19000 crores.

Therefore, one can easily imagine the scope if the Government has the capacity. But if the Government does not have the capacity, if the Government does not have the money, if it does not have the resources, then it cannot give subsidy from the Heaven. But nothing prevents in the agreement to give subsidies to the level which you want to give to support your agricultural programmes.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : If the Finance Minister wants, he can give. But he does not want to. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : This is the information I have. I would like to clarify it. I will now come to the question of BoP. (*Interruption!*) Of course, the Finance Minister is present here. He can clarify. He can intervene at any point of time.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He will nullify what you say !

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : What had he said? He said that we have improved the BoP situation. Surely, we have improved the BoP situation because today we are not to pledge our gold to get a few hundred million dollars. Surely, it is an improvement of the situation. But that does not mean that we have come out of the woods. Even if you take the trouble of reading the Eighth Plan Document where itself we have calculated and where we have pointed out that if we want to overcome the BoP crisis in future with which we were concerned so recently, our external support, as reflected in the Current Account deficit, should not go beyond 1.6 per cent of GDP in absolute terms it is US \$22 billions at the price level of 1991-92. Now, assuming for the time being the country comes out of the BoP cover.

Then what would be the scenario and what would happen? Yes, we shall have to

give access to import. But what is the type-binding we are having? It is hundred per cent for cereals, 150 per cent for processed agricultural products and 300 per cent for edible oils. Do you not consider that this type of, this level of tariff protection is adequate to protect the interests of the Indian farmers? Who is going to make money by importing agricultural products by paying hundred per cent duties on cereals, 150 per cent duties on processed agricultural products and 300 per cent duties on edible oils? Where is he going to sell his products in the Indian market? So, how is it going to affect? So far as agricultural agreement is concerned, it will be operated for a period of seven years. The base year has already been fixed-1986-89. The level of subsidy which we have given there, which we have indicated and placed on the table of negotiation, is the final one in respect of us, in respect of any other country. Nobody can re-open it before this agreement comes to a conclusion after seven years. Assuming from the date of 1.1.95, the Dunkel, the Uruguay Round or the New GATT of 1993-let us talk in that term because Dunkel and Uruguay Round both have become obsolete and now it is New GAAT 1993-it comes to be operative after January 1995, then the agricultural agreement will be in operation up to 2000. You can re-open in 2001 in the sixth year depending on the condition prevailing at that point of time and every contracting party will re-negotiate. Therefore, we are not going to compromise on subsidy.

Why did the question of PDS come? It came because of some language, some phrases in the text. And when this information was out, they accepted our view and necessary amendments have been brought in the text. Our public distribution system is not going to be affected.

Another point has been raised and I

was really amused to hear that. Yes, it is going to help these industrialised countries not to have recession and it is going to help us because if there is a recession in the industrialised countries, who is going to buy our goods? Where are you going to export? In heaven? It is the industrialised countries who have the capacity to buy. It is the industrialised countries' recession which put us on the map in the early eighties. That is why in the first three years of the Sixth Plan there was a steady export growth because there was tremendous recession in the industrialised countries. What is GATT? GATT since its inception, is meant for creating this liberal trade. If liberalism is a dirty word to use, do not go for GATT. GATT is basically meant for creating a liberalised trade atmosphere by reducing tariff by opening the market, by creating the level ground for all. Of course, the developed countries would have an advantage because they control it totally. We shall have to be realist.

Now coming to the third question and these are certain technical issues-I do not know whether I have replied to the hon. lady Member Shrimati Malini Bhattacharaya about Article 18. Article 18 provides that some facilities in the developing countries will be in regard to qualitative restrictions or tariff restrictions in respect of import. And that facility is going to be continued in the GATT 1993. Therefore, it is not being withdrawn. So far as the GATT and it will phase out. The GATT 1993 will consist of the Agreements, which I referred to in this statement, I am not repeating that in the new organisation which is going to operate these agreements will be MTU. Therefore, article 18 which we are relating to because one should not look into my statement in isolation. It is in continuation of the reply to the debate and it is also in continuation to the overall developments which are taking place since the negotiation.

SHRIMATI

MALINI

BHATTACHARYA : Is India going to be regarded as one of the least developed countries? That is the difference which is going to be there.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Why should we be a least developed country? There are landlocked countries, small countries, tiny countries and each country have their own definition. Why should we like to be considered as a least developed country?

SHRI MALINI BHATTACHARYA : In that case, you would not have the facility. That is the point.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Otherwise, you do not get the benefit of article 18.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : There is no need for getting his benefit. The moot question was : whether or not India is going to get this benefit. You do not change your position. You can change it and I do not mind. You wanted to know, what would be the position of article 18, when the transition takes place. My reply to that is, article 18 is going to have a new form in the new GATT of 1993. And the reference, whether India will get this advantage or not, that is a different question. Why should we like to be treated as a least developed country after seven Five Year Plans? I do not like that.

SHRIMATI

MALINI

BHATTACHARYA : That is the point of the whole question.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : One hon. Member raised the question as to what type of benefit we have in Multi-Fibre Agreement (MFA). I will request, particularly, Shri George Fernandes to keep in view,

because he was the Industry Minister immediately after the Tokyo Round of discussions, the fact that for the last twenty years, we are trying that the MFA should go and textiles should be brought within the discipline of GATT. Is it a fact or not? If it is a fact, is it not an improvement that for the first time, after seven rounds of GATT discussions, at least, there is a definitive period that after ten years, it is going to be integrated? Even in Tokyo Round, the developed countries straightaway refused; even, till the last moment, there was a serious attempt to expand the transition period from ten to fifteen years. When negotiations were going on, there was tremendous pressure that bilaterally if we do not open up our market for their textile products, they are not going to allow us to have the concessions, the nominal growth, which are likely to emerge as a result of this integration, during the transition period.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You have opened the market for what they call as industrial fabrics.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : I am coming to that. Yes, we have opened the market for industrial fabrics like bulletproof jackets which we do not manufacture; we have opened the market for those types of garments and industrial overhaul which we are not producing, which are being used by the Fire Brigade people and we are permitting certain specialised industrial overhauls. And this is not a new thing. Already, about \$ 1200 million worth of textile items come through various routes including the special Advance Licensing Mechanism route.

My colleague from the Ministry of Textiles is also present here and as and when the situation demands, he will definitely share the information with you.

But, if I find that by opening up my market, to some extent, I will get a larger advantage by entering into their market, then, it is a question of judging and making a balance of advantages. So far as this issue is concerned, yes, we have agreed to reduce the tariff rates. Taking 1990 as the base year-in agriculture, I have already indicated the tariff to you-in certain other areas, we have reduced it. This is within the overall policy framework of us. The Chelliah Committee also had made this recommendation; various other Committees also have made recommendations.

. Much has been said about the sovereignty. Why did this question of sovereignty come? I would not have liked to use that phrase at all. Day in and day out, it was pointed out that we are going to compromise our sovereign rights. All 117 countries, have they compromised their sovereign rights when they accepted this?

Mr. Speaker. Sir, you will appreciate the fact that even U.S.A. had to come back and concede certain things. What did they want? They wanted that semiconductors should not be within the discipline of the compulsory licensing. And when they had to concede on that, to the demand of the EEC, are they compromising their sovereign rights of when EEC countries are going to concede to the fact that they will have to reduce the support which they are giving to their Aviation industries, are they compromising their sovereign interests? In an international agreement, in certain areas you will have to give in and in certain areas, you will have to take in.

Sir, you will appreciate the fact that 450-page document is not available with us and we cannot go into each clause, each section and each schedule; and schedules will run into thousands of pages.

Therefore the total quantification of loss and gain will have to be made. Somebody has asked what has been the loss and what has been the gain. It is not a question that we are making some sort of arrangements on these issues quantifying them.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
That is what you said.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Yes, gain is there if the international atmosphere is less protective, if the international trading arena is less protective.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTICATTERJEE :
How do we gain?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : We gain because we have the competitive advantage in certain areas.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTICATTERJEE :
It is the multinationals who gain always.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : We are gaining Mr. Chatterjee, if you are not blind to the development. Even in the last eight months our export has grown to the extent of 20 per cent in US dollar terms despite losing a very important market of erstwhile Soviet Russia, now CIS countries, which accounted for nearly 34 per cent of our exports. There has been a sharp decline to the extent of 62 per cent only in the year 1992-93. Despite that if we have a positive growth in the last eight months, this is an indication that we are also improving. But, nonetheless we did never claim that we are a major player; I did never say that I am a major player.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTICATTERJEE :
In a free trade only major players gain.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : My

point is, as I am not a major player my maneuverability to that extent is limited...*(Interruptions)*... Yes, I am a player, I am going to be a player.

Last time I concluded by saying that all of you endorsed the policies of the Government which we were pursuing till the other day and I have no doubt after six or seven years you are going to endorse the same policies. That Sir, is entirely evident as some of the hon. Members here speaking from that side were in the interregnum period in the Government and I did not find from the document anywhere that they had a different approach because these negotiations were going on from September 1986 till yesterday. I did not find anywhere that they had a totally different approach from what we are having. Let us not go to that aspect. I know that.

Now I come to the question of what type of sui generis protection we will have. Shri Rao has raised it and it is a very pertinent question whether it is UPOV 1978 or UPOV 1991. My submission is, we need not imitate any model because the provisions are given to us. This is an area where I would like to seek your guidance, where I would like to seek your cooperation. The Minister of Agriculture has appointed a small group to look into the frame of legislation which we shall have to enact where we can protect our farmers' interests.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : How ?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : I am seeking your suggestions. If you have anything, you come out. *(Interruption)*

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARARAO VADDE : You cannot protect the farmers' interests.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Do

not get excited.

My limited point is that we will have to make a national legislation. We have got to do that. What have we tabled? The conditionalities which we have tabled there are that we are not going to accept the patenting of seeds. It is not acceptable to us - patenting of macro organisms in live forms and naturally occurring genes. The arrangement is that we shall have to give protection in some form. We shall have to provide for plant breeders' rights and if we want to provide that it will have to be provided in the national legislation. What would be the format of national legislation in which we can provide this protection would be worked and precisely for this purpose the Agriculture Minister has appointed a small group. If you have any suggestion, that according to you this is the way we can protect in the legislation our farmers' rights, you can give that.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Within the terms of the GATT 1993.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : I am talking of the GATT terms. I am not talking about anything else right now.

I have already touched the DoP cover. Now I come to the question of developing countries and the common strategy. It is known to you what common strategy we had and how one country after the other fell on the wayside. We had it with 37 countries, not one. They, under the leadership of the President of Argentina, wrote a letter to President Clinton, to the British Prime Minister, to the Japanese Prime Minister that we want successful conclusion.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO) : Sir, it is all well-known. I do not think, we should mention names. The point is that the solidarity with which the

negotiations started did not last long enough to sustain our position because the conditions were different in different countries; I am not blaming any country. But, these facts are well-known; I do not think, we should mention names.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : So, it is known. They wanted the conclusion of the Uruguay Round of Talks on the basis of the Dunkel Text. Therefore, let us not go into the aspects of what G-77 did and what others did.

Secondly, it is an area where we shall have to keep in view certain conflicting interests which are there. Even in the area of textiles, some of the developing countries have higher quota. They find that if India does not get higher quota, it will be advantageous to them. They can take the raw materials from us, put their craftsmanship, add value to that; and on the basis of that, they can expand their exports. Here, everybody would like to go according to one's own national interest.

Now, if you want to come out of that system, who can prevent you from coming out of that system, if you want to choose it? So far as the old GATT was concerned, the notice for sixty days was required. But, so far as the new arrangement is concerned, if you decide not to go there, you can come out by giving a notice of six months. Nobody prevents you. But, what would be the great advantage you will have? Then, with whom will you have to deal? You have to deal with these mighty economic powers which account for 70 per cent of our external trade. *(Interruption)* Let us be very fair. They account for 70 percent of our external trade. Now this question comes. If we cannot have favourable terms with them in the discussions under a multilateral umbrella, what is the guarantee that we will get concessions?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
Because we are in India.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : So what? *(Interruptions)* So what? You will have to take into account... *(Interruptions)* Sir, most respectfully, I will submit. I am not talking of the size of the population, I am not talking of the largest democracy which we are having. I am talking of and we are discussing today about 'trade'. What is our total import? What is our total export? What is the share in the international trade? Last year, our exports accounted for 18 billion US dollars. Last year our import was 21 billion US dollars. So, total was, 18 plus 21, it is 39 billion dollars, of 3,38,00 billion dollars. So, what is the percentage?

We have not opened up. It is really the dichotomy under which we are suffering. If you open your economy, then you will have strength. You say, "Do not open the economy; keep it closed." At the same time, you are expecting that in the trade arena, you will play a major role! These two things cannot go side by side. *(Interruptions)* In regard to the investment, where is the question of compromising our sovereignty? *(Interruptions)* In regard to the investment, Sir, where is the scope of compromise? What we have said and what is the stated position is this, that every country like India will decide which foreign companies they will allow, which foreign investment they will allow and in which areas. Nobody asks us to open our door. Where you would open, to what extent you would open and where you would allow the foreign investment, etc. depend on us. When we passed the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1991 which got the endorsement of this House itself and when we opened 34 sectors for investment from abroad to the extent of 51 per cent equity participation, then, this Text was not finalised. At that time, '15th December 1993' was not

there. It was our own volition and it was our own decision that we would like to open these sectors for investment from abroad. What is now demanded is this. If you open one area, you cannot make discrimination. Most respectfully I would like to submit that we have never made any discrimination; rather, we have even favoured to some extent. In 1969 when we nationalised the commercial banks, we did not nationalise the foreign banks.

SHRINIRMAL KANTICATTERJEE

: And gave them special facilities?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : No.

We did not give any special facilities nor you are going to give them any special facilities. India is known for non-discriminatory treatment to the investor. Yes, in certain areas, we were closed up to some point of time. Now, we are opening. But it is our own decision. If we do not want to open, there is no compulsion that we shall have to open it, particularly, in respect of the investment to the protection of the small-scale industry. There itself is a policy statement. We are not going to discuss the whole range of the economic policies within the purview of this debate. (*Interruptions*)

Coming to the drug prices, as I mentioned, 80 per cent of the drugs which are being used in India today are outside the patent. But somebody says that, no, it is 85. Fifteen to twenty per cent of the drugs are patented. Now, what is going to happen? Even that pipeline protection will perhaps be from 1990 to 1995, for a period of five years. After 1.1.1995, if some company gives patentee right of some medicine in some country, till we make our laws, whichever is earlier, I am assuming that we will make our laws at the end of the year-you will have to give the exclusive marketing rights.

But two safeguards are there. One safeguard is compulsory licensing. Another safeguard is the inherent right of the Government. If they find that certain prices are going to be exorbitant and beyond reach and it is going to affect the health programme of the Government, the Government will always have the inherent right of intervening. Government can apply price control mechanism to ensure that the prices do not go beyond the reach of the common people nor it upsets the health programme.

SHRIMATI

MALINI

BHATTACHARAYA : What are the conditions under which compulsory licensing is allowed?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Only one criterion would be there, that is, the sovereign Government of the country comes to its conclusion that the behaviour of the patent-holder is detrimental to the interests. (*Interruptions*) Yes, that is there. (*Interruptions*) Let us not go to the debate. That is my reading. If I am incorrect, I will come and I will subject myself to the correction. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI

MALINI

BHATTACHARAYA : The applicant has to go to the patent-holder. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE :

Exclusive marketing rights in our case will have to be given not from 1995 but from 1.1.2000. That means, after seven years.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : When the application for the patent is pending, that applicant for the patent during that interim period will be given exclusive rights of marketing in the country.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE :

Exclusive marketing rights for five years:

yes, I admitted that point.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Why should that be done? Why should he be given exclusive marketing rights?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : India has to submit !

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : No, not submitting. (*Interruptions*) There is no question of compromise. (*Interruptions*)

Then, I come to the last point. What was the significance of 15th December? I explained it a number of times that the official level negotiators were appointed. They were given a date from September, 1986 to December, 1993. Seven years are enough. No other round has taken so much time. So, negotiations have been completed. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Trade and so many things were brought in. That is why so much time has been taken.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Yes, that is true. But still there is some delay. You should appreciate that because of our persistent pressure, the financial service sector is out. (*Interruptions*)

What has happened? Other matters like Trade Related Investments, Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights, are being brought. After all, the world scenario is also changing very fast.

With the types of technological revolutions which are taking place in various fields, surely the scenario in which GATT was originally conceived in the post Second World War is no longer there. Another point should be kept in view that some of the countries got favourable terms in bilateral

arrangements in the context of the Cold War. I would not like to mention the name of the country because Prime Minister has very correctly pointed out that it is not desirable to do so but you know a particular country and about the facilities which they got before 1985 and what they got very recently. Two countries were given only one year period to change their patent law and here, we have got ten years to change our patent law. That is the difference between bilateral and multilateral arrangements. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do consider the points which the hon. Members raised and I have tried to clarify them. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : He has not replied to a lot of questions raised by me.

MR. SPEAKER : My ruling is this that he has replied to the majority of questions... (*Interruptions*) Mr. Speaker : Please ask the next question. Why are you creating a dispute on this point?

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : My submission is that had two options in the GATT go in for sui either to accept the patent or generic. The Government had submitted that they were not going to accept patenting of life form, the patenting of naturally occurring genes. It is a very good idea but GATT has asked either take it or leave it. Now, want to know as what is the position in this regard... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Please address the chair.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : This is Parliament. Please listen. They have talked about Sui generic system. We wanted to know the way the rights of the farmers in India would be protected under this

system...(Interruptions).. They have tried to be fool the nation through this House. You are saying that the farmers have the right to retain the seeds. Should the right to multiply the seeds or to sell the seeds be with the farmers or not because two-third supply of seeds is made by multiplying and selling them by the farmers. He has not replied that point (Interruptions)...

[English]

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : So far as replanting is concerned, they will have the right to retain and to replant. So far as sale is concerned, as I mentioned while replying to the debate, patented seeds by packaging and levelling with commercial sale will not be permissible; exchange is possible, retention for replanting is permissible...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : This policy would enslave the farmers... (Interruptions)

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Nothing will go on record except Mr. George Fernandes's statement.. (Interruptions)**

MR SPEAKER : Mr. Nitish Kumar, what you have protested has gone on record. You allow him to speak now.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : When I asked how that two hundred billion dollars will be earned, the hon. Minister stated that it is a simple mathematics. Two hundred billion dollars is increasing every

year because the growth rate during the last decade is 5.5 percent. You are not clarifying the point, how is it rising with the great efforts done by you. I am asking this point third time today but the answer is not coming. You should stop these misleading statements.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, one of my seven suggestions was that before signing any agreement in Geneva or at any other place, the hon. Minister should make statement in the House...(Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : With regard to international agreements this procedure is not followed.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : The hon. Prime Minister is present here. I would like to know the reaction of the Government there to,

[English]

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : I would like to clarify one point. I thought that it is known to the hon. Member as to which are the major components of our export basket. Or is it not known to you?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Sir, he has been caught; the Government has been caught...(Interruptions)...(Not recorded.) They have no way of saving themselves.

MR. SPEAKER : This portion is not going on record.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Sir, I am on my legs. It is not a fair comment from a senior Member like him.

MR. SPEAKER : It is not part of the record.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I did not say about him, Sir. I said about all those who have been making such a campaign. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : That is not a very major point in a very substantive debate like this even assuming that I am wrong...(*Interruptions*).. I am sticking to it...(*Interruptions*).. You are doing the sell-out and nobody else. It is your responsibility. I am not going for that. The only point which I am trying to clarify is about the sui generis system which Mr. Nitish Kumar wanted to know. He wanted to know the way of protection of the farmers. We are going in for sui generis. There is no fixed pattern for sui generis and I have also suggested that it is not necessary that we should imitate. (*Interruptions*)

14.00 hrs

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Is the hon. Prime Minister going to intervene because it is a very serious matter ?

MR. SPEAKER : The Minister has replied on behalf of the Government.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : We want to know whether the Prime Minister is going to add anything. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I think your agreements are more powerful than your protestations.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the questions raised by the hon. Members during the entire discussion have not been replied to. Shri Fernandes gave pointwise suggestions. It is clear from

the reply of the hon. Minister that these suggestions have not been accepted by him. The Government have given evasive replies on the questions pertaining to agriculture and seeds etc. One can put forth one's view point quite forcefully but the important thing is that when views of both the sides are presented, they should be taken care of and should be attended too. 107 countries are covered under the fresh proposal and developed countries among them are only seven. Decision on Uruguay Round talks could not be arrived at because of the differences among seven most industrialised nations of the world. As soon as the differences were resolved by these nations among themselves, pressure for signing the Treaty was mounted. Questions pertaining to agriculture, medicine, industry and open market have not been properly replied to. Economic subservience scenario has not changed. Statements made in the House in this regard are simply misleading. Even apprehensions of the people of India in this regard have not been removed. Therefore, I stage a walkout from the House along with my colleagues.

14.03 hrs.

At this stage, Shri Sharad Yadav and some other hon. Members left the House

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER : I thank all the Members for participation. The House stands adjourned till 3 p.m.

14.04 hrs.

The Lok Sabha Then Adjourned for Lunch till Fifteen of the Clock