

महोदया, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे विवर मंत्री ने जो यह नया बजट पेश किया है इसमें स्मॉल-स्केल और कटिज इंडस्ट्री की पूरी तरह से हल्का होने की स्थिति पैदा हो गई है। ये सब बंद हो जाएंगे और 3 करोड़ लोग बेरोजगार हो जाएंगे। अगर उनके ऊपर एक्साइज का बोझ डाल दिया गया तो ये मल्टी-नेशनल कंपनियों का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकेंगे। इसलिए मेरा अनुरोध है कि ये जो 393 नोटिफिकेशन रद्द किए गए हैं, इनके पुरानी जगह पर वापस लिया जाए और जो यह 2100 करोड़ रुपए का बोझ स्माल-स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज और कटिज इंडस्ट्रीज पर डाला गया है, इसको वापस लिया जाए नहीं तो इन 3 करोड़ लोगों के बेरोजगार होने का अंदेशा पैदा हो जाएगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now that matter is over.

As suggested, now we are not taking up Special Mentions. We are going to take up the GATT discussion. Mr. Jaipal Reddy, your name is first.

If the House agrees, we can adjourn now for lunch, half an hour ahead, and resume the discussion after lunch.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): We can dispense with the lunch hour.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why do you want to dispense with the lunch hour?

DR. BIPLAB DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): How long will we continue?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That depends on how soon we finish it... (Interruptions) ...

What I was suggesting is that we will have one hour discussion. Then we will have one hour lunch break. So, it is better... if the Minister agree that we have lunch hour now?

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): In fact, the day before yesterday when I suggested that we would like to finish it before lunch dispensing with the lunch hour, at that time I was under the impression that the issue would be taken up in the Lok Sabha. But because of the sad demise of a Member, as the Lok Sabha has adjourned, I have no problem if we have the normal transactions. But I would request if you could finish it at least before 5.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That we would do, but what I was suggesting was we have only half an hour to the lunch-break and if we adjourn half an hour early and resume at 2' O clock, that

would be much better and the discussion will not be... (Interruptions) So the House agrees. O.K. The House is adjourned for lunch till 2 of the clock.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one minute past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two minutes past two of the clock.

The Vice-Chairman (Shri Shankar Dayal Singh) in the Chair.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Clarification on Statement by Minister Regarding Concluding Ministerial Meeting of Uruguay Round

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश): मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, जो आज के एजेंडा में है और जिस पर जयपाल रेड्डी जी स्पष्टीकरण पूछने जा रहे हैं। इस पर 19 अप्रैल को माननीय वाणिज्य मंत्री जी ने अपना वक्तव्य दिया था। जो मंत्रिपरिषद् होती है उसका संयुक्त दायित्व होता है। आज केन्द्रीय मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्री का उद्घरण इस सिलसिले में छाया है, उनके न्युज समाचार पत्र में प्रकाशित हुए हैं...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह): पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है। सबने इसको पढ़ा हुआ है। केवल आप अपनी व्यवस्था का प्रश्न बताइये।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: मैं पढ़ता नहीं हूँ। उन्होंने कहा है कि इस विषय पर एक कैबिनेट कमेटी बनी थी जिसका अध्यक्ष उनको बनाया गया था। उस कमेटी ने रिकमेंडेशन दी है और वह रिकमेंडेशन यह है कि पार्लियामेंट में बहस, विवाद, विचार-विमर्श होने से पहले अपोजिशन से इसमें कंसल्ट किया जाए। पार्लियामेंट में बहस हुई 29 और 30 तारीख को...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Mr. Vice-Chairman, where is the point of order?

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Mr. Narayanasamy, you are not in the Chair. I have not yet completed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): Mr. Narayanasamy, I would request you to kindly take your seat.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Kindly hear me for a minute.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Mr. Narayanasamy, fortunately you are not in the Chair. Let me complete. मेरा निवेदन यह था कि मंत्रिपरिषद् का

संयुक्त दायित्व होता है। अर्जून सिंह जी ने इस संबंध में अपना वक्तव्य दिया है। यह वक्तव्य आज ही के समाचार पत्र में छपा है जबकि वाणिज्य मंत्री ने 19 अप्रैल को अपना वक्तव्य दिया था। इस पर मैं केवल यह जानना चाहूंगा कि आखिर सत्यता क्या है। इस पर क्लेरीफिकेशन होने से पहले—क्योंकि 19 अप्रैल के बाद यह वक्तव्य आया है, इसलिये मेरा यह व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं मालवीय जी को सपोर्ट करता हूँ। यह एक नया मोड़ है और अब यह एक नया विषय बन गया है।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : हम संसद में, राज्यासभा के मंत्री जी के बयान के ऊपर चर्चा कर रहे हैं। यह एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण विषय है और इस बारे में काफी चर्चा हो चुकी है। लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि मंत्री महोदय यहां पर भारत सरकार के पक्ष में एक बयान देते हैं और उसके ऊपर हम लोग अपनी राय, अपने सवाल और अपना स्पष्टीकरण मांगने जा रहे हैं। लेकिन जो क्लेक्टिव रिस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी की बात है और जब संसद सत्र में चल रहा है तो उस समय मंत्रिमंडल के एक वरिष्ठ सदस्य अगर अपना बयान बाहर देते हैं तो यह व्यवस्था के खिलाफ है, जो क्लेक्टिव रिस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी मंत्रिमंडल की है उसके खिलाफ है। अगर कोई मंत्री इस बयान से संतुष्ट नहीं है तो इसका मतलब है कि इसमें एक राय नहीं है। इसलिये मंत्रिमंडल के उस सदस्य को सदन में आकर अपना बयान रखना चाहिये और उन्हें सदन में अपनी बात का स्पष्टीकरण देना चाहिये। लेकिन बाहर, प्रेस में जब कि सदन में इस बारे में चर्चा की जा रही है, उस समय यह बयान देना गलत है और यह संसदीय परम्परा के विरुद्ध है।

श्री मुहम्मद सलीम : हम संसद में राजीव साहू के मंत्री जी के बयान के ओपरेटिव रहे हैं। मैं यह बयान बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण मानता हूँ और इस बार से मैं काफी चर्चा हो चुकी है। लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि मंत्री महोदय यहाँ पर बयान देते हैं और सदन में चर्चा होती है, उस समय यह बयान देना गलत है और यह संसदीय परम्परा के विरुद्ध है।

اپنے سوال اور اپنا پیشگی کرن مانگتے جارہے ہیں لیکن جو کلیکیٹیو ریسپونسیبلیٹی کی بات ہے اور سبب سند ستر چل رہا ہے تو اس سے منتری منڈل کے ایک ورثت سدرتے اگر اگر اپنا بیان باہر دیتے ہیں تو یہ ویو سترقا کے خلاف ہے جو کلیکیٹیو ریسپانسیبلیٹی منتری منڈل کی ہے اس کے خلاف ہے اگر کوئی منتری اس بیان سے سندتھ نہیں ہے تو اس کا مطلب ہے کہ اس میں ایک رائے نہیں ہے۔ اس لئے منتری منڈل کے اس سدرتے کو سدرن میں آکر اپنا بیان رکھنا چاہئے اور انھیں سدرن میں اپنی بات کا پیشگی کرن رکھنا چاہئے۔ لیکن باہر پریس میں جبکہ سدرن میں اس بارے میں چرچہ کی جارہی ہے۔ اس سے یہ بیان دینا غلط ہے اور یہ سند سے پرمیئر کے ورودھ ہے۔

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : Let the Minister answer.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर बहाल त्रि३) : नो नो, आप मेरी बात सुनिये। क्लेक्टिव नाट हियर भी फस्ट ? व्यवस्था का प्रश्न जो मालवीय जी ने उठाया और जो सलीम साहब ने कहा तो यह तो बेयर का दायित्व है कि वह प्रश्न का उत्तर दें। मंत्री जी तो आफ्टर दि क्लेरीफिकेशन उत्तर देंगे। आप जानते हैं कि 251 के अंतर्गत उन्होंने स्टेटमेंट दिया है और मंत्री जी का बयान क्लेरीफिकेशन पूछने के लिये आया है। जो व्यवस्था का प्रश्न मालवीय जी ने उठाया है यह व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं है। यह एक विचार का प्रश्न हो सकता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय जब जवाब देने लगेंगे तो जिन मुद्दों को आपने और सलीम साहब ने उठाया है, उनके बारे में वे जवाब देंगे।

श्री सत्यप्रकाश मालवीय : अगर पहले ही मंत्री जी अपने विचार इस पर प्रकट कर दें तो माननीय सदस्यों को इस बारे में प्रश्न पूछने में आसानी होगी

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर बयाल सिंह) : यह तो मंत्री जी पर निर्भर है। मैं इस बारे में उनको स्ट्रेस नहीं कर सकता। अगर वे चाहें तो अपनी बात कहना चाहते हैं तो आई केन अलाऊ हिम।.. (व्यवधान)... आप बैठ जाइये गौतम जी।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम : एक वरिष्ठ मंत्रिमंडल के सदस्य ने स्पष्ट कहा कि कैबिनेट में जो निर्णय लिया गया था, उसके विरुद्ध यह काम है। इसलिए प्रधानमंत्री जी को आकर सदन में स्पष्ट करना चाहिये कि वास्तविकता क्या है।

شری محمد سلیم : ایک ورثت منتری منڈل کے سدھیتے نے سپیشٹ کہا ہے کہ کیبنٹ میں جو نرنے لیا گیا ہے اس کے ورودھیه کام ہے اس لیے پر دھان منتری جی کو آکر سدن میں سپیشٹ کرنا چاہیے کہ واسنوکنا کیا ہے۔

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The point our friends and I are trying to make is this. The Commerce Minister made a statement on behalf of the Government and, naturally, on behalf of the Central Cabinet. If a senior member of the Central Cabinet is not in agreement with it and if he chooses to air his difference of opinion in public, can we take it that this is the view of the Government at all? Was the matter discussed in the Cabinet? Was the Cabinet kept in the dark? Who authorised Mr. Pranab Mukherjee to sign at Marrakesh? That is the question.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to clarify the position which has been referred to by Malaviyaji, Reddyji and some other friends. Even if they study the statement which appeared in the name of the Human Resource Development Minister, they will find that he himself has said there that this was decided in the Cabinet and he shares the joint responsibility. He explained in the statement or the news item which appeared why he did not ... (Interruption).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Cabinet Sub-Committee.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : I am coming to the position of the Cabinet Sub-Committee. He himself has said that it is a joint responsibility and it was decided by the Cabinet. When somebody asked him whether he disagreed with it, he said that there was no question of

that. That news item has appeared in various newspapers and I myself have read it. Some news item appeared in the Press that he was supposed to speak in Lok Sabha and there was a lot of speculation in the Press. He wanted to clarify why he did not speak in Lok Sabha. But it is not that he disowned what has been done or that it is not a Cabinet decision. So, I would like to inform Shri Jaipal Reddy, "Of course, it is a Cabinet decision and I was authorised by the Cabinet to do it." Otherwise, what is my locus standi to put my signatures there? Nobody is coming out of that. Mr. Arjun Singh is very much a part of it. So far as the Cabinet Committee is concerned, there is a history. The Dunkel Draft was available in 1992. A Cabinet Committee, under the Chairmanship of the HRD Minister, was appointed to have discussions and, in fact, I have got a list of the persons with whom Mr. Arjun Singh and a group of Ministers interacted. It is a long list. A large number of people including the representatives of various apex industrial bodies, individuals, Members of Parliament, the leaders of the Opposition, met him and expressed their views. In fact, a one-line recommendation was made by a group of Ministers that it should be discussed in the House and as I mentioned earlier, from the side of the Ministry of Commerce, we gave as many as 17 notices to raise the discussion. But unfortunately, the discussion, in that sense, could not take place before December 1993 and what the circumstances were are known to all. Mr. Arjun Singh referred to another round of discussion in yesterday's Press statement. Perhaps, some Members are mixing up the two sets of recommendations. What he referred to is this. He wrote me a letter and that has also appeared in the Press, seeking certain clarifications and these clarifications are not of his own. These points were raised by someone who got in touch with him and he wanted to have clarifications from me and I sent the clarifications. In between, he had gone to Egypt. After coming back from Egypt, he got it. That also has been referred to in the Press statement. Thereafter it was suggested whether, before the meetings of 29th and 30th in Lok Sabha, there could be another round of discussion with the political parties. But he himself has mentioned it that within the time available at that point of time, it was not possible to have discussion with the leaders of the Opposition. This is the plain and simple position. It is not a question of violating any principle of joint responsibility. So far as discussion with the political parties is concerned, the hon. Members will agree with me and that information also I shared with him that in April 1993, in response to an announcement made on the floor of this House by my predecessor, I said that

we would like to have a discussion with the major political parties to which Mr. Swell had taken some exception. He said: "Why did you make a distinction between the major and the minor parties?" But the fact is that I had invited all the major parties and except the BJP, everybody responded to it and they came. Persons like Mr. Surjeet, Mr. Sita Ram Yechuri, Prof. Madhu Dandavate, Shri George Fernandes, had come to have discussion. It is not that they agreed to our viewpoint or we agreed to their viewpoint. None of them agreed with our views nor did we agree with them. But discussions took place. Even after that, I first wrote to the Chief Ministers in January, sending a copy of the final Act, requesting them to let me know when it would be convenient to them and I would be prepared to discuss the matter with them. Some issues relating to the States also came up. After that, again I wrote to them on 21st March, that before I went to Marrakesh, I would like to have a discussion with them. Some of the Chief Ministers responded and in fact, I had discussions with four, five of them. Some others had sought a little longer time and according to their convenience and my convenience, a date will be fixed. Some of them have suggested that there can be an NDC meeting and as for the NDC meeting, Mr. Vice-Chairman, as you are well aware, though I have something to do as Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, I have nothing to do as the Commerce Minister. Thank you.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are discussing this subject for the fourth time in recent memory. I participated three times earlier. It shall be my endeavour not to cover the same ground as I had traversed earlier.

Now, from the vantage point of the post-Marrakesh scene, the Uruguay Round since April, 1989 appears to be a sad story of incremental economic aggression—may I repeat 'incremental economic aggression'—on the part of the developed countries, North, and increasing political withdrawal on the part of the developing countries which are today known as South. Why do I say this? The U.S.A. began to mount pressure on all the developing countries, in fact, at that time, including the EEC, from 1982 onwards. Why did the U.S.A. begin to do this in 1982? The U.S.A. by 1982 had lost its competitive edge in manufacturing sectors such as automobiles etc. It still had world leadership in the services sector, in intellectual property rights. So, the United States wanted to retrieve what it had lost in the area of goods by extending the scope and purview of GATT to services, TRIPS and what you have. I must say, in fairness to our Governments which were there at

that time including Congress-(I) Governments, stood their ground firmly, consistently, I would say even vehemently, between 1982 and 1988, December. We did not budge an inch. We might have sometimes beaten tactical retreats during those years. But, alas! it was in April, 1989 at Geneva that the Government of India beat a strategic retreat. One does not know why it happened. It allowed the TRIPS to become an integral part of the new GATT Law, what is today known as GATT-94. Why did this happen? The explanation of the Government on the sly is that Brazil which had stood by us in the previous years, developed, cold feet; and we therefore, had no option. But the sources in Brazil say, it was India which had all along assumed the leadership of the developing countries and which threw in the towel in April, 1989. And since April, 1989, it has been a case of vacation of our own ground in instalments, and consequent advance by the U.S.A. and other developed countries in instalments. After 1989, a lot of things kept on happening behind the scenes. Our Government, both of Rajiv Gandhi and others, even after that tried to retrieve the ground. But in December 1991 the then Secretary-General, Arthur Dunkel, who is a Swiss, I am told—as I said, his name is to be pronounced as *Dunkel*, whatever that might mean—brushed aside all the serious objections of the southern countries and produced a text out of his hat. He did not do so from nowhere. He did so in deference to the sentiments and views of the USA and other developed countries. When the Dunkel Draft came to our country, what was the reaction of the Government? The Government tried to adopt an ostrichlike attitude to begin with. It hid its head in the sand of shame. It was not to be seen or heard anywhere. For full one year people like us were crying in the wilderness. Mr. Dinesh Singh, who was then only a Member of Parliament, who was the Minister of Commerce in April, 1989, was among the first to protest against the Dunkel Draft Text. He is now the Minister for External Affairs. He, of course, maintains a golden silence now. Then public opinion in this country was mobilised in a big way. The Government then began to react in a contradictory fashion. First, it said, "We have no option. We cannot live without GATT." The second reaction was, "Well, you read the Text properly. You look at the fine print. It is not after all so bad." The third was, "You read more carefully. It is, in fact, very good." There was this ambiguity, ambivalence, in the attitude of the Government because the Government on this question suffered from a gigantic guilt complex.

After that we come to 15th December, 1993, the fateful day when the Dunkel

Draft Text, with some modifications, came to be transformed into the final Act of GATT. The present Secretary-General, Mr. Peter Sutherland, described it as "a defining moment in history". Surely, a defining moment in history for the ground of countries to which he belongs. It represented a total victory of the North over the South.

Now, apart from hailing the so-called final Act of the GATT, the Government did something else. The Government agreed to have the link between trade and environment discussed by including the same in the work programme on December 15, 1993. This was over and above the final Act of the GATT.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I charge this Government with betrayal of the nation. I charge this Government with breach of faith. I charge this Government with having kept Parliament in the dark on the question. I would like to know in what statement and through what communication the Government has taken the nation or Parliament into confidence in regard to this link between environment and trade. I came to know about it only two days back. I expected the Commerce Minister to make a reference to this in today's statement. He has deliberately, scrupulously, of course, intelligently avoided referring to it. This is a typical example of the clandestine, conspiratorial, cloak-and-dagger fashion in which the Government of India has been approaching this subject.

Before our Minister went to Marrakesh, we did some sabre-rattling and we indulged in a bit of theatricals. We had a G-15 meeting. We had the ESCAP meeting. We boldly announced that we would oppose all non-tariff barriers. But what happened at Marrakesh? I expected more from Mr. Pranab Mukherjee. He is one of our most experienced Ministers. I don't know why he failed himself at Marrakesh. At Marrakesh, the Chairman, in his concluding remarks, said that the question of linking international trade and labour standards had been raised. The Chairman also said that the Preparatory Committee would discuss it. It is known as PREPCOM that is the Preparatory Committee of The World Trade Organisation (WTO)? I have gone through the papers supplied by the Government. I did not find the long form of WTO in any of the papers. On the 15th December, 1993, the expression was 'MTO', Multilateral Trade Organisation. This was the expression used by Mr. Dunkel. This was the expression adopted by GATT on the 15th December, 1993. But suddenly, the Americans felt that this word 'M' is not good. I don't know why the Americans have allergy to the word 'M' and why they are so sentimentally attached to the word 'W'. They mistake America for the world. That is

the reason, perhaps. This 'WTO' name was not adopted at any meeting yet. We have all come to adopt it. Now, we are finding ourselves as members of the World Trade Organisation. It is not a very substantive point, Mr. Vice-Chairman. But I am making this point to show how completely the USA is dominating the proceedings of GATT. Earlier, the conflict in the world was between the East and the West. The East was represented by the communist Bloc. The West was represented by the capitalist bloc. That conflict was ideological, political and military. That conflict is no longer there. We are not a Third World Country because the Second World does not any longer exist. Today, the conflict is between the North and the South, between the developed countries and the developing countries. This conflict, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is primarily, essentially, economic. There are many people in this country who believe that liberalisation and globalisation will lead to increase in employment, increase in investment by the multinationals in this country. They are living in a fool's paradise. They are at best living in the world of the Eighties. They should read the inaugural address delivered by Mr. Bill Clinton when he became the President. He said categorically that America would export goods and not jobs. America is trying to get your markets opened up for their goods. America is not going to decrease its own employment potential. Now the developed countries are unashamedly adopting double standards; one for themselves and one for us. Recently, I came across a very interesting and pathetic news item. In the UN Peace Keeping Force, if a soldier of a developing country dies, he should be paid less compensation than the soldier of a developed country. It is a typical example of the dual treatment that they want to subject the developing countries to. Keeping all this in view, I would say, the Marrakesh meeting which was attended by our Commerce Minister—he certainly spoke very boldly, but could not act boldly—is another nail driven into the coffin of the original GATT. It is also another nail driven into the coffin of sovereignty, the sovereign economic space of India and other developing countries. It is another major disaster in a series of disasters that have been befalling our country and the other Southern countries since '89 April. Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are often told by our learned Minister and the more learned spokesmen of the Government outside, that all our criticisms are based on imaginary fears. Is this true? All our criticisms are in fact based on the negotiating positions that the Government's team took at GATT. All the positions that we are taking here were the positions taken by our Government at GATT with the difference that our Government's team put across these position with

greater force, with greater emphasis than what we are able to do as non-specialists. Then what went wrong? Do I find fault with the Government for not taking a stand? No. I compliment the Government for having taken a correct stand at every important turning point. But the problem with this Government was that it had conviction, but it did not have the courage of conviction. It did not have the political will. When you go to a negotiating table ... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI ASHOK MITRA (West Bengal) : You are granting too much to this Government.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I take the hint from Mr. Ashok Mitra. But I am trying to be charitable and generous. The point that I am trying to make is that our Government, while taking negotiating positions, did not draw the Maginot line saying, "If you cross this, we shall not agree." You did not draw the line at all. You were only arguing academically. Now, in the Chairman's statement which has been referred to in the statement made by the Minister, the link between labour standards and trade has been included in the work programme for the Preparatory Committee; the Preparatory Committee will discuss it. I am told that. The statement further adds that the Ministers have taken note of it. This means that the Chairman made his concluding remarks with the prior and full consent of the Government of India. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, why is this Government allowing the GATT-47 to be buried? There is Article 1 of GATT under which any decision has to be agreed to by everybody because GATT is an agreement and not an organisation. You allowed Article 1 which is read with Article 30, to be given a clean burial. Why did you not, at Marrakesh, insist upon the meeting of contracting parties in regard to amendment of Article 1? Now, in a new organisation that is to come into being, any article can be changed by a two-thirds majority. It means that GATT will no longer remain an agreement but it will become an organisation. Any member can now be expelled by a three-fourths majority. Earlier, the rule was that any decision had to be necessarily unanimous. Every contracting party, even a Timbuctoo, if it was a member, had an implicit veto. Today that is not the case. So, why did you allow Article 1 to be demolished? And, in fact, if we read the statement of the Minister which also contains some remarks of the Chairman, I find many disturbing things apart from the links between labour standards and international trade. Trade and competition policy is another new thing, over and above the final act of GATT. At a time when you are finding it difficult to swallow the final act of GATT, the developed countries are

trying to thrust a few more things on you and your mouth is so wide that you are able to swallow them too. Trade and competition policy means that we, as a nation, will not be able to determine our competition policy. Now I wish to refer to the last sentence of the statement made by the Chairman which says: "...the link between trade, development, political stability and the alleviation of poverty, and unilateral or extra-territorial trade measure." Firstly, I must confess, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I do not understand the implications; I think our senior friend, Dr. Ashok Mitra, will be able to throw some light. Also, our Minister should certainly be able to throw light on it. I suspect that it is about a good Government. I do not know whether WTO, at a future date, will be able to object to defections that the Congress Party had been able to introduce in this country. I am not speaking without this. I will try to draw the attention of the House to an article. ... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH) : Mr. Reddy, here I want to tell you one thing. We are here seeking clarifications on the statement made by the Minister. We are not discussing the statement. We are here discussing under rule 251 and not under rule 167.

SHRI M. A. BABY (Kerala) : Sir, may I draw your attention? On this matter, we had a discussion. There was a consensus that though the Minister made a statement, a general discussion should be allowed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH) : That is why I have given him more than 20 minutes... (*Interruptions*) ... No, I have to give time to other Members also. You don't worry on this count. I only want to remind that we are here seeking clarifications and not discussing the matter.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have taken note of your friendly warning. I shall try to conclude as quickly as possible. I should refer to an article written by Geza Fekereky. He was the Deputy US Trade Representative under Carla Hills. He says in his article in 1992 that there should be a link between trade and labour standards, there should be a link between trade and environment. He thinks further that the political policies of the developing countries must also be harmonised with those of OECD, the developed countries. May I read from the article?

"Political acceptability may require international co-ordination or harmonisation of the good economic or social policy if a majority of the voters are not prepared to see their

economy opened to a greater level of interdependence without an understanding on minimum acceptable standards in that policy area."

Earlier, he says that unless a majority of the countries of OECD agrees, trade with developing countries should not be concluded and he is one of the leading think-tanks in the area of international trade for the OECD countries, for the developed countries. He further says... (Interruptions) ... He was a deputy to Carla Hills. He is one of the leading think-tanks of OECD which comprises 30 countries. He further says in his article:

"...For future trade, such countries will be required to change their ideas and policies or forego the benefits of trade with the OECD countries."

I may also remind the House that not long ago a proposal was made before UNCTAD. Of course, UNCTAD did not take a decision but a proposal was made by the developed countries that a link must be established between good government and trade. They will, from now onwards, decide as to what is the good government in our country. It is not merely a question of trade. Their trade has an indissoluble connection, a Siamese link with their political vision, with their philosophical vision. You don't try to interpret the new GATT law merely in terms of economic losses and gains. Of course, in economic terms, it is an unmitigated disaster. And now, I know the answer our Commerce Minister will give: 'If the Chairman, in his concluding remarks said, the link between labour standards and trade will be discussed, the Preparatory Committee will also discuss the link between trade and immigration policies.' He can turn around and say, "Mr. Reddy, we will counter that with this." But then, are you using our genuine and, I would say, ancient demand for link between immigration policy and trade only as a bargaining counter, as a bargaining chip? And what is your bargaining chip as against the link between trade and environment, to which you had agreed on December 15, 1993?

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, now I do not want to take the time of the House by going into the merits of the final Act of the GATT. We did many times before. Dr. Joshi did very well the day-before-yesterday on that count. But the problem is, our Government says, "All right. Your analysis of the balance sheet of GATT is okay, fine. But we have no option." This Government is smitten by an isolation syndrome. And this Government is also haunted by what we used to call, 'TINA' factor—'There is no Alternative'. The Congress internally has no alternative to

Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao; the country has no alternative to Congress Party internally; the country has no alternative to GATT externally. Do you want to live negatively on the basis of 'TINA' philosophy?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Reddy will not look positively. That is the problem.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: And I want Mr. Pranab Mukherjee to shed his approach—GATT at any cost. Yes, none of us has been opposed to GATT '47. GATT '47 was not working properly and, therefore, the developing countries lodged a complaint which was taken up by UNCTAD. GATT '47 was never honoured by the developed countries. And talking of isolation syndrome, we are a country of 900 million people. How can we suffer from isolation syndrome? If it comes to isolation, today we stand stark naked in the whole world on the question of NPT, on the question of MTCR. If the isolation syndrome is going to haunt you, then you are going to compromise on NPT and MTCR too. Now, based on a clever Constitutional construction, our Government has the gratification that it can go in for GATT-ification without ratification by Parliament. Why are you afraid of going before the Parliament? This law needs not only ratification by Parliament, but this law would also require amendment to the Constitution. Don't try to exploit the weak, irrelevant Constitutional provisions to bypass parliament. There are two kinds of groups in this country. Who are supporting the theory of GATT at any cost. We have some followers of Milton Friedman, for whom Singapore is a model. I consider them victims of Singapore Syndrome. They think what is good for a small City State is good for this vast sub-continent of 900 million people. We have victims of the Singapore Syndrome among bureaucrats, among intellectuals, among lawyers—some of whom are in this House—and among Ministers. The second group is: 'You cannot do anything about it.' Yes, it is bad. I call them capitulationist. They argue that you can conquer through surrender. They say 'Soon to conquer! How can you conquer when the U.S. is not even content with the final Act of GATT? Their trade arsenal is vast. They have many more weapons in their arsenal. Therefore I urge upon the Government to draw the line and say: 'So far, and no further'. I believe, the final line must be drawn, not against the new issues, but against the final Act of GATT itself. You have wisely refrained from signing the final Act. But don't be wise only for just one more year. Be wise and bold to refrain from signing the final Act of GATT even after one year. This W.T.O. is going to be an octopus. Its tentacles will keep extending to every

neck and corner. You prepare this country to fight the octopus, you must steel your will. The people of the country must be prepared to face the ordeals, if necessary. In German language, it is called the *Sturm und Drang*—the storm and the stress. Can you prepare the country to go through a period of *Sturm und Drang*? To put it in American terms, let Mr. Pranab Mukherjee know, there is nothing like a free lunch and if Mr. Pranab Mukherjee thinks that he can have a free lunch in Marrakesh, in W.T.O., he is also not only living in a fool's paradise, he is pushing the country into a fool's paradise. Let him not do that. Let him take a decision against GATT. We shall all extend our co-operation and as a nation will fight against GATT. Thank you.

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA (Haryana) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Congress Party has the proud privilege of leading this country during the freedom movement and 45 years after the freedom movement, through various courses. The Congress Party is going to take this country to strides. That is why it is not a mere political party; it has always been a movement of the Indian people.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru laid the foundation of modern India. Shrimati Indira Gandhi prepared and launched a programme for eradication of poverty from this country. Shri Rajiv Gandhi's dynamism took this country to modern path, and it is our present Prime Minister, Shri Narasimha Rao, who is going to take this country to liberalisation.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Uruguay agreement is an international treaty running into more than 500 pages. It is a highly technical subject. The people, the farmers of this country, have faith in the leadership of the Prime Minister, the Agriculture Minister, the Commerce Minister, the Finance Minister and the whole Government. Here I quote Shri Rajiv Gandhi on this issue :

"Should India retreat into a shell like we have in the past, in a way to protect ourselves and let the world go by, or are we going to come out and fight for our rightful place on the globe? Are we going to have the guts to come out in the open? That is the real question, that is in front of us. If we are to take these steps, and in my mind, I am very clear that there is no alternative, then the challenges are very definite in exports, in a competitive industry, and industry which can compare with any other industry on the globe".

Initiating the discussion on 19th, Shri Murli Manohar Joshi, the BJP leader, alleged that the Congress party or this Government, was going to sell this country, sell this country's integrity, to the multinationals. Mr. Vice-Chairman, though

you, I would like to say that Shri Joshi has tried to play to the gallery. He has made a very sentimental speech which was bereft of any logic. I would ask the BJP. Your party has always represented the *status quo* in this country. It was the BJP which opposed the policies of socialism and self-reliance being practised by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It was the BJP which opposed Indira Gandhi's anti-poverty programmes. It was the BJP which opposed Rajiv Gandhi's modernism. And now it is opposing Narasimha Rao's liberalisation. Since when have they become the champions of the farmer's cause? It was the BJP which opposed the agrarian reforms in the country which ushered in the green revolution in the country. (Interruption). It was the BJP which opposed the nationalisation of banks in this country which, in fact, made the farmers and the poor people of this country modernise agriculture and increase production manifold in this country. It was the BJP which opposed the procurement of foodgrains under the PDS programme. These two programmes really benefited the farmers and the poor people and made them stand on their own legs, made them self-sufficient in their life. And it is the BJP today which is opposing the Dunkel proposals because the Indian agriculture will find access to the international market, to the world market, and the Indian farmer will be a partner in the international trade. After having miserably failed to capture power, after the demolition of the Babri Masjid, the BJP is now in search of an issue. But I would like to submit to my friends on the BJP benches that this issue is not their cup of tea. The Indian farmer has no faith in the BJP which has never been the champion of the farmer's cause.

I have sympathies for Mr. Reddy who made his speech just before me. He has made a very symbolic speech. He has made only a symbolic opposition to the Uruguay Treaty. He must be feeling constrained because of the statement issued by V. P. Singh welcoming the Uruguay Agreement. That is why I sympathise with him. He could neither oppose nor support these proposals. He is welcome—he has come back. He is a senior Member of the House. I said that he has only made a symbolic opposition and he could not muster any arguments against the Uruguay agreement.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : So long as there is an attack on me, I shall not reply.

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA : There is no question of attack. There is no reply to my argument.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH) : No, he is not attacking at all.

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA : I am not attacking. I am only paying compliments for his ability to steer himself clear.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : We had earlier discussed the merits of the final Act of GATT. Today we are discussing the post-Marrakesh scene. So I dealt with that issue from that vantage point... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, after the demise of the mighty Soviet power, the Indian Left Parties have been coming from cross roads and roaming in politically blind alleys. They did not find any political or ideological moorings. The Indian farmer has now a dream. He has now a dream of entering a new threshold of economic advancement, and Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao is the leader who is going to fulfil this dream. The Congress Party was never so united as it today is. The Janta Dal, having lost its moorings, is a party of only leaders/sons and followers. I would like to quote the speech of their leader, Shri V. P. Singh. I have with me *The Economic Times* of the 19th of this month where he has been extensively quoted in an article, the heading of which is, "VP spills the beans." And the speech which was quoted is like this.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Will you kindly yield? His remarks from Meerut were misreported. He held a full press conference the day before yesterday and the whole thing has been denied. The comment which you are referring to is based on a wrong report.

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am not quoting the editorial comment of the Editor. I am only quoting the lines which have been attributed to his statement.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Wrongly.

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA : I do not know. I have not uttered a word, and how do you know what I am going to say? How can you pass a judgment that what I am going to say is wrong? These are the editorial comments: "Just as his party has joined hands with others in the opposition to denounce the Uruguay Round as a sell-out, Mr. Singh has declared that India has no option but to become a member of the World Trade Organisation, the successor to GATT. India, he quite rightly says, cannot afford to become an isolated pariah in the world community." Then he further goes, "If India really wants to follow an isolationist policy, he tells his Opposition colleagues, they will have to learn to 'live like Vietnam and resolve that we can do without petrol'." It further says: "He says bluntly that the opposition parties too would be obliged to fall in line with the WTO if they came to power. Mr. Chandra Shekhar is hypocrite enough to oppose GATT today although he was

a fully party to GATT talks when he was Prime Minister." So, this is what the leader of the Janta Dal says.

Finally, about the SJP which is a party of the father and sons—Mr. Chandra Shekhar is clinging to the bandwagon of this so-called party. While speaking to a group of farmers from Haryana, Tau asked them if they knew anything about the GATT Agreement. When they expressed their ignorance, Tau told them, "Okay. Listen to me. Nobody is going to get at the truth except Tau." Then he said, "GATT is a company, and Dunkel is its officer." He further asked, "How many districts are there in Haryana?" Somebody said, "Sixteen". He said, "The Gurgaon District has been sold to Japan, Faridabad has been sold to Germany and Bhajan Lal has gone abroad to sell the rest of the fourteen districts to other countries of the world. Therefore, after some time you will be landless. You will have no land because the GATT is going to purchase all the sixteen districts."

SHRI SANGH PRIA GAUTAM : Buying and selling is the habit of Mr. Bhajan Lal, you know.

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA : The farmers looked aghast and pleaded, "kindly try to save our lands. Otherwise, we will be thrown out."

This is the false propaganda launched by these political parties which, in fact, have no issue. They are in search of an issue. They think that farmers are very simple people and that they will fall prey to their disinformation programme.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to add further that the Uruguay Round has become a highly emotional issue in the country and is evoking widespread apprehensions in the country. Some of the apprehensions are like this:

It is feared that our economic sovereignty will be endangered.

Our agriculture and food security will be eroded.

Our farmers will have to buy seeds every year from multinationals.

Our PDS will be adversely affected, etc. etc.

It is necessary to analyse the key elements of the agreements on agriculture and patenting which have raised the maximum apprehensions ... (Time bell rings)

Keeping the constraints of time, I will deal with only agriculture, subsidy and the patent law. I seek your indulgence, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

As far as the subsidy is concerned, the root cause of distortion of international trade in agriculture is the massive domestic

subsidy being given by the highly industrialised countries to their farmers. This has led to excessive production and to import restriction to keep foreign agricultural products out of their domestic markets and to dumping their produce in the international market. The obligations and disciplines incorporated in the agreement on agriculture relate to:

- (1) Domestic subsidies;
- (2) Export subsidies;
- (3) Minimum market access; and
- (4) Food stock holding or food aid operations.

Dealing with these, I would like to comment that in the case of developing countries, of which India is, of course, a leading one, the obligation to reduce domestic subsidies arises only if the total aggregate value of all the subsidies given to the farmers exceeds ten per cent of the total agricultural production of that country in a particular year. Let us analyse the Indian position. Another thing is that the subsidies given to low-income and resource-poor farmers, are exempt from the calculation of subsidy. There is no reduction obligation.

It is estimated that 76 per cent of the agricultural holdings in our country are five or less than five acres. The value of our total production in a day's period taking 1993-94 is likely to be Rs. 2.15 crores. Given these realities, it is very obvious that the aggregate value of all our product and non-product subsidies is much lower than the 10 per cent limit. This means we still have room to give more subsidy to our farmers. It is also fallacious that the 10 per cent limit is insufficient. It is based on a misunderstanding.

Coming to the export subsidy, I would like to say that the agreement on agriculture lists seven types of subsidies to which the reduction commitment will apply. None of these subsidies is being provided by us at the moment. The minimum market access will apply only to highly developed countries. Because India is under the balance of payments cover in GATT it is not obliged to tariff and import restrictions.

As far as the PDS is concerned, the final Act contains a footnote exempting the developing countries from the discipline envisaged in respect of public stock holdings.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): Please conclude.

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA : Sir, I will take two or three minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): No. Only one minute more. You have already taken

more time. You have already taken 20 minutes.

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA : Rice, wheat and cotton offer us immediately large-scale opportunity. In rice alone we can increase our export from the current level of Rs. 1,000 crores annually to Rs. 3,000 crores within the next few years. Japan, for example, may offer a very lucrative market, particularly for rice being produced in Bihar and in eastern UP and in other areas where the quality of rice is not very fine. Internationalisation of our agriculture in this manner has several implications. The terms of trade which have for long been in favour of industry, will now shift in favour of agriculture. It is estimated that over one per cent switch will divert Rs. 8,500 crores additionally in favour of agriculture and over Rs. 60,000 crores will be transferred to the agriculture sector from the non-agriculture sector in the next seven years. This additional rural purchasing power will create a phenomenal demand for a variety of goods and a part of this additional purchasing power will be ploughed back into the capital investment in agriculture.

On the patents, I would like only to say this much that the choice of the system of production of plant varieties is left to each country. This is the position mentioned in the Agreement. There is no compulsion that the plant varieties, including seeds, must be patented. But if the patent protection is not given it is obligatory to provide a *sui generis* system, a system of its own, for the protection of plant varieties and it must be effective. So, there is a common misunderstanding that the intellectual property protection will encompass all existing seeds and genetic material will be patented or protected by multinationals and farmers will be forced to buy their seeds from the multi-nationals every year. This is far from the truth. We have to establish our PDS system by the year 2000. Our Government has already announced that they are going to bring in a law, probably in this or next session, providing for a *sui generis* system of our own in the country where the farmers will be absolutely free to sell their seeds, to exchange their seeds or to grow any kind of seeds. They are not obliged to purchase seeds from any multinational or any other company.

The other class of restriction will apply only when one commercially deals in the seeds, but it is not applicable to the farmers. We can fully provide for farmers' privilege and researchers' privilege.

The more fundamental issue is whether it is in India's interest to adopt a *sui generis* system for the protection of plant breeders' rights. Dr. Swaminathan, an eminent international agricultural scientist and the ICAR, a very important body of the agricultural research and education in this

country have supported and endorsed this system.

Taken as a whole, India is more of a gainer than a loser from the Uruguay Round, the nature and magnitude of the gains being dependent on the policies we pursue, the strategies we adopt and the determination we show to realise the opportunities available to us in the international market. In agriculture, we have the freedom to follow our policies; it is the industrialised world that is required to bring down its domestic and export subsidies.

Finally, Sir, we need to shed our fear psychosis and gear ourselves to seize the opportunities. The Uruguay Round is a positive sum game, not a zero sum game, for those who do not miss the opportunities created by it for the challenges posed by it. Thank you. (Ends)

Thank you.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, my friend, Mr. Jaipal Reddy is absolutely right when he said that we have in recent months discussed the whole gamut of problems around the Uruguay Round and its culmination thrice here. But, unfortunately, on each of the pointed issues that we have raised, the Government has not responded even indirectly. That is why some of the points deserve to be referred to again. I think last Monday, in answer to a question on the floor of the House, the Minister for Commerce read out something which went as follows : "The objective of Uruguay Round of discussion is to develop or expand uninterrupted trade between the developed and the developing countries." No, Sir. The objective of the Uruguay Round of discussions has been and will continue to be to stimulate the uninterrupted exploitation of the developing countries by developed countries. This follows from the global situation. Look at West Europe. With the zero rate of growth, 25 million unemployed people, white women been begging for alms in the streets of Paris and London? In the U.S. they have been strangled by their own technological advances. Technology has advanced so much that they do not need so many people or so many days to employ people in order to produce some quantity of goods that they need to raise the standard of living of the people. Therefore, in order to survive, they must export, they must come back to the colonies or the empires which they were forced to get out of some 50 years ago. This is the single-minded objectives of the Western countries which. They pursue others with great aplomb and great finesse. They look at their own interests. They will demand market access from us. They will not give us any market access. We have to front-load our concessions for them. They would promise some back-loading of concessions may be around 2000 A.D. But that will also be a hypothetical question.

They have come up with the issue of labour standards. Tomorrow, they will come up with the issue of nuclear policy. They will say, "Unless you agree to our terms and conditions on NPT, we will not agree to have trade with you." This is only the beginning of the story. What has happened in Marrakesh is the thin end of the wedge. It is only the beginning of a very, very long route which we will be traversing. I do not think it odd that the countries that are colonial and imperial-minded people are looking after their own national interests. But what I find is that even our Government is much more interested in protecting the interests of the West, advancing the interests of the West at the cost of our own national interest, I had put a pointed question about two months ago on the floor of this House.

What are we getting out of the GATT Treaty? I have seen, and I am sure the Minister has seen, the joint report of the World Bank and the OECD about what would happen around 2002 with the expansion of world trade. World trade will go up by 213 billion dollars. This report is an authoritative one. Out of those 213 billion dollars, what will be our share? 4.6 billion dollars, a little more than two per cent of the total. What is the gain for us? Already we have $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent global trade. Even in the year 2002, on account of the GATT, we will continue to have only two per cent! Let us do a little bit more of arithmetic. I am really addressing myself to the Members of the Congress party. This is our country. Together, we have to save this country. What is 4.6 billion dollars in Indian rupees? A little more than Rs. 15,000 crores. What has been our total exports in the years 1993-94? Rs. 60,000 crores. So, what will be the extra increase in our trade between now and 2002, over eight years? 25 per cent. The sum of Rs. 15,000 crores as a proportion of Rs. 60,000 crores, is 25 per cent, over an eight-year period. What is the annual rate of growth? At the most, 2.5 per cent per annum. You can work that out. It is nothing complicated. Our Ministry is saying that even this year, we have experienced a trade and export gain of 20 per cent. So what extra gains are we getting out of the GATT? Nothing. We are giving away to the foreigners without getting anything for us. That is the situation. Why are we doing so? Because we want globalisation. Why, we are isolated. Why should we be isolated? They are much more interested in sending their goods to us. We are not that keen. After all, we have to look at the direction of the trade. I have figures for the first nine months of 1993-94, April to December. You take the total structure of our export. We exported to Europe, West Europe, less than five per cent of our total exports; to both the Americas, North America and South America, which will include Canada, United States, Latin America, 16.2 per cent; and to Asia and

Oceania, we are sending 40 per cent of our total exports. To East Europe, we have been sending about 20 per cent. Forty plus twenty, that is almost three-fifths of our trade, the developing part of the trade, we are sending to the new countries of the world, the emerging countries of the world, whose rate of growth is very much higher than that of Europe or America. Why must we then be at all bothered about what Americans are threatening us with? Forget about America. I have some figures about our traditional items which we are interested in sending to the United States of America. I have nine months' data for the year, 1993-94. Our textiles export went up only by five per cent. Americans will not take our textiles. They will discover some pretext or other not to accept our textiles. They have their own problems. In the export of leather and leather manufacture, actually, there is a decline, overall decline. In certain other things like carpets and handicrafts, the rate of growth is apparently eight per cent. On the other hand, in our manufacturing exports, engineering exports, project exports, the rate of growth is as high as 35 to 40 per cent. Most of these are going to Oceania and Asia and the Far-Eastern countries and elsewhere. This is where we should concentrate our trade efforts, our export efforts. Forget about America. A bit of, whether you call it benign neglect or malign neglect. ... Let us neglect the United States of America. But we cannot do so because we have borrowed and borrowed and borrowed. We have really mortgaged our assets. We have mortgaged the thinking cap to the Americans. We just utter and repeat such clichés about uninterrupted trade between the developing and the developed countries. I have been reading the newspapers. The Minister have been going round the country and accusing the opposition of misrepresenting the Government. It should be the other way round. The *suo motu* statement that the Minister made the day before yesterday has an astounding sentence namely, that the agenda for the new trade organisations would be decided by consensus among the member countries. Now, I have a copy of the draft final Act. I am sure the hon. Members have gone through it. I don't like any Member to take my word on trust. You kindly go through it on your own. You will see on page 5, "Agreement concerning the multinational trade organisation Decision-making." Now, setting the agenda is also a part of decision making. What does it say? This is again the prevarication of the GATT, the Western countries, which the Minister has accepted as his own prevarication. The old MTO has become WTO. Article IX—Decision Making reads—The MTO shall continue the practice of decision making by consensus followed under GATT 1947. Now, the second part of the statement is

true GATT 1947 conformed to the consensus principle—but this particular document does not. It is followed by the sentence, "Where a decision cannot be arrived at by consensus, the matter and issue shall be decided by voting." This is the anticlimax, the very next sentence says: "No, sorry. If there is no consensus, then the matter and issue shall be decided by voting. There are some complicated procedures written down in article 9 and article 10 about what would be the procedure of voting for this or that. If it is a matter of interpretation of the articles, then a simple majority is required. If it is a matter of a substantive nature, in some instances two-thirds majority is required and in some instances, three-fourths majority is required. It is therefore a very simple thing that we do not on our own have the right to object. If we had the right to say that decisions should be by consensus, why didn't the Minister turn down the American proposition about labour standards at Marrakesh. There is no consensus. I don't agree with that and for this reason it should not go to the Preparatory Committee. How did the proposals go to the Preparatory Committee? There was no consensus. This is the situation the Americans will have their say because they control the situation and we will just have to raise our hands and sometimes, we are not even required to raise our hands. Obviously, on the issue of labour standards, despite the statement which has been made for the consumption of the Indian Press, I doubt very much whether the Minister voiced his protest. If the Minister had objected to it, then the consensus issue would not have arisen. Of course, he did not do so. Today, they referred to labour standards. Tomorrow, they will ask you to sign something else. Otherwise, there will be no trade. The day after tomorrow, they will say, "We are sending the Prime Minister, the Finance Minister and the Commerce Minister. You appoint them. Otherwise, we will have no trade treaty. (Interruptions) I do not want to hurt the sensitivity of persons present in this house. Now, it is a question of what we want to do with our country, with our trade. And we have enough of options available. The Americans are not the only options. Given the grimness of the economic situation in West Europe and America, linking our trade-fate with American fortunes will not take us anywhere. Let us try to recreate some of the goodwill that we had with the Latin American countries, with the African countries and with the Asian countries. Let us recreate the conditions. After all, we betrayed them in April, 1989. We betrayed them. They did not betray us. We betrayed them on the issue of intellectual property rights, on the issue of services overnight. We thought, "If we butter up the Americans, they will give us some special concessions." They will not. The Americans have their own problems.

In any case, that is the geopolitics of Asia. They will not desert their past friends in order to attract our friendship.

Number two. Whatever kind of obsequiousness we may try to bring in into the negotiations, it is their domestic compulsions which matter to them. All I want to say is, in all such matters let us keep our cool. What has been done cannot be undone, but even at this stage one can fight and fight, and fight again. Between now and July, 1995, we have sixteen months' time; we can negotiate, renegotiate, re-renegotiate, although article one of GATT, 1947 is no longer available, we could have said sorry. We object, as long as we were part of GATT, 1947, we could have said, "Sorry, we do not agree to the intellectual property rights closure; sorry, we do not agree to what you have suggested about agriculture. How dare you suggest that our farmers must take the permission of foreigners before they decide what to produce, to whom to sell, at which price to sell?" And it is no use saying that we have misrepresented the position. I know what the Government is to say. "We are going to pass a *sui generis* legislation; once we pass that *sui generis* legislation, the interests of our farmers, the interests of our masses will be protected." No, Sir. Once we pass that legislation,—now that we are no longer in the regime of GATT, 1947 but in the regime of GATT, 1993 and of the M.T.O. the waiver that we ask for will not come automatically to us. The waiver will be subject to examination by the Ministerial Committee, by the General Council and has to be ratified by two-thirds of votes. But this two-thirds of votes may not be forthcoming in our favour. We are in a jam. Our farmers are in a jam because of the thoughtlessness and, shall I add the expression it pricks my heart but I must use the expression—the cowardice of our Government. But it is still our nation's state. Even if our Government has done something which is terrible, we should try to salvage the situation. I have a very simple suggestion: let us involve the people who have served the country loyally over the years in trade negotiations in foreign countries. Many of them are resident of Delhi many of them are resident of some other cities. Why don't you draw on them? They may not always ditto the official line but they are great patriots, and if you put it to them, they will still advise you on how you would still launch some rearranged action. And, for heaven's sake, don't sign in haste the final Act. In any case, why don't you watch? The American Administration has its own problems *vis-a-vis* the American Congress. We don't know where the situation will end, and whether it would be a repetition of 1947. What happened in the American Congress? It rejected the Havana Charter. This might well happen to GATT '93 too. Why should we in advance sur-

render our position which we have agreed to do? It should not have happened the kind of thing that has happened. On 14th December, 1993, on the eve of the final signing of the GATT, on the whole issue of import duty on textiles we surrendered. The duty was brought down from 65% to 25%. There has been an unending series of other concessions. There was a competition between the two ministers—the Finance Minister and the Commerce Minister as to who could concede more grounds to the foreigners. Today something is conceded by the Commerce Minister and tomorrow the Finance Minister thinks that he should concede more so that there may be claps from 11,000 miles away. (Interruptions) ...

Enough voices of protest are forth coming from the people of our country. Listen to them and see where you can still put up resistance and, in any case, wait and see how the American domestic dispute is resolved, wait till the American West European quarrel ends, wait and see how Japan reacts to the United States, wait for China to settle its MFN war with the United States. This is to your advantage. We control so little of the world's trade. That to our advantage. That is not a disadvantage. That is our advantage because nobody particularly bothers about us. At the margin we can increase our exports elsewhere. Forget about America. We tell America, "Nothing doing. We are not interested in exporting to your country. We are going to export China, to Taiwan, to the Philippines, to Malaysia, to Australia, to New Zealand to East Europe and to the Gulf countries." So, this is my final suggestion. There has been a reference as to why Parliament should discuss an international treaty. We mentioned why we should discuss it. It is not an ordinary treaty. This is a treaty which affects our internal structure of production, which affects our internal structure of distribution, which affects our internal structure of pricing. Foreigners are going to tell us what we can produce and how much we can produce. Foreigners are going to tell us what we should distribute and to whom. Foreigners are going to tell us at what price the things are to be distributed. This is outrageous. This is foreign domination. If somebody is saying that this Parliament is not interested in the problems of sovereignty and independence, I would say, "Thank you very much".

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Respected Vice-Chairman, Sir, GATT is the victim of invectives, not of logic. Different sticks have been invented to attack the GATT and through the GATT the present Government. Some have attacked this Government and the GATT in the name of *swadeshi*. Some have

attacked it in the name of this Government having bated away the sovereignty of nation.

The Vice-Chairman (Shri Md. Salim) in the Chair

Some have attacked it by asserting that this Government has landed this country into an economic slavery. The last Member, who spoke before me, referred to one particular article contained in GATT which provides for a decision by a majority. If I accept his logic and if I correctly understand him, he meant to convey to this Hon. House that by accepting the decision by a majority by means of GATT this country has bartered away its own sovereignty. Which sovereignty are we talking about at this juncture? The absolute sovereignty of a nation-State died with the second World War. Today the absolute sovereignty shall be the privilege of a stagnant and a retarded nation. It was no less a person than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who recognised this particular fact in 1950 when he declared in the context of India's industrialisation :—

"What perhaps is not sufficiently realised is the international character of industrialism. It has broken down national boundaries and has made nations dependent on others. The idea of nationalism is almost as strong as it was before and it has a holy name. wars are still fought and millions slaughtered. It is a myth which is not in keeping with reality. The world has become internationalised. Production is internationalised. Markets are international and transport is international. Only man's ideas continue to be governed by a dogma or which has no real meaning."

After listening to the speeches of the hon. Members on that side, I have been left with... no choice but to use the words of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and say that their ideas continued to be governed by a dogma which has no real meaning.

Sir, this acceptance of decision by a majority was first introduced in the United Nations Charter. In the United Nations Charter, all the nations which became signatories to this Charter put a severe limitation on the sovereignty by accepting the principle of decision by a majority vote. Here Article 9 of GATT has first said that the decision shall be by consensus. It is only if the decision is not by consensus, then the principle of decision by a majority vote shall be resorted to. This Article is nothing but an improvement on the United Nations Charter. Sir, the restrictions on national sovereignty of tremendous proportions have come about in this world, basically in the economic field. The example is the European Economic

Community. It was the European nations in which the concept of sovereignty of a nation-State was born and it is Europe itself which has become the burial ground of the concept of the sovereignty of a nation State. It is the European nations which had to come together on account of the imperatives of economics and in order to meet the onslaught of globalisation of market, globalisation of economy and the onslaught of the competition coming from other nations like the United States and Japan. They had to come together. They had to part with their sovereignty. They had to constitute a European union. In the beginning, they started with four things: agriculture, coal, steel and removal of tariffs. But with the passage of time they were caught in an economic inertia. It is the European nations like Germany, England and France which came to realise that it is not possible for them to stand in isolation, on their own feet in the present economic world if they have to meet competition from countries like the United States and Japan. They parted with their sovereignty and in the eighties, at Milan, they decided to form a common market for all the products. Now the Constitutions have been amended in various countries of Europe like France, Germany, Belgium and Denmark and specific provisions have been incorporated in their Constitutions to enable these countries to part with their sovereignty in order to become a part of one common world, not only politically but basically in the economic fields. The GATT has been the inevitable consequence of the economic development in the world over the past 45 years since the Second World War. It is impossible for any nation today to live in splendid isolation of her own economy. It is impossible. It is because of this that earlier in 1947, the GATT was adumbrated it came into being, gradually it continued and it started developing. In 1986, it decided to have a wider net and after negotiations among the countries spread over a period of seven and a half year, this Agreement was executed. An attack has been made on this Agreement on two counts: One is the provision with regard to agriculture which is called Agricultural Agreement and the other is Intellectual Property Rights. The Hon. Member, Mr. Jaipal Reddy, was particularly very scathing in his attack on the Intellectual Property Rights Agreement. Now, what does this Agreement say? I would draw the attention of this, hon. House to only one provision regarding this agreement on TRIPS. Article 27 of this Agreement says, "Subject to provisions in paragraph 2 and 3 below, patents shall be available for any invention, whether product or process, in all fields of technology." Sir, it is a recognised thing that invention of any product or process is a valuable right of the inventor. All that this Agreement provides is that any invention which is of original character, whether

it is product or process, can be patented. When we attack this provision, by attacking this provision that there should be no patents for invention of any product or any process, we are insulting the 900 million people of this country. We are insulting the millions of farmers in this country. We are insulting the scientists of this country. We are insulting the agricultural institutions of this country. We are insulting scores of agricultural universities spread all over the country. Why is it so? It is because the underlying concept is that the Indian scientists, the Indian institutions, the Indian laboratories, are not in a position to compete with the scientists and the research institutions of the West. And the only remedy, the only choice, open to India is to steal the inventions and products of the West. Do we call it a Swadeshi things? (*Interruptions*). Sir, I am on my legs ... (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding.

The right to steal other country's products according to them has to be equated with the sovereignty of the nation. In which understanding of the international law are we living? Is it the right of a nation to steal the properties of another nation? If we believe that we have to go *Swadeshi*, we have to be self-sufficient. Then the logical conclusion is that technologically, scientifically, we should be able to stand on our own feet and we should not become slaves to this technological advancement of the Western countries ... (*Interruptions*)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: What did the Americans do? What did the Japanese do? (*Interruptions*) What did the South Koreans do? Read the economic history of the world.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Americans are ahead of us. We should have a right to steal the scientific advancements of the Americans! It has become a convention that ours is not a nation which is capable of competing with the United States on an equal footing in this scientific and technological field. This is your inferiority complex. I feel ashamed of this attack and I feel ashamed of those who say that India can survive only on steal and theft of other people's property. I have full confidence in the scientists of this country. I have full confidence in the agricultural universities of this country. I have full confidence in the medical researchers of this country. And I have no doubt that India will stand up and face the most technological advancements of the Western countries. It is only because India was—so were other countries—in a position to have a soft passage by taking away the inventions of the other countries that scientific progress, possibly, could not take place in this country in consonance with the potentiality of this country. India has to raise to the full stature of its potentiality.

India has produced men like Khurana who

won the Nobel Prize. India has produced Chandrasekhars. India has produced, in the medieval ages, great mathematicians like Aryabhata. India, in fact, invented the numerals. And it is India which invented zero. India gave the world 'zero'. India gave the world the numerals... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: And make the Opposition a zero.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Please don't convert it into a Zero Hour.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: And today they say that India has been landed in economic slavery. The real economic slavery, Sir, is slavery to the technological and scientific developments of the West. We must get rid of that. We must stand on our own feet ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): That is exactly what we are saying.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: And this GATT agreement has created an opportunity for India to stand on its own feet. Sir, with regard to agriculture, not one provision of the whole agreement has been read out to show how agriculture in India will be affected. There is only one test to determine the beneficiality of an economic agreement: Will it add to the national wealth or will it not? That is the test. In order to determine whether it will add to the national wealth or not, there are two things which have to be borne in mind: Whether it will increase the production within the country and whether it will lead to an increase in the export of the products of that country? If this yardstick is adopted, you will notice that vast opportunities will be opened up for the export of the agricultural produce to the foreign countries. Who is going to gain? It is the Indian farmer, it is the country as a whole.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, he should see the 'TV—capsule'.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, what is this?

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE (Maharashtra): Sir, it is very unfortunate. When he was speaking, our party did not interrupt him even for a single minute. But when Mr. Bhatia is speaking, why should they interrupt him every now and then? It is a very, very bad thing in the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Mr. Bhatia is capable of defending himself. There is no problem for him.

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: He is, of course, capable of defending himself. But what for are we here?

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): What is this 'TV—capsule'? This kind of

words should not be uttered by Members in the House.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA : Incidentally, unlike this Member I don't watch TV. He may be picking up his ideas from TV. But I have no time to watch TV. I am a professional. He should know that. They come here picking up ideas from newspapers and TV and spitting them out here. I have no time to watch TV.

As I was submitting, the question is whether agricultural production is going to go up or not. The answer for this has to be in the positive. It is for the first time that restrictions were placed upon the subsidies which were being granted by the Western countries to agricultural products. These subsidies were restricted for the first time. The Indian farmer is going to have an even playing-ground for export of his agricultural produce to foreign countries. This is a gain for the Indian farmer. It is not only a gain for the Indian farmer, it is a gain for India because exports are going to go up as a result of this Agreement. Any increase in the exports is an increase in the national wealth and it is a gain to the country. Whether any restriction is placed upon this Government to extend help and assistance to the farmer, that is the crucial issue. I would like to answer this in a few words. This Agreement contemplates two kinds of subsidies. One is subsidy for things like water, fertiliser, electricity, grant of credit, etc. The other is subsidy in the form of support price. In the first place—there is a misconception which I would like to remove—there is a limit of 10% of the value of the total production of the agricultural products in the country and the total value of the agricultural products in this country in 1993-94 was Rs. 21,500 crores. That means, the Government is in a position to extend subsidies to the tune of Rs. 21,500 crores. Up till today, no Government in this country has extended subsidies to agriculture to the tune of Rs. 21,500 crores. On the contrary, it is much less. But there is something more which has been glossed over in all the newspapers, in all the speeches. And I want to draw the attention of this House to that particular provision—that is Part IV, Article 6—Agreement on Agriculture—para 2, which says :

"In accordance with the mid-term review agreement that Government measures of assistance, whether direct or indirect to encourage agriculture and rural development are an integral part of the development programmes of developing countries, investment subsidies...—this is important—... which are generally available to agriculture in developing country Members and agricultural inputs subsidies generally available to low-income or resource poor producers in developing country Members,

shall be exempt from domestic support reduction commitments..."

Which means, those subsidies which are generally provided to low-income or resource-poor producers in developing countries shall not be a part of the 10 per cent. They will be in addition. They will be exempt. Then, so far as this expression 'low-income or resource-poor producers' is concerned, this has not been defined in GATT. This has been left to the developing country to define as to who are low-income or resource-poor producers, which means, it is left to India to decide which farmers can be put in this category. And if any farmer can be put in this category, then subsidies which are generally provided to this particular category of farmers shall be totally exempt and shall be over and above 10 per cent. So far as India is concerned, an overwhelming number of farmers fall in this category. Millions and millions of farmers, more than 70 per cent of the farmers, fall in this category. And still they have the temerity to say that poor farmer has been taken for a ride and all his rights have been destroyed by this GATT. I submit, Sir, never before in the history of any democratic nation, so much cant, so much hypocrisy, so much dissimulation has been inflicted upon the people of a country, as has been done by the Opposition parties on the people of this country and the farmers in particular, in the name of attack on GATT. This has been their performance. Day in and day out, they use these invectives that the Indian sovereignty has been sold away, India has been made economically slave, Indian farmer has been thrown down the drain. But not even one word has been uttered on the specifics of this GATT. This is their performance outside the House and this has been their performance inside the House. The hon. Member who opened the debate spoke about Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution having been infringed by GATT. What is Article 14? Article 14 says : "The State shall not discriminate between one section of the people and another section of the people." I can assure that hon. Member that there is nothing in GATT which says that this Agreement shall apply only to the Members of the BJP and not to the Members of the Congress. If this is his understanding of Article 14, then there has to be some such provision. Then he talks about Article 21. Article 21 says : "A person shall not be deprived of his personal liberty except in accordance with the procedure established by law." If by 'personal liberty' he means the right to steal the inventions of other people and other countries, then certainly this Agreement has deprived the Indian citizen of his personal liberty. But it will be a matter of shame for 900 million people to say that they have been deprived of their personal liberty because

they have been denied the freedom to steal the scientific achievements of other countries. It is a matter of disgrace even to assert this argument. I feel ashamed for raising this argument.

Then they talk of article 19. What does article 19 say? Article 19 means the right of free speech. What have you been doing? You have been going across the country exercising your right of speech and misleading the people. No one has stopped you. There is nothing in GATT which says that you cannot criticise GATT. Article 19 speaks of right to form association. Which is the provision in this GATT which says that you cannot form an association? Article 19 speaks of right of freedom of profession. Which is the provision in this whole GATT agreement to say that you cannot choose your profession and use your own option? This is the extent to which they have been misleading the country. The leader of the BJP, Dr. M. M. Joshi, went to the extent of saying things like that. Mr. Jaipal Reddy talks about selling away the sovereignty and he talks of Intellectual property Rights. The last Member who spoke gave us a lecture on U.S. imperialism. He may play his politics. We know that. But this is a purely commercial agreement and we have to see only one yardstick. There is only one yardstick, which I have stated, Mr. Vice-Chairman, whether this agreement is going to give an opportunity to India to increase its national wealth, whether under this agreement, the Indian farmer is going to increase our national wealth or not, and whether he is in a position to increase his production or not. These are the only tests. Let them point out any particular provision in the entire agreement which will be a restriction either on the industrial production or the agricultural production. Let them point out any particular provision in this agreement which will retard exports of India of any particular product, and I shall be one with them. That they have not done. The only thing the last hon. Member was able to point out was article 9, the right of decision by a majority, and he has shown his colossal ignorance of the U.N. Charter where the principle of decision by majority was for the first time introduced in the world organisation in 1946 when all the nations of the world signed the U.N. Charter. By doing so, they restricted their national sovereignty.

In the end, I will just say one thing. I shall quote one decision of the permanent court—International Justice—in a very famous case. Before the International Court of Justice, the question was whether by entering into any such treaties, a country barter away its sovereignty. The answer was 'No'. The logic was—and I am relying upon the logic—'The Court declines to see in the convention of any treaty by which a State undertakes to perform or refrains from performing a

particular act, an abandonment of its sovereignty. No doubt, any convention creating an obligation of this kind places a restriction upon the exercise of the sovereign rights of the State in the sense that it requires them to be exercised in a certain way but the right of entering into engagement is a tribute to State sovereignty'. The entering into this international agreement is in the interest of the nation, in the interest of the Indian farmer, in the interest of the development of science in the country, in the interest of scientific and technological development in the country. The Government has entered into this international agreement by which the Indian farmer is going to gain, by which the production is going to increase, by which the exports from our country are going to increase.

The Government has not bartered away the sovereignty of the country. India has kept its steps in line with the steps of the rest of the world, lest India should recede into stagnancy and isolation. Thank you.

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

मान्यवर उपसमाध्यक्ष जी, डंकल समझौता जैसी असाधारण कोई घटना शायद ही इस देश में आजादी के बाद हुई हो। इसके जो नतीजे निकलने वाले हैं वे दीर्घकालिक परिणाम वाले हैं। उससे खाली आज ही नुकसान नहीं होगा बल्कि वह नुकसान अगले तक जारी रहेगा।

[उपसमाध्यक्ष (संयुक्त विद्युत रजि) पीठासीन हुए]

इस समझौते के तहत ये हमने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय और बहुराष्ट्रीय एकाधिकार वाली कंपनियों को अपनी आर्थिक व्यवस्था पर कब्जा करने का अधिकार दिया है, अपने बाजार को लूटने का अधिकार दिया है, हमारी प्राकृतिक संपदा के दोहन और शोषण का अधिकार दिया है और इससे भी आगे हमारे देश की जो खुद-मुख्तारी है और आजादी है उसको भी यह समझौता छीनता है, कम करता है। इस समझौते के तहत में कांग्रेस के ऊपर या सत्तारक्षक दल पर मेरा पहला इलजाम है कि इसकी अहमियत को देखते हुए इसकी जानकारी पूरे देश को कराई जानी चाहिए थी। हिन्दुस्तान में जो विभिन्न भाषाएँ हैं उनमें इसका अनुवाद कराया गया होता, लोगों को, आम आदमी को यह उपलब्ध कराया गया होता और उसकी इस देश में जानकारी कराई गई होती। कांग्रेस ने यह काम नहीं किया। जहाँ तक पार्लियामेंट का सवाल है, उसको भी विश्वास में लेने की कोशिश नहीं की गई। यहाँ पर चर्चा किस तरह से कराई गई? कमी तो बिल्कुल एकाएक कि आज इस पर चर्चा होगी, जिससे तैयार होकर न आएँ, कभी सेशन के बिल्कुल आखिरी दिन जिससे कि इस पर गंभीर

चर्चा न हो सके और कल को आप देखिए जब यह तथ्य हुआ कि इस पर चर्चा होगी तो किस तरह से चर्चा का समय कम करने की कोशिश की गई, वह सारे लोग जानते हैं। उसको दोहराने की जरूरत नहीं है और हमारी जो उपसभापति महोदया उस समय जो बेयर पर थीं उनको उस समय को कम करने की कोशिश को मुस्कुराकर बर्दाश्त करना पड़ा। तो मैं चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आज आप यहां हैं, हम भी हैं, हो सकता है दस साल, बीस साल, पच्चीस साल, तीस साल, चालीस साल के बाद जब इस सभा में न आप होंगे और न हम होंगे, आज जो सरकार है शायद इसके भी सदस्य न हों और जब कोई इतिहासकार या हमारे संसद की कार्यवाही में दिलचस्पी रखने वाला कोई खोजी आदमी कोई खोज करेगा तो यही मतलब वह पाएगा कि इतने बड़े गंभीर मुद्दे पर भी पार्लियामेंट में लूका-छिपी का खेल खेला गया और उस पर चर्चा भी नहीं की गई। तो यह चर्चा ठिक से, तफसील से नहीं होने देना यह मेरा पहले इलजाम है।

एक चीज मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ जिसकी तरफ कांग्रेस की तरफ से बार-बार कहा जाता है कि गैट समझौता तो एक वरदान है जो इनको मिल गया है। तो मैं और किसी का हवाला नहीं देना चाहता हूँ, मैं भारत सरकार के जो सबसे बड़े गैट के समर्थक है हमारे वित्त मंत्री डा० मनमोहन सिंह, उनका हवाला देना चाहता हूँ।

"गैट" क्या-क्या ला रहा है, हमारे देश में यह सन् 82 में मालूम हो गया था और सन् 86 आते-आते और भी साफ हो गया। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, उस वक्त एक साउथ कमीशन गठित किया गया था और जहां तक मुझे याद है उस साउथ कमीशन के चैयरमैन तंजानिया के राज्याध्यक्ष थे और सेक्रेटरी जनरल डा० मनमोहन सिंह थे। उन्होंने उसकी रिपोर्टें तैयार की थीं। उस रिपोर्ट में उनकी यह फाईंडिंग है, उस रिपोर्ट में उन्होंने कहा है कि जो पुराना युग था पूंजीवाद साम्राज्यवाद का या दूसरे देशों पर कब्जा करने का, उसको अब दोहराया नहीं जा सकता है और वह नहीं चाहिए। यही नहीं, उन्होंने उसमें बचाव की भी बात की थी कि इससे कैसे बचा जा सकता है? उसकी मैं बाद में चर्चा करूंगा। मैं इस सदन का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ कि वह साउथ कमीशन की रिपोर्टें को पढ़े कि उसमें डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी ने उस वक्त क्या कहा था?

अब जहां तक इस सरकार का सवाल है, जब "गैट" वार्ता शुरू हुई तो विश्व व्यापार में नए मुद्दे

कोड़े पड़े हैं—औद्योगिक अर्थव्यवस्था संरक्षणी, कृषि संरक्षणी, सेवाओं के व्यापार संरक्षणी और विदेशी पूंजी निवेश। इन चार मुद्दों पर हमारी सरकार के जो प्रतिनिधि "गैट" में वार्ता करते थे, उस वक्त यह उस पर विश्वास करने के लिए भी तैयार नहीं थे। मगर आज उनकी राय बिल्कुल बदल गयी है। जो लोग इस पर विचार नहीं करना चाहते थे, वही अब कहते हैं कि यह हमारे लिए वरदान है। तो इतनी पक्की राय के लोग हमारी सरकार चला रहे हैं तो इस देश का क्या हाल होनेवाला है, यह इन्हीं लोगों से मालूम कीजिए?

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, अभी मदन भाटिया जी बोल रहे थे, हालांकि अब वे हाउस से चले गए हैं, उनका यह कहना है कि औद्योगिक संपदा का जो मुद्दा इसमें जुड़ा है, उससे देश को फायदा-ही-फायदा है, लेकिन वह कैसे है, यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता। वह यहां बैठे सदस्यों की समझ में नहीं आता और जहां तक मैं समझता हूँ कि "गैट" के खिलाफ यहां पुरा-का-पुरा अपोजीशन है तथा कांग्रेस अकेली पार्टी है जोकि इसकी समर्थक है। कांग्रेस में भी इस पर अंदरूनी मतभेद है, यह किसी से छिपा नहीं है जिसका एक नमूना अभी मालवीय जी ने आपके सामने रखा था एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाते हुए। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, हमारा पुराना जो पेंटेड लाँ है, उसकी विशेषता क्या थी? वह इजाजत देता था खाली प्रोसेस की। यह एक बात हुई और उसमें यह था कि हमारे पेंटेड की अवधि 5, 7 या 14 साल तक की होगी। जो जरूरी चीजें थीं जैसेकि बीज, खाद, दवा—इनकी अवधि ज्यादा-से-ज्यादा 5, 7 साल तक रहेगी और कुछ चीजों की 14 साल रहेगी, लेकिन अब उससे कितना बड़ा डिफरेंस हुआ है कि उसकी अवधि अब 20 साल हो गयी है और इस दफा प्रोसेस पर नहीं बल्कि प्रोटेक्ट पर जोर है। जो बस्तु पैदा होगी उस प्रोसेस से, उस पर विदेशी कंपनियों का जोर है और ऐसा क्यों है? क्योंकि जब प्रोसेस पर पेंटेड है तो इजाजत हम देते थे और हम मजबूर करते थे कि कारखाना हमारे देश में लगाओ। जब हमारे देश में वह कारखाना लगाता था तो उसमें हम और ज्यादा खोज कर के, और ज्यादा शोध कर के, उसका विकास कर के और उससे भी अच्छी चीज पैदा करने लायक बन जाते थे। मिसाल के लिए एंटीबायोटिक दवाएं हमने रूस से ली। अब उसमें हमने ऐसा सुधार और उसे ऐसे मल्टीप्लाय किया कि हम रूस को खुद एंटी-बायोटिक दवाएं एक्सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं। तो उसके यह नतीजे थे और अगर कोई विदेशी कंपनी जिससे कि पेंटेड लिया गया है, वह हमारे यहां कारखाना

लगता था तो भारत सरकार उससे जुमाना मसूल कर सकती थी। भारत सरकार तीन साल के बाद उसकी मजबूर कर सकती थी कि किसी दूसरे को हमारे यहां लायसेंस दो। आज यह चीजें गायब हो गयी हैं।

फिर जहां तक रायल्टी का सवाल है, उसकी एक सीमा थी। और वह सीमा ज्यादा से ज्यादा चार प्रतिशत तक है, लेकिन आज वह सीमा जो है बढ़ जाती है, आप समझ लीजिए, मतलब वह सीमा ही खतम कर दी। तो इस पर आप गौर कीजिए, कितना और यह गैट समझोता एक विश्व-व्यापी पेटेण्ट कानून की बात करता है। हमारा जो आज का पेटेण्ट कानून है उसमें संशोधन करना पड़ेगा और उसमें गैट के नए प्रावधानों को समाहित करना पड़ेगा। जब कोई प्रोटेक्ट का पेटेण्ट हो जमएगा तो उस तरह को कोई चीज अगर दूसरी प्रक्रिया से भी बनते है तो हम पर चोरी का इल्जाम लगेगा और चोरी का इल्जाम लगने पर इल्जाम लगाने वाले को साबित नहीं करना होगा बल्कि हमको साबित करना होगा कि हम निर्वीण है। यह फल हो गया है।

आप समझिए, हमारे अकलमंद दोस्त, आलिम और फाजिल दोस्त भाटिया साहब ने गैट में जो उसकी रूपरेखा है... (समय की घंटी)... इतनी जल्दी तो यह खतम होने वाला नहीं है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (संघ सचिव रजि) : कांमिशन करेंगे तो खतम हो जाएगा।

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : नहीं, नहीं, हम ऐसी कोशिश तो नहीं कर पाएंगे, कोई जादू तो है नहीं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (संघ सचिव रजि) : तो पांच मिनट और ले लीजिए।

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : पांच मिनट में नहीं हो सकता, सर। इतना बड़ा मुद्दा है। इसको हम छोड़ नहीं सकते।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (संघ सचिव रजि) : कितना समय लेना चाहेंगे? आप छोड़ें नहीं, लेकिन समय की सीमा तो कुछ न कुछ आपको निश्चित करनी पड़ेगी।

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : कम से कम आधा घंटा चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (संघ सचिव रजि) : आई एम सॉरी, इतना समय नहीं। आप थोड़ा सा कम समय ले लें।

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : भाई घंटा चाहिए कम से कम।

तो सर, मैं यह कह रहा था कि यह इतना बड़ा डिपार्चर और हमारे लायक वेस्ट, काँग्रेस के साथी हमारे, मैं यह नहीं कहता कि उनको यह चीज नहीं मालूम है, वह सबके सब इस खतरे को समझते हैं, हमसे भी ज्यादा विद्वान है यह लोग, लेकिन वे क्यों चुप है? क्यों इनकी सरकार चुप है? यह तो माने कि इसमें कहें न कहें सरकार की कमजोरी है। अगर यह सरकार अपनी विवशता की बात करती, अपनी कमजोरी बताती तो शायद देश में इतना गुस्सा नहीं होता इस सरकार के प्रति, जितना आज है। इतना देश के लोगों में कुछ तो न होता, जितना आज है। इनकी मजबूरी क्या है? व्यापार संतुलन का संकट जब संतुलन के संकट से निपटने के लिए अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्रा कोश के पास हमारी सरकार जाती है कब के लिए जो उसकी पहली शर्त क्या है? वह बोलता है कि आप जिस आर्थिक व्यवस्था से अभी तक काम ले रहे थे वह व्यवस्था आपको इस हद तक ले आई, आपको इस दिन पर ले आई इसलिए अब इस व्यवस्था को ही बदल दो। तो पहली शर्त तो वह होती है कि उस व्यवस्था को बदलो।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह उदारीकरण की नीति, आर्थिक उदारीकरण की नीति जो लाई गई है जिससे विदेशी कंपनियों को हमारे देश में घुसने का मौका मिला है, यह डा० मनमोहन सिंह के दिमाग की उपज नहीं है और न ही यह उपज है हमारे प्रधानमंत्री पी० वी० नरसिंहराव जो के दिमाग की। यह तो विवेक्षण है अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मोनेटरी फंड का, कि इस तरह से उदारीकरण की नीति आप अपने देश में चलाओ। इसी के साथ जो गैट में प्रावधान है, इनके बहुत से प्रावधान मौजूद हैं, आप समझिए कि इनके कार्यक्रमों में बल्ले बैंक के और मोनेटरी फंड के कार्यक्रम जो है, एक जैसे है। इसलिए दूसरा इल्जाम हमारा यह है कि गैट समझोता तो आज हो रहा है, अभी उसमें अर्थव्यवस्था किया है, वस्तुतः होने है साल भर के बाद, लेकिन गैट के समझोते पर अमल शुरू कर दिया है इस सरकार ने दो-तीन साल पहले से। यह दो-तीन साल पहले से अमल शुरू हो गया है। आप उसकी मिस्त्रल देख सकते हैं, जैसे नोन-टैरीफ इक्वोट रिस्ट्रिक्शन का है। यह सरकार कर रही है और गैट समझोते में भी है, मोनेटरी फंड जैसे जबरदस्ती कर रहा है और दूसरी तरफ अपनी का बचाव है। अपनी का बचाव, वह हमें बता रहा है कि विश्व व्यापार के लिए

जाती चले और दूसरी तरफ अमरीका अपने सुपर 301 और स्पेशल 301 की धमकी देता है। कोई देश उनके माल को अपने देश में आने में बाधा डालता है, यह है सुपर 301 और स्पेशल 301 में है कि अगर उसका आदर नहीं किया जाता पेरेन्ट था, तब फिर अमरीका उसकी जो है, मतलब व्यापार पर जांच करके और उस देश को निगरानी सूची में डालता है। चाहे उसको निगरानी सूची कहिए या व्हिटलिस्ट कहिए और अमरीका धमकी देता है कि यह सारी बाधाएं दूर करो, ठीक से बीहेव करो बरना हम तुम्हारे माल को अपने यहां नहीं आने देंगे।

इस धमकी के आगे भारत सरकार बिल्कुल घुटने टेक देती है। अमरीका की धमकी, इंटरनेशनल मॉनिटरी फंड की धमकी, विश्व बैंक की धमकी, इस तिकड़ी के सामने यह सरकार बिल्कुल बेबस हो जाती है और वह सब करती है जो आज कर रही है। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर सरकार ने यह बता दिया होता कि हमारी यह मजबूरी है, इस मजबूरी को भी वह छिपा रही है और आप समझिए कि इसका कहीं जिक्र नहीं किया गया है बल्कि मालूम होता है कि इन्होंने खुद सपना देखा है कि भारत में उदारीकरण की नीति से आएँ और अपनी नीतियों को इस तरह से बदलने लगे। आप कहते हैं कि दस प्रतिशत तक हमको छूट है, हम ज्यादा सबसिडी नहीं दे रहे हैं। तो फिर क्या ब्रजहू है कि इंटरनेशनल मॉनिटरी फंड के कहने पर या विश्व बैंक के या अमरीका के दबाव पर आपने पहले ही सबसिडी कम करना शुरू कर दिया है? आखिर क्यों कम कर दिया गया है? माननीय मंत्री जी इसका जवाब दें या जो बड़े काबिल मित्र अभी बोल रहे थे, वे इसका जवाब दें कि आपने सबसिडी का कम किया जाना क्यों शुरू कर दिया है दो साल पहले? इसी के साथ, हमारे समर्थन मूल्य का क्या होगा, हमारी खाद्य सुरक्षा का क्या होगा, हमारी सार्वजनिक वितरण प्रणाली का क्या होगा, क्योंकि वे कहते हैं कि बाजार भाव से खरीदो? अगर आपको बफर स्टॉक भी बनाना है तो बाजार भाव से खरीदो और अगर उस बफर स्टॉक से बेचना है तब भी बाजार भाव से बेचो। कहाँ रहे जाँएगा यह समर्थन मूल्य? सारी अवधारणा यह समर्थन मूल्य की है और आप समझिए कि सार्वजनिक वितरण प्रणाली की है। मैं आपको यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो आपके पहले खाण्ड्य सचिव थे हूडा साहिब, तो हूडा साहिब ने मन्त्रालय के संबंधित स्थायी समिति के सामने गवाही देते हुए कहा था :—

Shri Huda also informed the Committee that the Government would get it in writing before signing the Agreement that the public distribution system in India would not be affected.

तो हूडा तो बात करते-करते गैट में ही चले गए, लेकिन मैं इस सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि हूडा साहब ने जो स्टैंडिंग कमेटी के सामने एग्योरेंस दिया था कि राइटिंग में लिया जाएगा कि हमारा पब्लिक डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन सिस्टम अफेक्टेड नहीं होगा, यह बात राइटिंग में ली गई है हस्ताक्षर करने से पहले या नहीं ली गई है? पूरा मुल्क आज चिंतित है और यह जानना चाहता है, अगर चिंता नहीं है तो इस तरफ नहीं है।

इसी के साथ-साथ एक चीज और कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक विदेशी पूंजी का निवेश है, कहते हैं कि किसान के बीज पर कोई असर नहीं पड़ेगा, हम सुई जैन्स सिस्टम अडाप्ट कर लेंगे। सुई जैन्स सिस्टम यूपीओबी 1978 या 74 और 1991, उसमें दिया गया था, उसमें ब्रीडर के राइट्स एक जगह दिए गए हैं। अगर कोई ब्रीडर किसी पोद्ये की या बीज की नई किस्म निकालता है तो उसके अधिकार सुरक्षित होंगे। उसके दो एक्सेप्शन होंगे, उसका पूरा नियंत्रण उस पर रहेगा, लेकिन दो एक्सेप्शन रहेंगे—नम्बर एक एक्सेप्शन है कि हमारे देश के ब्रीडर उस प्रोटेक्टिड बीज को अपने शोध के लिए आगे इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं और दूसरे यह छूट थी कि उस प्रोटेक्टिड बीज से अगर वह फसल तैयार करता है तो अपनी फसल के लिए उसमें से बीज बचा सकता है। लेकिन जो मानस है अमीर देशों का, अगर हम ध्यान में रखें तो उन्होंने उसको 1991 में पूरी तरह से जकड़ दिया है और जो किसानों को और शोधकर्ताओं को उसमें छूट मिली थी, वह भी खत्म होने जा रही है। वह करीब-करीब ऐसे हो गए हैं जैसे कि पेटेंट और पेटेंट जब आ जाएगा और 1991 वाली अवस्था जब लागू होगी, जैसा अभी हमारे साथी अशोक मित्र ने कहा था कि यह नहीं है कि हम तय कर लें, यह हमारे मालिक तय करेंगे, अमीर देश तय करेंगे, हमारी सरकार इसको तय नहीं करेगी और उस हालत में किसान न बीज बचा सकता है, न दूसरे किसान को दे सकता है और नतीजा उसका यह होगा कि हर दफा उसको बीज खरीदना होगा।

एक यह तर्क दिया जा रहा है कि इस सौदे से हमारा एक्सपोर्ट बड़ जाएगा, कृषि का एक्सपोर्ट बड़ जाएगा। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ, हुजूर, इस 40-42 साल, 45 साल जो आजादी के होते हैं इसमें

कितना एक्सपोर्ट आपने बढ़ाया है और आज की हालात में अगले दो-तीन-चार-दस साल में कितना एक्सपोर्ट आप बढ़ा लेंगे ? आपको यह बताना चाहिए क्योंकि जो आपको विकसित बीज मिलेंगे उनकी खासियत क्या है ? नम्बर-1, उनमें दो-तीन साल में फिर से पैदा होने की शक्ति नहीं रह जाती । नम्बर-2, अगले साल भी वह उतनी अच्छी फसल नहीं देते हैं जितनी देनी चाहिए । इनको रोग को रोकने की भी शक्ति नहीं रहती, इसलिए इनको रसायन की जरूरत है । फिर इनको ज्यादा खाद की जरूरत है, ज्यादा पानी की जरूरत है । जहां तक हमारे यहां पानी की व्यवस्था का सवाल है, सभी लोग बताएंगे कि एक-तिहाई जमीन से ज्यादा में पानी नहीं है । तो इन हालात में कैसे एक्सपोर्ट बढ़ जाएगा ? यह तो आप समझिए कि कोई बिल्कुल बेवकूफ, जो मूर्ख है और हमेशा बेवकूफों की जन्मत का रहने वाला है वही सोच सकता है कि हमारा एक्सपोर्ट बढ़ जाएगा, वरना उसके कहीं कोई आसार नहीं दिखाई देते । चाहे बीज की बात ले लीजिए, चाहे हमारी वर्तमान खाद और पानी की स्थिति ले लीजिए, चाहे और जो संसाधन खेती में काम आते हों उनको ले लीजिए । होगा क्या ? यह जो बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियां हैं, सरकार एक तरफ किसान की सबसिद्धी, किसान की सहायता कम करेगी और यह बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियां अपने बीज के साथ खाद भी जोड़ेंगे, कीटनाशक भी जोड़ेंगे, क्रेडिट भी जोड़ेंगे और अन्य चीजें जोड़कर किसान को मजबूर करेंगे कि इनको खरीदो । नतीजा उसका होगा कि सारा ट्रेड उसके हाथ में चला जाएगा । उस हालात में आपने छूट क्या-क्या दी है ? छूट दी है कि यह कम्पनियां किसान की जमीन को बंधक भी बना सकती हैं और जब बंधक बनाएंगी तो किसान बंधुवा मजदूर होकर रह जाएगा । यह बात गलत नहीं है जो कही जा रही है कि किसान अपनी जमीन से बेदखल होकर जाएगा और बंधुवा मजदूर होकर रह जाएगा । जहां तक बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियों का सवाल है, उनको पूंजी निवेश के दायरे में क्या छूट दी गई है ? हमारे यहां वह जहां चाहे वहां पर किसी तरह का कारखाना लगा सकते हैं । उन्हें स्थापना की पूरी छूट है ।

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : You can check them.

SHRI ANANT RAM JAISWAL : You cannot check them. After agreement on the GATT, you cannot do it. The Government cannot place any restriction.

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, मंत्री जी से भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे कैसे कारखाने लगाएंगे । कारखाना

लगाने के लिए उनके यहां जमीन कम है ? क्या अमेरिका में जमीन कम है या योरोप में जमीन कम है ? ये हमारे देश में वह कारखाना लगाएंगे जो जहरीले प्रदूषण पैदा करते हैं । जहरीली गैस का नमूना तो आप देख चुके हैं भोपाल के कारखाने में और भोपाल के कारखाने की जरा सी लीक में आज तक लोग मर रहे हैं । ऐसे ही वह नए कारखाने यहां लगाएंगे । दूसरी छूट उनको दी गई है कि हमारे मौजूदा जो कारखाने हैं, चाहे सरकारी क्षेत्र में और चाहे निजी क्षेत्र में हैं, उनमें 51 प्रतिशत या उससे भी ज्यादा वह शेयर पूंजी लगा सकते हैं । सारा प्रबंध उनके हाथ में चला जाएगा । मारुति को ही देख लीजिए । कल तक यह गवर्नमेंट अंडरटेकिंग था और आज 51 प्रतिशत शेयर सुजुकी को देकर वह हाथ से चला गया है । फिर जो हमारे निजी कारखाने हैं, इनमें सरकार किसी तरह का भेदभाव नहीं करेगी । उनके ऊपर यह भी पाबंदी नहीं रहेगी कि वह जो अपना सामान पैदा करेंगे तो उसकी खपत हमारे देश के बाजार में करेंगे या बाहर ले जाएंगे, यह भी उसमें नहीं है । फिर चौथा, अपना मूनाका वह रिपेटिट करेंगे । अभी इन बड़ी रियायतों का जिक्र यहां के कारखानेदारों ने डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी से किया । तो उन्होंने कहा कि आप इन पूंजीपतियों के लिए बड़ी-बड़ी रियायतें दे रहे हैं कोई बात नहीं है, लेकिन हमको भी तो रियायतें मिलनी चाहिए । तो उनको डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी ने टका सा जवाब दिया । उन्होंने उनसे क्या कहा ? यह कहा कि अगर तुम प्रतिस्पर्धा में नहीं ठहर सकते हो तो मिट जाओ, नष्ट हो जाओ । कोई आदमी जो इस देश का दुश्मन हो सकता है वही इस तरह की बात बोलेगा और अपने कारखानों को भार डालेगा और विदेशी कारखानों को यहां पर पनपाएगा जिनका कोई एतबार नहीं है कि कब छोड़कर यहां से चले जाएं । तो यह है विदेशी पूंजी का हाल, यह सम्पदा का हाल, खेती का हाल, सेवाओं का हाल । हर क्षेत्र में वह आ रहे हैं । क्या बनाएंगे हमारे यहां—आलीशान होटल बनाएंगे, कुछ ऐसी चीज बनाएंगे जहां पर बड़े लोग नहा सकें । पहाड़, नदी या आप समझिए कि झील के किनारे अगर अच्छे दृश्य वाली जगह है तो उसका सौंदर्यकरण करेंगे । ये हवाई-पट्टियां चौड़ी करेंगे और बड़े-बड़े एयरपोर्ट बनाएंगे । ये भिन्न-भिन्न सेवाओं का संचालन करेंगे । किन सेवाओं का ? बैंक के लिए कहते हैं, बीमे के लिए कहते हैं, स्वास्थ्य में भी आ रहे हैं । तो इन सब चीजों में एक तरह से श्री हमारी पूरी अर्थव्यवस्था है, उस पर हम बहुराष्ट्रीय

कंपनियों का कच्चा कसने जा रहे हैं। मैं बोझा सा समय और लूंगा उपाध्यक्ष महोदय। मैं बहुत बुझगुंजार हूँ नजमा जी का कि उन्होंने कल ही यहां श्राव दिलाया कि जब स्वर्गीय राजीव गांधी का स्वर्णवास हुआ तो इस सदन में कितनी लंबी बहस चली थी। मैं बड़े अदब से गुंजारिश करूंगा कि यह देश किसी भी एक आदमी से बहुत बड़ा है। अगर उन पर इतनी चर्चा हो सकती है तो क्यों नहीं इस मुद्दे पर 10 दिन तक चर्चा चल सकती है? होनी चाहिए। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम अपना पूरा देश एक तरह से उनके हवाले करने जा रहे हैं।

अमीर जयपाल रेड्डी जी ने कहा कि पर्यावरण की बात तो उठाई नहीं गई। अब हमारे बाल मजदूरों का प्रश्न उठाया जा रहा है, सस्ती मजदूरी का प्रश्न उठाया जा रहा है, पर्यावरण का प्रदूषित करने वाली जो विधियां हैं, उनका प्रश्न उठाया जा रहा है। यह बात नहीं है कि अंत हो गया है आपके दुश्मनों का। यह विदेशी प्रिपरेटरी कमेटी, जो नयी कमेटी गठित हुई है, उसकी सूची में ये सब बातें आ चुकी है और उन पर आगे चर्चा होगी। मैं बड़े अदब से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी तक जो रुझ रहा है सरकार का, इससे पहले जब बौद्धिक संपदा के संस्थान का मासला आया और जब इसका अपोजीशन हुआ विकसित और विकासशील देशों की तरफ से तो तब अमरीका ने कहा था कि इस मुद्दे को छोड़ दो, बार में देखा जाएगा लेकिन उसको शामिल कराया गया। उसी तरह से ये जो ताकतवर देश हैं, जो महाशक्तियां हैं, उन्होंने जिन मुद्दों को आज अपनी सूची में शामिल कराया है, कल वे उनको आपके फंसले में शामिल करा देंगे। यह बिल्कुल निश्चित बात है। तो एक अधरे की तरह हम बढ़ते जा रहे हैं।

(उपसभापति पीठासीन हुई)

मैं वाणिज्य मंत्री जी के जरिए से आपकी सरकार को याद दिलाया चाहता हूँ कि गांधी जी ने बहुत पहले ही इस बारे में सुझाव दिया था। गांधी जी ने जो यूरोप की सभ्यता है, बड़ी मशीन पर आधारित सभ्यता है, उसके मुकाबले में ग्रामीण स्वराज्य, ग्रामीण विकास, कुटीर उद्योग वगैरह का सुझाव दिया था। आपने गांधी जी को छोड़ दिया तो उसमें क्या उनका नुकसान है लेकिन देश को किस हासत में आपने पहुंचा दिया है, यह बात बिल्कुल साफ है। दूसरी बात यह है कि आप किसके पीछे भाग रहे हैं? आप भाग रहे हैं पूरा के पीछे और उस मूल के पीछे जिसने सारी दुनिया

का बोझ किया। महोदय, यह गोरे देकों की वृत्ति है कि इनको जो इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन से संपर्क मिली, उससे इन्होंने गरीब देशों को लूटा और अपनी खुशहाली बढ़ाई है। अपने देश की चहार-दीवारी के अंदर, अपनी राष्ट्रीय सीमाओं के भीतर इन्होंने खुशहाली बढ़ाई है।

उपसभापति : जायसवाल जी, आपने बहुत समय ले लिया है, अब आप समाप्त कीजिए।

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : महोदय, मुझे थोड़ा और समय चाहिए।

उपसभापति : मुझे तो यकीन है कि आप स पर पूरे दिन तक बोल सकते हैं, आपकी बहुत मालुमात है लेकिन प्रणव मुखर्जी साहब को 5 बजे जबाब देना है।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : उपसभापति जी, अभी आपका हवाला देते हुए, आपकी प्रशंसा करते हुए इन्होंने कहा कि स्वर्गीय राजीव गांधी की हत्या के बारे में इतनी लंबी चर्चा हुई थी... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : अब आप रिपीट कर रहे हैं।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : यह मसला तो बहुत बड़ा है। इस पर कई दिन तक चर्चा चलनी चाहिए। तो कृपया बोलने दीजिए।

उपसभापति : मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं है चर्चा चलने पर मगर हाउस का समय सीमित होता है।

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : अगर गांधी जी को आप याद नहीं करना चाहते तो डॉ० मनमोहन सिंह जी जो आपके नेता हैं आपको याद कर लीजिए। उन्होंने साउथ कमिशन की रिपोर्ट में क्या सुझाव दिए, इससे बचाव के लिए क्या सुझाव दिए? उन्होंने कहा है कि हम अपनी कोशिश करके, मेहनत करके स्वावलंबी बने और बजाय गोरे देशों की तरफ देखने के हम साउथ-साउथ कोअप-रेशन पर ज्यादा जोर दें क्योंकि हमारे पास बाजार है, हमारे पास तकनीक है, हमारे पास संसाधन है। उनका इस्तेमाल करके हम अपनी तकनीक पर खड़े हो सकते हैं और इन अमीर देशों का मुकाबला कर सकते हैं। अगर आप ऐसा करते तो शायद देश बच जाए।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, Mr. Narayanasamy. Mr. Narayanasamy, you will take only two minutes. I am sorry. Mr. Madhavan. I would be very obliged, Mr. Madhavan, if you are very brief. I know you are very cooperative.

SHRI S. MADHAVAN (Tamil Nadu) : Madam, the Government has signed this agreement in spite of protests from almost all the Opposition parties in the country

and now the Government is trying its best to allay the fears of the public about our future economic interests. Apart from political confrontation, there are genuine apprehensions about the GATT agreement. The differing opinions published in journals, given by experts and jurists about the various provisions and their interpretation, are adding fuel to this controversy. Eminent jurists and Judges of the Supreme Court have declared that there is a violent conflict between the basic structure of the Dunkel Draft text and the basic structure of the Constitution of India. Fundamentally, it affects the governance of the nation; impairs and destroys India's capacity to exercise its sovereign power; affects India's self-sufficiency in fuel and restricts the power of the State to intervene for the benefit of the Indian people; destroys the federal character of India's Constitution; adversely affects the livelihood of the large bulk of Indian farmers. These are the opinions expressed by retired Supreme Court Judges and eminent jurists. Now, the State Governments have gone to courts questioning the validity of the GATT agreement and against its implementation. The hon. Minister has assured us that farmers' interests would be protected, the agriculture subsidy will continue, subsidised distribution of essential commodities will continue, the drug prices will be controlled and the interests of the pharmaceutical industry will be protected. These are the assurances given by the hon. Minister. The conflicting opinions arise from the different interpretations given to the various provisions of the agreement. For this, the hon. Minister has given an assurance that before signing the agreement, there would be footnotes confirming our Government's interpretation of these provisions. One more assurance was given by him that there would be a separate agreement or understanding in writing between our trade-partners, confirming to the interpretation of the Indian Government so that these interests, especially in the field of agriculture, pharmaceuticals and PDS would be protected. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what steps the Government have taken to fulfil these assurances before the signing of this agreement. Is it a fact that State Governments were not consulted on this issue before signing the agreement? In spite of repeated requests from the State Governments that they must be called for discussion, that they must be consulted before the signing of the agreement—especially the Tamil Nadu Government has written a number of letters to the Prime Minister and the concerned Minister that before signing the agreement, they must consult the State Governments because the interests of the States are also affected they have not done so. The hon. Minister has also stated one fact that this agreement would be for six years only and within this period, our interests would not be affected. After six years, we have got a choice to review this position and we can come out

of this agreement. Is it correct? Now, the hon. Minister for Agriculture has quoted article 15 of this agreement and stated that India can come out of the agreement by giving six months notice if our country's interests are affected. I would like to know from the hon. Commerce Minister whether he agrees with this view of the hon. Agriculture Minister, expressed by him in the other House. I want to have a categorical assurance from the hon. Minister that India will withdraw from the GATT agreement by giving six months' notice if the fears expressed by all the Opposition Parties become true and our interests are affected. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy. Will you please follow the same example?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Yes. I will be very brief.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Madhavan took only five minutes.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Thank you, Madam, for giving me an opportunity to speak. Madam, the subject of Uruguay Round of Negotiations and the Final Act that has been signed at Marrakesh has been debated inside as well as outside the House for and against by the political parties. There are four areas about which strong criticisms were made by the Opposition relating to this Agreement. One is agriculture. The second is pharmaceuticals. The third is intellectual property rights and the fourth one is textiles. Apart from these, they are speaking about the other Acts which are of not much concern. Madam, the hon. Commerce Minister made it very clear in this House on the last occasion how farmers' interests would be protected by this Agreement, how Indian farmers would be able to export their commodities at a better price to the developed countries. He had also stated that there was an import obligation on the part of the developed countries, and apart from that, once the subsidy that had been given by the developed countries for their agricultural produce was reduced, how India would be able to compete in the international field. But, Madam, to my utter surprise, what I find is the Opposition leaders have started launching a disinformation campaign. They have told the farmers that their seeds have to come from the United States, their technology has to come from other European countries and they will be at the mercy of the developed countries. That is the disinformation campaign that has been perpetuated by the Opposition leaders in this country as far as this Agreement is concerned. But, Madam, the reality is quite otherwise. The farmers are suffering because they are not getting a better price for their produce marketed in the international field. Now, they will be able to get a better price for their produce because of this Agreement.

This point has been totally ignored by the other parties. It has not at all been considered by them but they have been accusing this Government on this ground. Madam, I would like to go a step further and say that ours being an agricultural country, the standard of living of our farmers has to be improved. Already, 117 countries have put their seal of approval to the Agreement. They have joined together and formed a block. If India is isolated and if India as a country goes to the international market, then it will not be able to protect the interests of its farmers. As far as farmers' interests are concerned, this Agreement is going to safeguard their interests and give a better price for their produce. The subsidies which are given by this Government to the poor farmers will not be cut.

Madam, about the public distribution system, the stocking of the produce as well as the seeds by the farmers, a criticism has been made that the entire public distribution system will collapse. That is the theory propounded by them. We have one of the best public distribution systems in the country. It is not the farmers who are getting the subsidy. It is going to the consumers directly. The subsidy part will not be affected. Let me challenge the hon. Members sitting on the other side. They can show any clause which goes against the Public Distribution System; I will agree with them. But they are totally ignoring the point and trying to give a distorted picture to the people of this country, to the farmers of this country.

Madam, I will give one example about the intellectual property rights and then conclude. I would like to mention that computers were brought from abroad. Our scientists have developed it. India has become one of the important countries which are producing computers. Rupees two thousand and five hundred crores worth of computer softwares and computer parts are sent abroad from this country today. In our country it is cheaper compared to other western countries and the United States. We have adopted the technology. We have developed the technology and our scientists improved upon it and because of that India is able to get Rs. 2,500 crores per year from computer softwares and computer parts. This is one area. Let us take the technological development in other areas. Our scientists are capable of developing technology. There is a fear in the minds of the Opposition leaders and they referred to the intellectual property rights. It is widely known in the world that all the countries are rewarded for their scientific invention. We export our agricultural technology to abroad. We have got Rs. 1,500 crores through the Ind'ian Council of Agricultural Research. Therefore, the Government has considered agriculture. They need not have any fear about that. Our scientists will be able to improve our agriculture. Our scientists

will be able to develop our pisciculture. We will be able to sell them abroad and we will get better benefit out of it.

A hue and cry has been made by a senior Member, Shri Madhavan. He was making a point as to why the State Governments had not been consulted before signing the treaty or the agreement. Day in and day out the Government is signing various agreements with various countries for various developmental projects and various developmental schemes, to this country. When they are being brought the States are not consulted. We are getting a lot of foreign exchange out of them. Development is taking place in the States. If the Central Government is to consult every state on every agreement it signs with other Governments, then the Central Government will not be able to function. It is for the Central Government to decide on the question of our country's agreements with other countries. Therefore, this aspect has to be considered by the Hon. Members.

I have only one suggestion to make to the hon. Minister. There is a fear and that is my apprehension also. That is the connecting of the world trade with labour standards. Labour is one of our assets. The multinationals are closing down their factories in the developed countries. They are making investment in India because the labour charges are more there than in our country. Therefore, they are closing down their factories in the developed countries and they want to make investment in the developing countries. If there is a compromise on the question of labour in the world trade, then India will lose the benefit. I will request the Hon. Minister that the Government should be firm and there should not be any compromise on the labour issue. I will request the Hon. Members of the other side that when it is a question of the nation, when it is a question of the interest of the country, they should forget the petty politics. Let us work together so that India will become a powerful country in the world. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Giri Prasad. You please be very brief. I have to allow the Minister to reply.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, I request you to show some indulgence to me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am very indulgent to everybody. But the watch is not very indulgent.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: When we speak at the end we are always at a disadvantage unless you protect the interests of the speakers who speak at the far end.

AN HON. MEMBER: The weaker section.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know everybody is a weaker section in this House.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: We can sit beyond 6 o'clock.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We can sit. But he has a commitment. A foreign minister is coming. He has to meet him. He did not know that we were going to discuss it so long. We have to think about it.

SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM: He can reply tomorrow.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no chance tomorrow. Please don't give wild advice which could not be abided.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATARAMAN (Tamil Nadu): Earlier speakers have taken one hour or forty-five minutes. The list should not be squeezed for that purpose. We must be given an opportunity. They have taken a lot of time. *(Interruptions)* ... Madam, you should protect our interests also.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Venkataraman, you are a very intelligent person. You can make your point in six minutes for which others might take one hour. I know it.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: Madam, a few minutes back, I heard a very disturbing voice when one Congress Member spoke about the very validity of the sovereignty of the country. I totally disagree with him. I think there is nobody on the earth to question the sovereignty of the country. We may have agreements with any other country. That is a different matter. We may abide by the commitments made in those agreements. But nobody can question the validity of the sovereignty. Our republic is formed on the basis of sovereignty. I hope the Minister also will not take a lenient attitude towards his colleagues when they question the sovereignty of the country.

Madam, due to this agreement, by converting GATT into a World Trade Organisation, the final act, our country has lost many interests which were there. The first thing is this. There was Article 18 in the GATT Agreement which says, "there is protection for the weaker countries or the developing countries in terms of trade." There was a provision to ban or restrict imports to protect the domestic industry. Earlier, this provision was there. But under this final act, we don't have any such provision. Moreover, we are asked to open our markets to all types of foreign imports without any restriction. So, this is the qualitative change. Our negotiators, including our Hon. Minister, never bothered to protect the interests of our country.

18—7 RSS/ND/95

I would like to cite one more example. Many apologists of this GATT Agreement have been arguing that we are going to be benefited by this Agreement, especially in two or three sectors, including the agriculture sector. What is the fate of our agriculture sector? For the last 10 years the capital formation in the agriculture sector has been going down. It has come down from 18 per cent to 11 per cent. Though we are producing grain and many other commodities due to good weather and proper rains, these are not sufficient for export purposes. So, what is the rationale in saying that we would have a very big market and we would have a very big marketable surplus to export to other countries. Unless they reorganise the whole agriculture sector starting from implementing land reforms, they will not be able to produce more commodities in the agricultural field. Even in terms of using these commodities, I think, we are lagging behind. Although, we produce a lot of wealth in the agriculture sector, that is hardly sufficient to meet our own needs.

Then there is a very sinister clause in this Final Act. Of course, some Members from the Treasury Benches can say that we will not be covered by that and we need not reduce the subsidy.

5.00 p.m.

They may say that because there is a BOP cover we will not be constrained. But that is a different matter. It also says that the whole thing would be reviewed after 6 years. After that we would have to open our markets to foreign agricultural commodities up to 5 per cent. When you look at the rate of production in our country, after 5 or 6 years we may be forced to import more than 22,000 to 30,000 crores of agricultural commodities. The Minister must clarify this point. There is every possibility that the developed countries would resort to dumping their agricultural surplus in our country. With regard to textiles also, we are not able to gain much because of the Multi-fibre Agreement. Our Minister has been saying that this would taper off in the next 10 years. But the American people do not agree to this. Even with regard to those textile goods which are not covered by the MFA, they are trying to bring it under MFA for calculation purposes. Hence, we will not have any additional quotas in terms of additional textile exports. In this context, the US Commerce Minister, Mr. Mickey Kantor, said, "India cannot pick and choose." What does this mean? They want to pressurise us to import from their country. So instead of exporting more to America, we will be compelled to import from them. That is why this bilateral agreement will not help us as far as textile is concerned. What is the additional benefit that we get in terms of exports? Some of our friends here quoted certain figures. But according

to the Asian Development Bank, our country will be able to generate additional exports worth one billion dollars only. Today our exports are worth 20 billion dollars. So this additional one billion dollars of export is not a big expansion. My other point is that in spite of this multilateral agreement or the so-called dispute settling mechanism, there is no guarantee that the Americans would not use Super 301 against other countries. The Americans have threatened Japan. They are trying to pressurise other countries to follow their dictates. The point I wish to make is that instead of negotiating on our own strength, the strength of our own people and instead of taking help from other developing countries, we tried to enter into a bilateral deal with America. Of course, we require technology and we may need their help. But we have ditched other developing countries and have drifted towards the developed countries, especially the USA. Now they are trying to pressurise us. The WTO or the Final Act will only help the developed countries. It will harm the interests of the developing countries. My last point is that even at this stage the Government can negotiate with all other countries in terms of this agreement. There are so many clauses. Even the Minister, in his statement, has made a mention of so many things as brought out by the Chairman. It is not only the question of economic matters, but now social problems have also come up so also labour issues are being raised. Actually, the American Government follows 'hire and fire' policy as far as employment is concerned. And the foreign investors coming to our country insist upon the Government changing our labour laws. These American leaders are now asking our Government to have standards of labour policy. They mean to say, "Pay more or else we will restrict your imports to our country." So, instead of helping our country, instead of insisting on following their own policies here, instead of promoting exports from developing countries, they are pressurising our country to reduce our exports to them. It appears from the statement that the question of political stability is also involved. So, they are going to take into account the political stability in the developing countries. They might say that they would trade with such countries only. All these factors will come up for discussion. But our Government drifted away from the discussion the day the TRIPS was taken up for discussion because it did not want to pre-judge things. But the developed countries pre-judged everything and we have seen the result of it. So, if our Government does not take a proper stand, a strong stand, in defence of our country, I think, we will be ruined. I think that the Government will have to renegotiate and stand by the country's interests in every respect. Otherwise, our whole country will be ruined; the interests of the people will be ruined. I hope that the hon. Minister

will keep all these things in view in the coming months.

Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Ram Gopal Yadav. Not present ... (*Interruptions*)

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : मंत्री जी का जवाब देने का टाइम तो लेप्स हो रहा है। 5 वजे था।
... (व्यवधान)

उपसमापति : आप लोगों की वजह से लेप्स हो रहा है। ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa) : Thank you, Madam. I will stick to the convention of this House and it being a *suo motu* statement, I will seek clarifications only.

Madam, the signing of the GATT agreement on 15th of April is a *fait accompli* and any amount of debate in this country will not undo what has been done..... (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At 5.30 p.m., the Minister has to go. That is why I am requesting everybody to be brief.... (*Interruptions*)

आपका नाम आया तब आप बोलि या। ...
(व्यवधान) कर्नाडिस साहब को बोलने दीजिए।
... (व्यवधान)

I said from the Chair that we should finish it by 5 o'clock ... (*Interruptions*) Don't argue. We are wasting every minute ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat) : We can take it up tomorrow.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, we cannot take it up tomorrow ... (*Interruptions*) Don't argue, please. We are wasting the time. Let Mr. Fernandes speak ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu) : Madam, I thought that you would respond to the mood of the House. There is a Private Member Bill tomorrow which is also on the same subject.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fernandes, you continue.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES : Madam, I was mentioning that the signing of the Treaty is a *fait accompli* and any amount of discussion in the country cannot undo what has been done. I think it is not proper for us to have a post-mortem but we should rather look forward and see how well we can implement this agreement. Madam, with the signing of this agreement, the prestige of our country has been enhanced. India is not a "banana" republic. India has one-seventh

of the total population of the world. And I think it was proper for our country to be a member of that agreement. Madam, the hon. Minister mentioned that 110 countries had signed this agreement.

Madam, the hon. Minister, in the same paragraph, has mentioned that 104 countries have signed the Agreement for establishing the World Trade Organisation. The Minister has not made it clear whether our country is a party to it. So, I want the hon. Minister to clarify this because it is not very clear in the first paragraph.

We know that many countries have been clubbed together. We all have been put in one basket: the super powers, the developed countries and the developing countries. We know that the Western countries have their own economic clubs. We know about NAFTA in America and EEC in Europe. I want to know from the hon. Minister whether India will champion the cause of the developing countries. We have championed the cause of the developing countries in the various international fora, including NAM.

Madam, our country is an agrarian country where 80% of the people depend on farming. In the Western countries, the farming community constitutes only three per cent. Therefore, we have to be very careful and see whether the interests of our farmers are protected. In our country, agriculture has not yet been declared as an industry and it does not get the benefits of the liberalisation policy. I want the Minister to react to this and to see that agriculture is declared as an industry, that our farmers are protected and that they are able to compete with the farmers of the Western countries.

Madam, we have seen, of late, that we import many of our commodities. There is an Open General Licence. OGL is being given for importing oil and sugar also. Very recently, the Finance Minister did mention that for the last two years, we were able to export goods worth about Rs. 100 crores. The Western countries export what is in excess of their requirement. It is said that they eat what they can and they can what they cannot. But, in our country, this safeguard that the farmer is not given a free licence to starve his own people and export all the produce to the Western countries just to get a few dollars, has to be taken. I hope the hon. Minister will react to this.

Again, there is a feeling internationally. We know that India is a large democracy. It is a working democracy. But there is a campaign from the Opposition friends who say that the GATT Agreement does not have any sanctity of the people and the Parliament. If you see, in the Western countries, there is the Maastricht Treaty. It was ratified by all the Parliaments of those respective countries in

Europe. Similarly, I feel that we also have to give an impression to the Western powers, the world, that we also would like to take our Parliament into confidence. Moreover, for the implementation of this Agreement, the Minister will have to come to Parliament in order to amend the laws from time to time, whenever the laws go against the interests of our country. I think our Constitution has to be amended and the Government should not take freedom under article 70 in such a way as not to take our Parliament into confidence.

There is a campaign in our country and our farmers are being misguided. I would not name whether it is done by the Opposition benches or the Treasury benches. I think the farmers are misguided by some for their own political ends. I want to know whether the Government will take any steps and see that our farmers are properly educated and informed through the electronic media and by other means. There is a fear-psychosis created in our country.

With these few suggestions, I hope the Minister will react to these.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fernandes. Now, Mr. P. Upendra.

SHRI P. UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, there is a countrywide discussion on this issue. Several agitations have been conducted, massive demonstrations have been held all over the country. I have carefully heard the speeches of eminent economists like Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi and Dr. Ashok Mitra. I don't doubt their sincerity or concern for the country and I don't subscribe to the view that they are politically motivated in making the criticism. I must say that I am not convinced by the arguments put forth by them against the signing of the GATT Treaty. One point, which has some validity, is that the Government has not taken the people and the Parliament into confidence all these years about the implications of the Treaty and about the various stages of the negotiations. But I cannot blame Mr. Pranab Mukherjee for that because if a freak child is born today, the last doctor cannot be blamed. These negotiations started from September, 1986 and four Governments were involved in this. And at no stage this House was taken into confidence, the people were taken into confidence. If at all somebody has to be blamed, all these successive Governments have to be blamed for that. And it is also very clear that the United States and some of the developed countries in Europe have adopted arm-twisting methods to brow-beat the developing nations. That is very clear. And what these countries could do?

The question of sovereignty was raised. I am also not convinced by that argument. In an international agreement,

there is a give and take. It is not that 117 or 120 countries would get whatever they want. Similarly India is also placed. We may be a nation of 900 million people, but in terms of our share in the world trade, it is less than half a per cent. Where do we stand? After all, the negotiating power of a nation depends on its economic strength also. We cannot say that we are a big country, and we could have mobilised everybody and that we could have prevented certain things. It is not so. And we cannot say that those 117 or 120 countries, who have signed, have surrendered their sovereignty also. The question of sovereignty does not arise because in an international treaty, every country has to surrender a part of its sovereignty just as an individual surrenders his individuality and independence in a society, in a community, and in a party. Therefore, that argument does not hold good.

And what has been done by this Government or the earlier Governments? The negotiations were being carried on. At several stages, amendment were placed. But some stubbornness was shown by the developed nations. Even otherwise, they were doing that even without this Treaty. When the cryogenic deal was stopped by America, what could we do? When Germany imposed restrictions on our shoe exports because a particular chemical was being used, what could we do? Then, again, when France banned our sea-food exports, what could we do? Even bilaterally also, these nations are adopting these tactics, and we are helpless, the nations are helpless. Therefore, at least, there are some advantages which are likely to come from this Treaty. Not all the bad points are there. I know there are bad points. I know we would not derive what all we want. But let us see the good side also. A chaotic situation is there as far as international trade is concerned. Some order is sought to be brought today by this World Trade Organisation or whatever it is. An appealing machinery is going to be set up because, when a nation unilaterally acts, there will be scope for appeal. But today there is no such scope for appeal. And the developed nations have been asked to reduce their subsidies which will help our agriculture ultimately. It may not be beneficial today itself. Why should we think that India will remain in this developing stage always and we will not become a developed nation later on and take advantage of these provisions? Therefore, the argument that we continue to be in such a disadvantageous position is also not correct. Then there is the patent system. There may be some bad points in that as far as one or two items are concerned. The patent system will encourage the innovation and incentive research also. And we should not forget that. And if any rule is contravened by any country, if a patent is violated,

there is scope for appeal and for intervention of the WTO. And the developed nations which are now giving massive subsidies will be asked to reduce them in course of time. And in the long run, we will be benefited in this also. And the intellectual property protection system will also help in joint ventures. It will attract more capital also. And that also is an advantage which we find in this Treaty. One more thing has been mentioned as far as the textile exports are concerned. According to the multi-fibre agreement, the United States, Canada the EEC countries, etc., are now adopting the quota system. They will be required to eliminate these quota systems gradually. They have to completely abandon these quota systems in the course of next ten years, and that will definitely enhance our exports also. When I mentioned that no country could get everything it wanted, I wanted to refer to a report which appeared in the 'Indian Express' of today from Geneva by Chitra Subramaniam. It says: "Andrew Stoler, Deputy Chief of United States Trade Office in Geneva said he lamented that their efforts were being frustrated by developing countries, like India, who have a natural suspicion of moves initiated by U.S. This is the most frustrating issue I have dealt with—it is not good to let a frustration level buildup." That is what he said. Even America is dissatisfied. We should take into consideration the position of certain developed countries like Japan and Korea, who can stand on their own legs but they had to surrender, specially in the case of import of rice they had to surrender.

Dr. Ashok Mitra asked as to why we should be there and why we should be a part of it; we can negotiate with other countries. But if 120 countries from part of the W.T.O., which countries will be left out with whom we will have any bilateral arrangement? He should specify the country with whom we can have a bilateral agreement. If all the countries form part of the W.T.O., there would be no country left out for a bilateral agreement with us. Therefore, we have to be a part of it.

There are two points where doubts exist and a lot of campaign is being carried on all over the country, and that is in regard to the farmers' rights to keep seeds for their own use. The Minister last time tried to dispel this impression. The better course is, let the next crop come and they will themselves realise whether this propaganda has got any value or not. That is the only way to counter this propaganda. Otherwise, whatever convincing arguments you may give, they may not have any value. But this point has to be clarified as to what will be the effect on the Indian farmers if ultimately this system is enforced on the farmers. Secondly, as regards the drug

prices, last time the Minister admitted that drug prices will increase. But he said that only the new patents will be affected and not the existing medicines because only 10 per cent of the life-saving drugs are now patented. But there are genuine fears on this account also. He admitted that drug prices will increase and he said that suitable legislation will be brought forward both for seeds and for product patent. I don't know. Probably the Government is working on that. I also don't know as to why we should rush for it. Dr. Ashok Mitra raised the question whether these laws will be valid as these are likely to be questioned by certain countries in WTD. In such a situation, when sufficient time has been given to the country to change laws, which in our case is 4 to 10 years, why should we rush with these laws now? Let us see the reaction of the world; let us see the reaction of other developing countries and if necessary, necessary changes can be brought about at that time instead of rushing with legislations now when the atmosphere is very hot. I think the Government should not rush.

Senior leaders who spoke on this side have brought out some apprehensions very clearly but none of them advocated that we should get out of the GATT. That is one common point. No speaker has said that we should get out of the GATT, because there is no other alternative that we are thinking of. Nobody said that and we cannot survive in this world by getting out of the international agreement. What I feel is, in view of the time available with the Government, the Government should call all the party leaders, take them into confidence, take the country into confidence, take the Parliament into confidence, because this is a national issue which has a great bearing on the future economy and future trade of the country. Let us not take a partisan view. The Government should not stand on prestige nor should the Opposition always think of putting the Government on the mat. We should evolve a national consensus on this issue and where necessary, we should try to mobilise other countries. I am particularly happy that after the G-15 conference in Delhi, in Marrakesh our delegation was very active and they could prevent America and other countries from inserting the social clause. It will be useful if we act united on this issue. Therefore, I plead with the Government to take suitable steps to evolve a consensus. Ultimately if we find that the whole agreement is bad and the W.T.O. cannot safeguard our country's interest, we will have the freedom to get out of it. The Minister may clarify.

The point is whether we can keep that option. After working the system, if we find that it is disadvantageous to the country, can we opt out of it?

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA : Really an unattached Member.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA : Madam Deputy Chairman, thank you very much for calling me. Actually, we are considered as a weaker section. (Interruptions) We should get more time, but the stronger partners are taking more time. Anyway,...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI : Developing Members.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Both of them have come out of stronger parties.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA : Madam, I would take just four-five minutes. I would be very brief.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN : Take your own time.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA : I would like to draw your kind attention as well as the attention of the House to a news item which appeared in today's 'Hindustan Times'. It is a front-page news where the Ambassador of China has said that his country is trying hard to join the World Trade Organisation. He has said that by joining the World Trade Organisation, which is emerging after the Uruguay Round of G.A.T.T., China would have the most-favoured nation treatment.

Then, about Coca Cola, he said that instead of opposing the entry of Coca Cola,...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Mehta, you cannot read from a newspaper in the House. You can make a note of it, but you cannot bring a newspaper and start reading from it.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA : I am only quoting.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is not proper. It is never done.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA : They say that instead of crying hoarse about international drinks, they are in a position to send their drinks to the United States and other countries.

Therefore, I would say that when a country like China, which is very much concerned about its sovereignty, takes such a stand because they consider that it is very beneficial to their country, this point is worth considering by those who are opposing this G.A.T.T. Treaty. You may have some amendments. But when about 120 countries are joining it, are they losing their sovereignty? Are the developing countries mortgaging their freedom?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Yes.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA : Now, we have the United Nations. We are also a part of the United Nations. We are maintaining certain international

political relationships. Have we given up our sovereignty by this? In the United Nations, five nations have the veto power. In the World Trade Organisation, none has the veto power. This is the marked difference.

Recently, I organised a seminar in Saurashtra where more than 100 grassroot farmers gathered to discuss the Dunkel Text. We had also one non-resident Indian from the United States who came there when he was told that we were holding a seminar. We had a discussion for about four-and-a-half hours. He said 'I am surprised that you are afraid of Dunkel; it is the Americans who are saying that Dunkel may harm their interests and, therefore, they are delaying the endorsement by the Senate for one year'. He said that the American labour was resisting even the Mexican goods in terms of the N.A.F.T.A., and, therefore, why should we be afraid.

There was another point which was made by him. He said: 'You have got the cheapest labour in the world; therefore, you do not want to modernise; if Rs. 5 million is to be invested in the modernisation of the industry, you calculate the interest and other charges and you conclude that the cheap labour is more beneficial and, therefore, you do not want to modernise; that is why you are remaining technologically backward'.

These are the points which, I think, should also be considered by the Opposition.

Now, on the question of subsidy, there is nothing to discuss at all. We can give more subsidy than they are getting today.

About seeds, multiplication of seeds by the farmer for his own use and for selling it to other farmers, without using the brand name of the original company, is permitted. This is what I have understood from the G.A.T.T. Treaty. If it is not permitted, please show me where it is said so.

Then I will agree with you that the farmer cannot multiply the seeds for his own use and for his selling without using the brand name of the original company. Therefore, this also should be considered. And till the year 2000 if all the patents which we have, process patents and other patents, are going to be left intact, the question comes after six years. Here I have one question in my mind. If a developed country has patent rights and if it refuses to part with the product licence to our country or if they charge exorbitant prices, what are the regulations for that? Can we use that product and produce it in our country without their consent and, if they don't want to give consent, can we produce the same product because we know how it can be produced? Because the product is

patented, knowing that fully well, will we be prevented or would they charge exorbitant prices for what they had invented?

Thirdly, Dr. M. S. Swaminathan, Agro-Economist, has calculated—whether you agree with it or not—that 25 per cent of the seeds market of the world would be covered by India, that India would be able to sell patent seeds in the world seeds market and that our share will be 25 per cent because our agro-economists and researchers are far advanced and highly talented. So, do you share the optimism of Dr. M. S. Swaminathan, internationally recognized Agro-Economist? The Opposition have valid reasons to raise a doubt about it—I am not objecting to it. So, please clarify on all these points.

About textiles, and also the textile industry as such, since it is a beneficial agreement because they would be able to sell their goods in developed countries, and our labour being cheap it will be very difficult for them to compete, let them send their textiles here. It will be very high cost textiles, and for the elitists it is a small market if they want to sell their goods. In exchange if we can sell our handlooms, our garments, then our labour would be employed in a much more larger way. Therefore, I think, the Opposition's doubts should be clarified.

Let there be a debate. Call a meeting of all the leaders and let us discuss once, with no restriction on speeches, with no time bar. Let us have three, four or five days and discuss it once. This point is over but you did not allow us to discuss it. A threadbare discussion did not take place. Anyone can discuss and analyze our views.

Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri G. G. Swell. ... Absent. Shri T. G. Venkatraman.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: Madam Deputy Chairman ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Please speak in Tamil.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: The Interpreter is not here. Do you understand Tamil?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. Please speak in English so that we can finish it faster.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: My friend here is suggesting it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't accept that suggestion. Some other day, when we have more time, you may speak in any language.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: I will speak in English: I won't trouble the House.

Madam Deputy Chairman, after hearing the various questions raised, one thing is certain, that this Government has turned a deaf ear to all the suggestions made by the Opposition and they have not been taken in the right spirit. That is all I could gather, and in spite of the best advice given by the Opposition Members, still the Members of the Treasury Benches are harping on the fact of the Minister having signed the agreement. Madam, in February 1993, on 18th and 20th, there was an International Convention on People's Approach to GATT Negotiations. A message was also sent by the Prime Minister wherein he had stated that he was glad to know that the National Group on Patent Laws was holding an International Convention on People's Approach to GATT Negotiations in Delhi. I quote further:

"Such discussions should stimulate thought and promote useful contribution to the on-going debate on the subject which is of concern to us. I convey my best wishes to all the participants of the Convention."

Madam, this is the message sent by the Prime Minister of India. Instead of taking into consideration the advice or the findings of this Convention, they have signed it, even after taking into consideration all these. The very first resolution, I want to submit, is to the following effect. I quote:

"The People's Convention strongly felt that the Dunkel Draft Text, DDT, in its present form, is totally unacceptable and must be rejected as it is inimical to the basic needs and aspirations of the people world over and people in developing countries in particular and also because the Dunkel-GATT is not of the people, by the people and for the people."

So, the very first resolution said, "We totally reject it. It is not for us, and we should not sign it." But, in spite of these efforts and the Prime Minister having given this message, they have disregarded it and thrown it into the dustbin, and they have signed it. It has been heralded by the Minister concerned by saying, "We have signed it. What is it that you are going to do?" It is as if a challenge.

We, the Opposition parties are satisfied with our efforts. Our conscience is clear now. We have done our duty. The party on the Treasury Benches should examine conscientiously whether they are doing justice to the country. One day or the other, they will certainly come to the conclusion that the Opposition was correct. That what the Opposition had said, was quite correct.

Just now the Treasury Benches made the point, "Now everything is over. They have signed it. What is the point?" That is correct. I take it in right spirit. Things are over. Now a postmortem is being done. How have the injuries been caused? What is the cause of the injuries? What weapon was used? We are doing this postmortem here because you signed it. What is the point in your asking us now about it? You are going to sign it again in July. Finally you are going to do it. So, this is a ritual being done by the Minister concerned. So far as I am able to see it, it is only the last, final ritual by the Minister concerned in this regard.

I want to put certain questions. I do not know whether the Minister will be able to answer them or not at this juncture because he is rushing to see foreigners. I want to put a few questions:

What are the amendments proposed by the Government of India regarding the DDT? How many of the amendments have been carried out according to your specifications? If not, why not? Does it not mean that you are treacherously betraying the confidence reposed in you? You must answer these questions.

Secondly, what was the export and foreign exchange earning of India in the fields of agriculture, textiles, medicine, bio-technology and industry till date, and what percentage are you expecting by signing this GATT Agreement?

Was the Government of India aware of the fact that the DDT had omitted the bracketed items and that it is solely based on the lines of the 1990 Brussels Ministerial Meeting?

Let the Minister answer these questions.

Added to these, is the Government of India aware of the fact that by liberalising the trade policy regarding foreigners, multinationals coming into India, the local, indigenous manufacturers, be they in agriculture, the pharmaceutical industry or any other industry, as a matter of fact, will be ousted from the trade market? In view of the fact that you are giving a lion's share of concessions to foreigners, it will be a multinational market, and they will be plundering and taking away our wealth. Formerly we had only the British here for 150 years. Now you are opening the floodgates for all the multinationals, and they are going to plunder the country and they are going to take away the wealth of the country.

Will the Government constitute a Joint Parliamentary Committee to go into the details of the Uruguay Round and the GATT and then finally sign amendments suggested? Even now there is time because we are only in May. In July finally you are going to sign it. You think about it. You constitute a Joint

Parliamentary Committee of all the concerned Members in the Opposition, eminent jurists and all concerned persons from all walks of life and try to see that. At least you can mend your ways.

Sir, public opinion is against the signing of the DDT. Does the stand of the Government reflect the interests of the citizens of India, or are they playing the second fiddle to multinationals? This is my last question. Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I must make an announcement. I requested the hon. Minister to delay the meeting, but at 6 p.m. we must start his reply. So, please cooperate. I would call Shri Ish Dutt Yadav, Dr. Naunihal Singh, Shri Bhupinder Singh Mann and Shri Jagmohan. Four Members are there. आप समय का ध्यान रखिये। 6 बजे से इनको शुरू करना है इसलिए दूसरे मेम्बरों के बारे में भी सोच कर बोलिए।

श्री ईश दत्त यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं तो इस पर लम्बा भाषण करना चाहता था...

उपसभापति : आप तो बहुत चाह रहे थे....

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : यह इनकी मीडन स्पीच है।

श्री ईश दत्त यादव : मैं लम्बा भाषण करना चाह रहा था।

उपसभापति : आप बाद में कभी कर दीजिए, आज नहीं करिये।

If wishes were horses we would be riding them.

श्री ईश दत्त यादव : उपसभापति महोदया, आपकी अनुज्ञा का अक्षरशः पालन करूँगा और आपकी उंगली घंटी पर जाने से पहले मैं अपनी बात समाप्त कर दूँगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Thank you very much.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Let the Minister answer on Monday.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : On Monday we have got discussion on the working of the Ministry of Labour. We do not want to cut it down.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN : To answer he must take time. Let him do some homework and answer our questions. Otherwise what is the point in our posing questions.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Madam, let him answer on Monday.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He will be busy in the Lok Sabha on Monday.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Madam, there is a lot to answer. And he has some engagement. We could take it as the first item on Monday for his reply.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He will be needed in the Lok Sabha. Today the Lok Sabha did not sit.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT) : He is not needed in the Lok Sabha at all...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : In fact, the matter was to be taken up today in the Lok Sabha if it had not adjourned. That is why we decided before we adjourned we would skip lunch break and complete it today. Most respectfully I submit if the Hon. Members sit a little longer, if it is needed, we will complete it because we have to complete it today. On Monday I may have to be there. Of course, I cannot say whether they will take it up or not, but it is expected that it may come up in the Lok Sabha. I would not like to create a difficult problem for us.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Therefore, let us finish it today.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : We appreciate his problem. I am sure on Monday the Lok Sabha will discuss it, but he will take only half-an-hour here. In the meantime he can go to Lok Sabha. We can take it up at 12 o'clock and finish it by 12.30.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We have had two days for it. So, let us finish it today.

श्री ईश दत्त यादव : उपसभापति महोदया, गेट, डकल और कंफ्रिस की सरकार ये तीन पूरे देश में चर्चा के विषय बने हुए हैं। न केवल यह सदन बल्कि पूरा देश आज इन तीनों के काम से चिंतित है और भयभीत है। लगता है कुछ समय के बाद देश के सामने कोई बहुत बड़ा संकट आने वाला है उस समझौते से जिस समझौते पर वाणिज्य मंत्री ने इस महीने की 15 तारीख को हस्ताक्षर किये। यह बात निश्चित लगती है कि जिस समझौते पर वाणिज्य मंत्री ने हस्ताक्षर किये हैं उससे देश की सम्प्रभुता पर, देश की आर्थिक स्थिति पर बुरा प्रभाव पड़ेगा, भयावह प्रभाव पड़ेगा और देश आर्थिक गुलामी की ओर बढ़ेगा। यह भी लगता है सरकार और वाणिज्य मंत्री और देश के प्रधान मंत्री अमेरिका के दबाव में, विदेशी शक्तियों के दबाव में आकर के इस गेट समझौते पर, डकल प्रोपोजन पर इन्होंने हस्ताक्षर किये हैं और इसको प्रमाणित किया है। कुछ दिनों पहले मैंने हिन्दी के एक दैनिक समाचार पत्र में पढ़ा था, सम्भव है वह गलत है। वाणिज्य मंत्री बैठे हैं,

प्रणव मुखर्जी बैठे हैं वह इसका अतिमात्र भी कर देंगे। लेकिन जब मैंने यह एक महीने पहले पढ़ा तो उसमें निकला था कि देश के वाणिज्य मंत्री प्रणव मुखर्जी अंशक प्रयोजन पर अमेरिका के दबाव पर हस्ताक्षर करने जा रहे हैं। हो सकता है यह गलत हो। मैं नहीं कहता यह सही है...

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : यह दैनिक जागरण में छपा था।

श्री संजय प्रिय मीतम : यह हमने भी पढ़ा है।

श्री ईश बस यादव : राष्ट्र के बहुत से लोगों ने इस की पढ़ा होगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि जितने पेपर निकलते हैं उनकी कंटिंग मंत्रालय के लोगों के पास जाती है और संबंधित मंत्री के पास जाती है। लेकिन वाणिज्य मंत्री की ओर से एक महीना हो गया, इस बात का कोई खंडन नहीं हुआ है। इसलिये मैं इस निष्कर्ष पर आता हूँ कि यह प्रणव मुखर्जी का बयान था और सही बात उन्होंने कही है। उन्होंने आत्मा की बात कह दी। उन्होंने अपनी आत्मा की आवाज की बात कही कि अमेरिका के दबाव में आकर हम डंकल प्रपोजल को मानने जा रहे हैं। मंडय, विदेशी भाषा, विदेशी पूंजी निवेश, विदेशी दबाव ने दोनों चीजें और विदेशी बीज, मधुगा बीज ये सब देश के विकास के लिये खतरनाक होते हैं। मैं नहीं समझ पा रहा हूँ कि जब पूरा राष्ट्र चिंतित है, पूरा सदन चिंतित है, पूरे देश में और अब तो गांव-गांव में हर किसान भी चिंतित है कि डंकल प्रपोजल पर हस्ताक्षर करने से इस देश का क्या होने वाला है तो सरकार इस पर गंभीरता से विचार क्यों नहीं कर रही है? देश के प्रधान मंत्री और वाणिज्य मंत्री, जिन्होंने इस पर हस्ताक्षर किये हैं वे इस पर क्यों नहीं सोच रहे हैं? पूरे राष्ट्र को, पूरे सदन को आप विश्वास में क्यों नहीं ले रहे हैं? आप भले ही अपनी ओर से प्रयास कर रहे हैं लेकिन आप पूरे देश के सामने स्थिति को स्पष्ट नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। मैं खूब विषयों पर नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ। इस विषय पर इस सदन में बड़ी गंभीर और विद्वतापूर्ण बहस, चर्चा हो चुकी है। मेरे पास समय नहीं है इसलिये केवल एक विषय पर, केवल कृषि के बारे में ही बोलकर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ।

महोदया यह निश्चित है कि देश के वैज्ञानिक कह रहे हैं, देश के बुद्धिजीवी कह रहे हैं, देश के अर्थ-शास्त्री कह रहे हैं और देश के पत्रकार कर रहे हैं, केवल कांग्रेस को छोड़कर पूरा सदन कह रहा है कि देश की कृषि के ऊपर, किसान के ऊपर इस डंकल प्रपोजल का बुरा प्रभाव पड़ने वाला है। लेकिन सरकार इस पर कोई विचार नहीं कर रही

है। आप सचिदी खल कर देंगे तो कालान्तर में इसका प्रभाव पड़ेगा। माननीय आपसवाल भी कह रहे थे कि आपकी यह दीर्घकालीन योजना है। तो दीर्घकालीन बुरा प्रभाव इसका पड़ेगा और उस दिन इस देश के किसान की स्थिति क्या होगी? मंडय, जब किसान उत्पादन करना कम कर देगा, विदेशी बीजों के खा जाने पर, मधुगा बीजों के खा जाने पर और देश में इस तरह का कालून बन जाने के बाद जब देश का किसान हतोत्साहित हो जायेगा तो आपकी अर्थ-व्यवस्था पर इसका प्रभाव पड़ेगा या नहीं पड़ेगा? मैं एक चीज कहना चाहता हूँ वाणिज्य मंत्री जी कि दुनिया में जितनी सम्पत्ति है वह जमीन के अंदर से निकलती है, पृथ्वी के अंदर से निकलती है। आप इस पर विचार कर लें कि कौन-सी चीज है जो आप जमीन के ऊपर से निकालते हैं। अनाज जमीन के अंदर से निकलता है, फल जमीन के अंदर से निकलते हैं, लोहा जमीन के अंदर से निकलता है, लकड़ी जमीन के अंदर से निकलती है, कपड़ा जो हम पहनते हैं वह भी—कपास जमीन के अंदर से निकलता है। कौन-सी वस्तु है जो जमीन के अंदर से नहीं निकलती है? जमीन के अंदर से इन चीजों को निकालने वाले केवल दो ही हैं। एक तो किसान है और दूसरा मजदूर है। आप इसके द्वारा किसान और मजदूर के हितों पर कुलसम्भार करने जा रहे हैं। इस डंकल प्रपोजल, डंकल सम्झौते पर हस्ताक्षर करके आप इन दोनों का अहित कर रहे हैं। आपने पिछले साल सचिदी कम की और किसान को हतोत्साहित किया। आपके पास सरकारी अंकड़ें होंगी। जैसे आपके अंकड़ों में एंथर कंडीशंड कमरे में जो बैठते हैं वे तैयार करते हैं। इनको वे तैयार करते हैं जिन्होंने न तो किसानों की देखा है और न गांवों की देखा है। ये वे हैं जो गेहूं और जौ की बाजियों में फर्क नहीं समझते। जो गाय और बैल में फर्क नहीं समझते। ऐसे लोग बैठकर एंथर कंडीशंड कमरे में बैठकर अंकड़ें तैयार करते हैं। चार साल तक बारिश ने साथ दिया और देश का उत्पादन बढ़ा। लेकिन जब आपने सचिदी में कटौती की, खाद की सचिदी में कटौती की तो देश के किसानों ने अपने खेतों में कम खाद डाला और जब उन्होंने कम खाद डाला तो देश में अन्न का उत्पादन घटा, किसानों का उत्पादन घटा। महोदया, जिस दिन किसान का उत्पादन घट जायेगा, खेतों का उत्पादन घट जायेगा, धानों से निकलने वाली धातुओं का उत्पादन घट जायेगा उस दिन आपकी सारी योजनाएँ और सारे सम्झौते बेकार हो जायेंगे। इसलिये मैं सरकार से गंभीरता पूर्वक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस पर फिर से सोचे,

इस पर फिर से विचार करे और आप एक बैठक बुलाये। वाणिज्य मंत्री जी आप प्रधान मंत्री जी को राय दें कि वे एक बैठक बुलाये। देश के मुख्य मंत्रियों की बैठक बुलायें, देश के अर्थशास्त्रियों की बैठक बुलायें, देश के कृषि वैज्ञानिकों की बैठक बुलायें, देश के बुद्धिजीवियों की बैठक बुलायें, पत्रकारों की बैठक बुलायें। आप उन के माध्यम से पूरे राष्ट्र को समझाइये और बताइये कि जिस ढंग से पूरा देश को समझाईये और बताइये है, इसका दूरगामी बुरा प्रभाव देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था पर नहीं पड़ेगा, देश की सार्वभौमिकता पर नहीं पड़ेगा, देश की संप्रभुता पर बुरा प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा आप को पूरे सदन को और राष्ट्र को यह समझाना पड़ेगा। आपको पूरे राष्ट्र को विश्वास में लेना पड़ेगा। अगर इस तरह की बैठक बुला कर आप पूरे राष्ट्र को विश्वास में नहीं लेते हैं, स्पष्टीकरण नहीं देते हैं और विश्वास में नहीं लेते हैं, स्पष्ट नहीं करते हैं कि इस समझौते से आपके देश को लाभ होने वाला है तो पूरा देश आपके इन कारनामों के विरोध में खड़ा हो जाएगा और आज खड़ा हो भी गया है। पूरा देश चिन्तित है अपनी अर्थव्यवस्था के लिए। पूरा देश आर्थिक गुलामी की ओर बढ़ रहा है। आप विदेशी ताकतों के सामने झुकते चले जा रहे हैं। इस पर आप पुनर्विचार करिये। मैं समझता हूँ आपको आश्वासन दिया था कि मैं आपकी आज्ञा का पालन करूँगा वरन् मेरे भाषण का अभी कोई अंश भी शुरू नहीं हुआ बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

DR. NAUNIHAL SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, on the 20th April, the Hon. Power Minister, Mr. Salve, and other Hon. Members of the ruling party demonstrated their legal skills and acumen by stating that according to the Constitution, the Executive does not need Parliament's ratification of treaties like the GATT. Well, this is a very awful statement made. In fact, I will call this a great Constitutional hoax. I wish to bring to the notice of this august House that the signing of the GATT treaty by the Government will generate innumerable conflicts with India's socio-economic objectives. Some areas of the Dunkel Draft come into conflict with the Directive Principles of State Policy enshrined in the Constitution of India. The domain of domestic policy is being subjected to international security. Hence, conflicts may arise between our socio-economic and political objectives and international commitments. A conflict may arise in the exercise of jurisdiction between our judicial bodies and panels and the authorities being established by the Dunkel proposals where domestic policy issues are involved. For example, no exemption is allowed for assistance given

to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Classes whereas article 46 of the Indian Constitution enjoins upon the State the duty of promoting the economic interests of the weaker sections of the people. Such people are generally engaged in enterprises like handlooms, carpets or the National Textiles Corporation which carry more than five per cent subsidy and, as such, there will be no exemption for these. Hence the objective of article 46 will be in conflict with these provisions of the Dunkel Draft. Similarly, supply of agricultural inputs such as fertilizers at subsidised prices will attract the provisions of the Dunkel Draft which require reduction of domestic support. Some of the regional development programmes such as, for the North-East, on the basis of, say, provision of freight subsidy, will not be permissible. Similarly, our PDS and the distribution of essential goods at subsidised rates designed to reduce inequalities in income required by article 38 of the Constitution will be frowned by the Dunkel Draft.

Another area for focussing attention is article 48 of the Constitution which states:

"The State shall endeavour to organise agriculture and animal husbandry on modern and scientific lines and shall, in particular, take steps for preserving and improving the breeds of cows, calves and other cattle."

There will be hindrance in the achievement of this objective due to the proposed provisions regarding patents. Besides, no exemption is made for pesticides and agricultural inputs and even for plant varieties and animals. And a provision of patents of 'sui generis' system is established. Hence, there can be problems in making available the genetic material and propagation of improved breeds for general distribution to farmers. The prices of agricultural inputs are very likely to increase due to the introduction of product patents in these areas. If that happens, their use or consumption which is strongly correlated to prices, will be adversely affected, and in turn, it will affect agricultural production, unless farmers are compensated by corresponding adjustment in output prices. Difficulty may also arise in multiplying and supplying new breeds of plants and animals, which would negate article 48 of the Constitution.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Singh, Please conclude.

DR. NAUNIHAL SINGH: Madam, you are pushing me so hard in this manner, not giving enough time. Any way, I wish to bring home to this House one very important article of the Constitution and that is, article 253. I would like to quote that article.

"Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing provisions of this Chapter. Parliament

has power to make any law for the whole or any part of the territory of India for implementing any treaty, agreement or convention with any other country or countries or any decision made at any international conference, association or other body". However, since many basic policies of the State Governments are involved, they must have been consulted before any commitment is made with respect to such areas. Thus, a ratification by Parliament of the emerging agreement on a matter of such great importance to the nation and consultation with the States should be done. Contrary to past practices, as no such wide-ranging international agreement contained sensitive issues affecting the future of the country, its national and sub-national policies, and of concern to many sections of people, has been concluded before. If that does not happen, that lapse would constitute a clear erosion of the spirit and the conscience of the Constitution of India.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have two names. Shri Bhupinder Singh Mann and Shri Jagmohan.

उपसभापति: मान साहब, आप जरा बहुत ही संक्षेप में बोल दीजिए... (व्यवधान) ठीक है, मगर समय का कास्ट्रेंट है, नहीं तो मैं आपको ज्यादा भी टाइम दे सकती थी।

श्री भूपेन्द्र सिंह मान (नाम निर्देशित) : मैडम, कामर्स मिनिस्टर जी ने जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है आपने आज इसके बारे में इनसे क्लैरीफिकेशन मांगने के लिए मुझे समय दिया, शुक्रिया।

मैडम, इस्टीमेट कमिटी की 12वीं रिपोर्ट में पेज 71 पर यह कहा गया है, जो कि इंडस्ट्री सेक्टर ने कहा है कि देश की इंडस्ट्रीज दुनिया की मांगी इंडस्ट्रीज से ज्यादा प्रोटेक्टेड इंडस्ट्रीज है। पहली बात तो मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आपने एग्रीकल्चर को अनप्रोटेक्ट किया हुआ है। इसके बारे में तो आपने कैपिटल सब्सिडी कहकर कहा है। यहां इस देश की इंडस्ट्री कितनी प्रोटेक्टेड है, कितना परसेंट प्रोटेक्टेड है इसके बारे में कृपया बताने की कोशिश करें। इसके साथ-साथ मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि यहां की जो इंडस्ट्री है वह इतनी प्रोटेक्टेड है कि आमतौर पर कहा जाता रहा है कि यहां की जो कार बनती है उसका बाकी सारा कुछ बोलता है, एक जो नहीं बोलता है तो वह हाने नहीं बोलता है। इंडस्ट्री का आज भी अगर हाल देखें तो मैं मंत्री जी से कहना चाहूंगा कि बाहर की जो गाड़ियां हैं उनके रैम्स इंजन, कार के इंजन अगर यहां आने की इजाजत दें तो ये नहीं देंगे, यह कहकर कि यहां की इंडस्ट्री फेल हो जायेंगी। इसलिए बाहर के स्वार इंजन यहां लाने की इजाजत नहीं देंगे। तो इतनी प्रोटेक्टेड

इंडस्ट्री है। ऐसे ही यहां की चीनी बनाने वाली इंडस्ट्री है। वह लाइसेंस लेती है। प्रोटेक्टेड है। बाकी सारी इंडस्ट्री यहां की प्रोटेक्टेड है। इस प्रोटेक्टेड इंडस्ट्री को तो तकलीफ है लिबरलाइजेशन की यह एक स्पष्ट बात है। मुझे समझ में नहीं आता है कि जो लोग इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स के विरोध में हैं जो टाटा, बिड़ला, बाटा, इधर-उधर के जो इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स के लिए कहते हैं कि हम उनके विरोध में हैं... (व्यवधान) तो वही उतावली सारी इंडस्ट्री को प्रोटेक्ट करने के लिए एकदम इकट्ठे हो गए। मुझे तो हैरानी होती है कि वह सारे कंज्यूमर के विरुद्ध जाता है। अगर कोई यहां का इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट यहां के कंज्यूमर के हित का खिलवाड़ करके, उसको न जो क्वालिटी में देता है और न सही कीमत में देता है, जो वह कंज्यूमर का ध्यान रखना मैं समझता हूँ कि सभी का फर्ज होता है। यहां कंज्यूमर का कौन ध्यान रखता है? दूसरी तरफ अगर दूसरा पक्ष किसान का लें तो किसान इस वक्त जो यहां उच्चमै राउंड में डाकूमेंट दिया है उसमें भारत सरकार ने, मंत्री जी आपने वहां कहा कि यहां की जो 17 वस्तुएँ हैं उनके ऊपर नेगेटिव सब्सिडी है और वह नेगेटिव सब्सिडी भी कितनी है, 23,743.7 करोड़, कितनी कीमत पर 34,769 करोड़ की कीमत पर, तो मुझे इसका जरा परसेंटेज बताइये कि इन 17 वस्तुओं पर जो आपने नेगेटिव सब्सिडी फार्मर को दी है इतने साल से उसकी परसेंटेज क्या है? एक जो मैंने निकाली है वह 68.8 परसेंट है। 68.8 परसेंट नेगेटिव सब्सिडी का किसान पीड़ित रहा हो तो इस वक्त अब यह दो पक्ष सामने आते हैं। एक पक्ष है जो इंडस्ट्री प्रोटेक्टेड रही है, वह तो यहां दुखी है कि लिबरलाइजेशन न हो, क्योंकि उसको काम करना पड़ेगा, उसको क्वालिटी देनी पड़ेगी, उसके बर्कज को काम करना पड़ेगा। उनको काम करने की आदत नहीं रही है। उनको मुनाफाखोरी करने की आदत है। इससे रिस्क-तखोरी बढ़ती है तो लाज़िमी तौर पर वह दुखी है। क्या जो लोग लिबरलाइजेशन का विरोध कर रहे हैं वे इनकी मदद कर रहे हैं, यह स्पष्ट होना चाहिए? दूसरी तरफ किसान जो इसी फ़ैर से पीड़ित है, नेगेटिव सब्सिडी से पीड़ित है, वह भी इतनी कि आपको पूरी तौर पर क्लीयर करना चाहिए कि यह जो सब्सिडी है वह सारी 68.8 परसेंट की नेगेटिव सब्सिडी है, अगर आप उसको खत्म कर दो, मैं तो यह कहूंगा कि मुझे नहीं चाहिए यह सब्सिडी, मुझे सब्सिडी जीरो कर दो तो मैं क्लैमिंग गेन करूंगा 68.8, वह भी किसान, इन्कम टैक्स का नहीं, वह गेन करूंगा जो मेरी टर्न ओवर है,

जो मेरी सेल प्रोसीड है, उसका मैं गेन करने वाला हूँ। तो मुझे जीरो सबसिडी अगर आप करते हैं तो 68.8 परसेंट गेन करने वाला हूँ। आप मुझे जीरो सबसिडी कृपा करके कर दीजिए।

मैं तो हैरान हूँ कि किसान की बात को करने वाले, किसान का नाम लेने की यहाँ बात करने वाले, किसान को हम बात करते हैं नेगेटिव सबसिडी की किसी में भी यहाँ बात नहीं की है। क्यों नहीं की? इसलिए कि किसान का जवान पर दब है, किसान का दिल पै दब होना चाहिए। मुझे तो यहाँ तक भी शक है कि जो लोग यह नहीं, यहाँ का डिवाइस यह नहीं कि आपोजीशन है, एक पावर की है पार्टी, मुझे तो यह लगता है कि जो लोग प्रोटेक्शन लेते रहे हैं, वह चाहे कहीं भी बैठे हों, वह इसके विरोध में है। जो लोग अन-प्रोटेक्टेड रहे हैं उनकी बात कौन करेगा? देश उनका है, देश किसान का है और यहाँ तक कि अगर आप यह देखें कि पब्लिक डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन सिस्टम लोग कहते हैं, इसमें कहा गया है कि पब्लिक डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन रह सकता है, लेकिन सरकार को मंडी में से खरीदना पड़ेगा। बात तो सिर्फ इतनी है कि अगर मंडी में से सरकार खरीदती है तो सरकार को थोड़ा महंगा पड़ेगा और उसका लाभ किसान को होगा तो किसान के लाभ की हर बात को यह कह कर कि किसान के हम बहुत हक में हैं। किसान के कंधे पर बंदूक रख कर किसान के खिलाफ ही बंदूक चलाना मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ठीक नहीं है ... (व्यवधान)

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : मान साहब, एक मिनट ... (व्यवधान)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No interruption. You took enough time. I am not allowing you. Jaiswalji, you took enough time. Please don't interfere.

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : मदद के लिए ... (व्यवधान)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Don't help. He is capable of doing it. I won't allow you. This is not proper.

श्री भूगेंद्र सिंह मान : आज भी मुझे अपनी पंजी से चावल निकालने की इजाजत नहीं है लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि लिबरलाइजेशन में वह मुझे होगी और होनी चाहिए। आज भी मैं अपने गन्ने से चीनी नहीं बना सकता हूँ। क्यों नहीं? आज तक क्यों नहीं यह मेरा इन्टरैस्ट वॉच किया गया? अगर इसमें होता है तो जो लोग, जिनके कि ये खिलाफ जाते हैं तो वह लोग तो चीखेंगे और चिल्लाएंगे

और वह जोकि आज तक गांवों में नहीं गए थे किसान का हित देखने के लिए, आज वह इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स और बड़े-बड़े लोग किसान को यह कहने के लिए जा रहे हैं कि इससे किसान के हित को नुकसान होगा, किसान बीज नहीं रख पाएगा। उपाध्यक्ष जी, डंकल प्रपोजल में लिबरलाइजेशन की बात आती है और मैं समझता हूँ कि वह आनी चाहिए। तो बीज की कीमत कौन देगा? मंत्री जी, कॉस्ट कैलकुलेशन में अगर बीज एक रुपए का आना है तो भी उसकी कीमत कंजूर को देनी है और अगर बीज एक पैसे का आना है तो भी उसकी कीमत कंजूर को देनी है, बीज चाहे कितने का आए, उसकी कीमत कंजूर को ही देनी है। इसलिए अगर कंजूर चाहेगा कि हमें अच्छा बीज चाहिए, ज्यादा बीज चाहिए तो वह बीज कंजूर डिसाइड करेगा। उसे हम और आप डिसाइड करने वाले कौन होते हैं, वह तो मार्केट डिसाइड करेगा। अगर मार्केट में हम अपनी वस्तु बाहर लेकर जाते हैं तो जो ग्राहक दुनिया की मंडी में बैठे हैं, वह डिसाइड करनेवाला है कि उसे हमारी वस्तु कितने में लेनी है और उसने कौन-से बीज की बनी हुई लेनी है। हमें इस बारे में अपनी शक्ति पर भरोसा होना चाहिए और मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा किसान यह सब कर सकता है। अगर इसका विरोध अमेरिका के किसान या फ्रांस के किसान करें, तो मैं उसे समझ सकता हूँ कि उसे 60 से 70 प्रतिशत पोजिटिव सब्सिडी है। वह तो इससे दुखी है। जैसे यहाँ के इंडस्ट्रीज को पोजिटिव सब्सिडी है वैसे ही वहाँ के किसान को पोजिटिव सब्सिडी है और ये दोनों दुखी हैं दुनिया में हो रहे लिबरलाइजेशन से, लेकिन यहाँ के किसान के तो वह हित में है। इसलिए अगर वहाँ का किसान दुखी हो और अगर वहाँ का किसान विरोध करे तो उसे करना चाहिए, लेकिन यहाँ के किसान को नहीं। मैं यह तो मानता हूँ कि इसका विरोध है क्योंकि यह बात किसी के भी हक में बिल्कुल नहीं है। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि यह भारत के हित में जाती है, लेकिन आज भारत में जो पैरासाइटिक एटीट्यूड है, वह इसके विरोध में जाता है। वह तो जहाँ भी हो, इसका विरोध करेगा पर जो यहाँ का प्रोड्यूसर है, उसके यह हित में जाता है और वह उस चैलेंज को कबूल करेगा। आज तक जिन्होंने प्रोटेक्शन का आनंद लिया है, वह इसके विरोधी हैं। जिन्होंने प्रोटेक्शन दी है ब्यूरोक्रेटिक चैनल से दी है, वह इसके विरोधी हो सकते हैं और जिन्होंने लेकर दी है, चाहे वह कोई भी हो, चाहे वह पॉलिटिकल पार्टियों से ताल्लुक रखनेवाले हों या कोई भी हों जिन्होंने प्रोटेक्शन

लेकर दी है, वह भी इसके विरोधी हैं। यह ठीक होना चाहिए।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, आज तक देश में जो आर्टिकल-14 है क्वालिटी बिफोर लॉ, उसमें जो रूरल सेक्टर है उसको इग्नोर किया गया है, उसके साथ अन्याय किया गया है, इकॉनोमिक किया गया है, इकॉनोमिक ब्लॉकैड कर रखा है। वह इकॉनोमिक ब्लॉकैड खुलना चाहिए और जब वह खुलना है तो वह लोग चीखते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस चीज को बोल्डली लेना चाहिए। अभी लिबरायजेशन की स्पीड स्लो-डाउन कर दी गयी है, यह गलत बात है। अगर आपने लिबरायजेशन किया है तो इसको इमिडियेटली करना चाहिए और किसानों को एकदम छूट देनी चाहिए कि अगर वह अपनी उपज को बाहर ले जाना चाहे तो ले जा सकते हैं क्योंकि यह क्या बात हुई कि "स्विच आन" या "स्विच ऑफ" करने की तरह से कभी आपने कपास एक्सपोर्ट शुरू कर दिया और कभी इम्पोर्ट शुरू कर दिया और कभी एक्सपोर्ट बैन कर दिया। यह अभी आपने किया है मंत्री महोदय। तो ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिए और मैं समझता हूँ कि किसानों के साथ "फेअर-प्ले" होना चाहिए। इससे देश की इकॉनोमिक हालत बदलेगी और लिबरायजेशन देश के हित में जाएगा।

मैडम, यह कुछ क्लैरीफिकेशंस मैं मांगना चाहता था। धन्यवाद।

SHRI JAGMOHAN (Nominated) : Madam, I don't propose to make any speech. I wish to raise only a few points for the consideration of the Government. The first point is: Does the Government realise that, by signing this Final Act, the advantage or benefit that would accrue to the developed countries would be disproportionately large compared to the benefit that would accrue to the developing countries? It cannot be denied that in certain areas some advantage will accrue to us. They might be very limited. But the developed countries will secure disproportionately large benefit over a period of time. You can always give opinions on general statements. But one should go by the evidence that is provided by history during the last 50 years. During the colonial period, the developed countries, of course, took away the resources of this country by military might. We are all aware of it. I don't want to dwell on it. But what happened in the post colonial period when the colonial period ended? All types of mechanism, international mechanism were set up, i.e. World Bank International Monetary Fund, AID, Aid India Consortium Willy Brand Report.

Woodland Report, etc. All types of things were there and aid was also given. But what has been the net result? The gap between the developed countries and the developing countries has increased, widened. In spite of the Stockholm Conferences and other things, the number of poor people in the world has increased. We should go by empirical evidence and by the facts. The per capita income in the developing countries should have gone up by 1.2 per cent or so. In the developed countries, it has gone up at a much higher pace and the gap is increasing. These are the statistics. This is exactly going to happen now. This is the same economic power structure, the international economic order, which is being governed by the developed countries, which want to perpetuate and strengthen it to their advantage. One should go by what they will actually do in practice, not by what they declare. It was said that there would be competition. We should not be afraid of any competition. But competition can be among equals or among those who are nearby. It cannot be between unequals particularly when the unequal partner is not able to buy good talent, is not able to provide the best education, is not able to give so many facilities that they can give. You can develop the best nuclear technology. You can take the best brain. (...time bell...) Madam, I have not started my speech. I would suggest only one thing. Madam, you should preside over the function at the start of the speeches not at the end.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will do it from tomorrow.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: I will shorten my speech from tomorrow.

Madam, I can understand the time constraint. I just want to make one or two points more. I will not repeat anything which has already been said. These are a few points which I thought I would mention which were not mentioned very clearly.

So, if the world is unequal, then your human dignity and human rights, I think, become meaningless. You know that the powerful people, particularly economically powerful people, can always bend any system to their own advantage.

The second aspect is that this system would give a very large cover to the multinationals. I will give you a few statistics. Two hundred multinationals have already cornered about 30 per cent of the world trade. Out of these 200 multinationals, 170 multinationals belong to five big. These five big means UK, USA, France, Japan and Germany. You know what the history is. Wherever there is concentration of power, human freedom and liberties are menaced. You may do it in your Constitution. You may have it everywhere.

But, in actual practice, they will be undermined. What will actually happen in practice? Has the Government taken this aspect into account?

The third thing is that we should not view Dunkel in isolation. It is a part of an overall pattern, including the Satellite. You know the menace which has changed the taste of the people. It is the change of the taste of the people which make the Indian society a consumer society. Make the middle class people buy things which they are producing. It is a multi-pronged attack. You cannot view Dunkel in isolation. You have to view it in relationship with other things which are simultaneously happening. Now, what will happen? Nobody is against international order or internationalisation. It has become inescapable. But we have to consider our position. What will our position be in that international order? We will become a small cog in the big international machine which will be propelled by insentient barbarism, if I may say so. It will be impelled by consumerism which will violate our cultural heritage and make us greedy people—born for garbage and greed—and make us forget our good value system of contentment, balance, harmony and the concept of *karma yoga*. You may have five to ten per cent people who may benefit from this order and they will become the mouthpiece of this order. This is the grave danger which we as a nation need to consider. It is not a party issue. It is a question of the future of the country. What type of life do you want to have for the next 50 years, that is the issue which is involved here. The issue is not merely of economic manipulation. These are the four or five points that I wanted to make. There are a few more points, but your bell has made me forget them.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Madam, Deputy Chairperson, I am glad to have the opportunity once again to listen to the observations made by a large number of Members on the multilateral trade agreement, which is now GATT, 1994 and the WTO. Before I left for Marrakesh, I had the privilege of listening to the Members from this House and the other House. The issues which were raised today had been raised earlier and for the sake of brevity I would not like to repeat the issues and the position which I had taken in respect of these issues. I would like to confine my observations substantially to what happened in Marrakesh and what future implications would be there and what future course of action would be demanded of us as a result of that. While I was listening to the hon. Members. I did not doubt their sincerity, their honesty of purpose or their patriotism. A lot of strong words were used. But that is part of politics and I am not going to respond or react to that. But

surely, despite their sincerity, I did feel that they were not able to appreciate many of the issues in proper perspective. If you allow me to say so, this has not happened for the first time. Views had been formulated even before 6th December and even before 15th December. That is why, in my observations at Marrakesh, I said that the agitation was not confined merely to the floor of the House or merely to debating the issue at the academic level. It has spilled over the streets. It was even asked, by referring to a statement or a news item and making it out to be the views of one of my colleagues, as to why last minute efforts for consensus was not made. It was not made because of the simple fact that positions were already taken. A position was taken even before 15th December. I have given a detailed account of the discussions which I had at various levels and I would not like to repeat them. I am quoting what I said while making my observations at Marrakesh. I am quoting from my own statement: "Trade distortive practices have to be disciplined without affecting, in any way, the developmental programmes and social objectives of the developing countries. My Government is firmly committed to protecting the interests of our farmers, who constitute the country's lifeline, and to the objective of ensuring food security for our people". I also mentioned, while commenting on the TRIPS, that we stand committed to the prevention of exploitative pricing of life-saving drugs in our country. Madam, I did not make these observations as a rhetoric. In the international congregation, in the conferences of Trade Ministers, I made quite clear the policies of the Government of India in respect of certain very vital sectors. Of course, as you know, like the Indian Parliament, in the international conferences of this sort, there is always time constraint. So, when 125 members were to make their observations over a period of three days naturally, we could not delay, discuss and debate on all issues. And I would like to repeat that, under no circumstances, the Government of India—and, here, when I say, 'Government', it is not merely our Government but any Government, for that matter.—will compromise the sovereign interests of our country, the interests of the people, the interests of the farmers and the interests of the workers. This goes without saying. Therefore, we shall have to keep in view what our ultimate objective is. Surely, we are proud of being Indians; I entirely agree with the hon. Members and there are no two opinions. None of us present in this House will dispute it. When somebody claims that we are proud of being Indians, it means that we are proud of our culture, we are proud of our heritage and, under no circumstances would we compromise with our national pride. So, that is not the question here. The question is: through this international trade agreement, which is, no doubt, complicated, and which

has far-reaching implications, have we compromised our sovereignty and have we sold the interests of our nation? Madam, my most respectful submission is 'No'. We have not done it. We have not done anything which others have said. Everybody there, as somebody has pointed out, every representative, there is fully conscious of his/her constituencies, of his/her responsibility of the people of the respective country. And, here, most respectfully, I would submit let us not speak for others. I had the privilege of listening to everybody's speech—I made it a point as I used to do when I was a lone Member of Parliament representing my party, I am saying 'lone Member of my party' because that was the case 25 years ago—and I would like to quote some of the observations of the Ministers. Despite differences what was their ultimate conclusion? Madam, if you will allow me I would just quote some of the observations of the Ministers. First I would like to make an observation for the information of the hon. Members of a Minister of China. A Minister representing China said and I quote: "The Uruguay Round of Negotiations was an unprecedented multilateral trade negotiation. It not only produced extensive and substantial commitments on market access but it also strengthened and expanded the study of multilateral rules governing world trade. We welcome the package agreement reached at the Uruguay Round and are prepared to make efforts for its smooth implementation." In regard to WTO regarding which Dr. Mitra has raised certain basic issues, I will come a little later. In regard to the establishment of WTO, a most distinguished representative, the Minister of Cuba, pointed out:

"The most important feature of this new organisation is perhaps its dispute settlement mechanism to which, hopefully, we may resort on an equal footing."

This is about the dispute settlement mechanism of WTO. Dr. Mitra has raised two points. I would like now to clarify the first point. If I did not hear him wrong, he said that India's share in the international trade is 0.5%. Secondly, he said that 4.6% was incremental, according to a study to which he made a reference.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA : Of course, it is incremental.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Yes, it is incremental. Thirdly, as an individual country, US is the single largest country so far as our exports are concerned. Therefore, we will have to take note of all these factors while working out our developmental strategy. To this part, I will come a little later. Dr. Mitra said, "Why did we not stall the negotiations by exercising the veto right in the name of consensus under article 1?" What would we have achieved? Would all the developing countries have followed us? If that becomes

the case, if everybody will follow us, then why are we afraid of WTO? WTO is not IMF. WTO is not World Bank. There is no weighted voting right. Here, each country will have one vote unlike in IMF and World Bank. Of the 111 countries who have signed the Final Act, 104 countries have signed the WTO and each one will have one vote. If the developing countries try to combine, if they genuinely feel that their interests need to be protected and if they are concerned about their advancement, about the atrocious violations by the industrialised countries, they can do it now. They would have two-thirds majority. They would have three-fourths majority. We must work on one set of logic if we feel strange about this. There, I agree. I agree with Dr. Mitra and others who suggested that this should be the pattern, this should be the method. This will continue both within WTO and outside WTO. But what would be a better platform for you to fight it out? Is it by being isolated, by remaining a pariah? We are very often talking of the size of the Indian market. Yes, there are 900 million people. But what is their capacity to absorb? How much can we import? Unless we expand our exports, we cannot do this. If we want to export, what would be the ground? The 40% incremental ratio may be there in Oceania and Asia. That may be the performance during the first nine months of 1993. But what happened in 1992? Even in the erstwhile Soviet Union, which accounted for nearly 27% of our exports just before the collapse of the system, there was a 62% decline as a result of which our total exports came down to 3.4%. This is despite the fact that there was a rise in the general currency area to the extent of 12% in 1992-93. In 1993-94, the scenario has changed. Exports have grown by around 20% and we are expecting to reach more than 21 billion dollars. Perhaps it may be 22 billion dollars. Somebody has pointed out that under WTO, the interests of the developing countries would not be protected. My understanding and appreciation is totally different because I have the experience and it is not imaginary. What happened in Mexican Tuna case? With one individual country, who was the violator of the rights of the developing country, resorting to Clause 1, putting the veto, the interests of the developing countries in the Mexican Tuna case could not be protected. But here, if the developing countries can combine with two-thirds majority or three-fourths majority, they can do it. Would they combine? It depends on to what extent we can play our role. Therefore, my submission, Madam Deputy Chairman, would be, let us prepare ourselves. I am prepared to have consultations with... Yes, I am always ready to concede.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : You have very rightly said that we need to organise many countries, mobilise their opinion for

fighting, and all that. Was any attempt made by the Government of India to do so? In 1991, December when the Dunkel proposals were put forward, if the Government had made that attempt, then in two years, between the time when the proposal was mooted and when it was finalised in December, 1993, a certain amount of mobilisation could have been effected. I would just mention that in 1953, when India refused to join the military pact with the United States, India was not a very big country, not a very powerful country. But because India stood out and fought, other countries joined in—Egypt, Ghana, Indonesia, Yugoslavia and so on. And eventually, Non-alignment Movement became a very powerful movement. What I am asking is this: Was any attempt made by the Indian Government? I find only silence on your part. In these two years, nothing was said. Was there any attempt made by the Indian Government to ensure that the Third World as a group fights against it?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am afraid my good friend has missed one basic point which I have also referred to on earlier occasions. Here I would not like to pass on the blame on anybody else, but the cold fact is the co-ordination which we had till April, 1989. It is easier for somebody to say that Brazil is whispering or some other country is whispering that India is responsible. I do not have the liberty or privilege to come to that conclusion. But I have a detailed discussion with the Brazilian Foreign Minister who was the chief negotiator till the other day before he was appointed as the Foreign Minister recently. Even when we were waiting as to what view the US Congress takes so far as Clause-one mandate is concerned, as many as 38 countries, under the leadership of another important developing country, wrote a letter to President Clinton, to the then leader of the E-7 Group, the Japanese Prime Minister, and the British Prime Minister saying, "we want an early completion of the Uruguay Round of negotiations on the basis of the Dunkel Draft." Therefore, it is true, the fact remains that the developing countries considered this. That is why, Minister after Minister, speaker after speaker, said, "Yes, we have different perceptions, we are not 100 per cent in agreement with all the provisions. But we consider that it is better to go through consensus because it will provide the rule-based multilateral forums, it will provide an automatic extension of most-favoured-nation treatment because you can never change that Article One".

Now a question has been raised, and Dr. Mitra has also pointed out as to what would happen in WTO. Yes, the scenario which you built up, if it happens, then the developing countries have no case. If all the developing countries succumb to the

pressure, then we cannot muster two-thirds majority. But before going to the WTO, there is one stage. It is the Preparatory Committee. From the 16th of April, 1994 and 1st of January or 1st of July of 1995, the WTO comes into existence. Now it has been decided that from the 1st of January, 1995 or soon thereafter, the WTO will come into existence. So, between 16th of April, 1994 and 1st of January, 1995, there would be a Preparatory Committee. And the Preparatory Committee's decision is to be taken by consensus. In the Preparatory Committee, the decision is to be taken by consensus. There, one individual member, one individual country can veto if what has been suggested in the concluding remarks of the Chairman, goes to the WTO. What was the objective of the industrialised countries? The industrialised countries wanted to get an endorsement of the Ministers at Marrakesh as a part of the Marrakesh Declaration, and we resisted that. Here, I am most grateful to my colleagues in the developing countries for the mandate which we received from G-15 Summit here in para 10 of their Joint Communiqué where it was suggested that Trade Ministers of G-15 countries should meet together and work out a common strategy that international labour standards and social clauses are not put as part of the Ministerial Marrakesh Declaration. I had a meeting; I called a meeting and as many as 13 representatives of the G-15 countries attended and they agreed on a common strategy. Thereafter also, we had the privilege of calling a large number of developing countries. In fact, in my lunch and other bilateral discussions, I could establish contact with almost 25-26 developing countries and we could work out a common strategy and that common strategy paid off.

Mr. Jaipal Reddy is not here. He raised a point as to why the question of political stabilisation was raised in the concluding paragraph of the Chairman's remarks. All the points which have been raised in that part of the concluding remarks of the Chairman were raised by some countries, and this particular point was raised by some developing country that they want it. And here if the hon. Member is interested, I would like to say that all of them are developing countries; I am not talking of developed countries, and they wanted as we wanted that immigration policy on international trade should be brought in. In respect of primary products trade, the issue was raised by Ivory Coast, Camaroon. Cuba raised unilateral or bilateral matters. The question relating to regional rules on FTS was raised by Japan and Korea. Trade competition policy including restrictive business practices question was raised by a large number of countries. What the Chairman in his concluding remarks says is, whatever suggestions are there, these issues should

be considered to be included in the agenda for the WTO during the intervening period, by the PREPCOM. He summed it up and brought it along with the issue raised by the U.S., France and some other developed countries on the international labour standards to be linked with trade. Alongwith that, these other issues were raised.

A question was raised whether we raised the question of immigration policy to counter or to frustrate the desire of the U.S.A. to bring in international labour standards. My point is not that. I am opposing international labour standards because of the fact that we are following these standards. We are second to none in this respect. Immediately after independence, we passed Trade Unions Act; we passed Industrial Disputes Act. We have given fundamental rights to the workers to form unions and associations and provided for it in the Constitution itself in 1950, within three years of our Independence. We have built up the concept of collective bargaining not only in private sector but even in the public sector. And in my previous incarnation as the Steel Minister, at intervals of every four years, I had to enter into an agreement with the steel workers and 15 to 20 per cent increase was almost compulsory. But the point is not that. The point is, why are you trying to link it with trade? Your ultimate objective is to put trade sanctions and if you want to put trade sanctions, why are you going through a circuitous route? If the ILO Convention in respect of exploitation of child labour or forced labour has not been implemented, go and raise these issues in ILO. Go and raise the issues of human rights violations in the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Why are you linking it with trade? A rather more relevant, direct and apparent relationship is between immigration policy and trade. When you are talking of trade in services, the movement of natural persons, who are service-providers, has a direct relevance, has a direct co-relation, with trade. Therefore, this should be taken up first. It is not that we raised the issue just to score a debating point. It is not that we wanted to raise one particular aspect just to pose an alternative issue to the others. Madam Deputy Chairman, this was the reason why we raised this issue.

A question was raised as to what would happen if we find that the interests of the country are not protected by this. I have mentioned it a number of times. No international agreement can keep anybody bound in perpetuity. Any country—not only India—can come out of it giving six months notice. One can come out by giving the World Trade Organisation six months notice. Therefore, what is the great problem?

Constitutional issues have been raised. I would not like to go into that aspect. After all, this has been challenged in the courts. The Constitutional issues are being adjudicated in different courts. In regard to the question whether the constitution has been violated or not, neither the Executive nor Parliament are the supreme arbiters in the matter. It is for the courts to decide whether it is Constitutional or not. When the courts are seized of the matter, let us wait for the judgement. A large number of cases are pending in the various High Courts. The Bombay High Court has already dismissed one such case. In some other High Courts, cases are pending. In the Supreme Court also, cases are there. Let us wait for the judgement.

It would not be correct to say that we have not consulted. I would like to point out that even earlier, immediately after the completion of the negotiations on the 15th December, I wrote to the Chief Ministers, enclosing a copy of the draft act. Then again, on 21st March, I wrote to them that before I went to Marrakesh, I would like to have a discussion with them. I am glad that some of them responded, including some Opposition Chief Ministers. I had a discussion with them. But if somebody considers that he or she can talk only to the Prime Minister, I cannot help it. It is for the Prime Minister and the person concerned, he or she, to decide when they can fix up some time. After I wrote, quite a large number of them responded. When they come, we will discuss with them. It is not necessary that we should agree with them. But surely, we can share our concern and we can share our views.

Then, about the Committee to deal with trade-related environment. This is as per the Rio Declaration. We are a party to the Rio Declaration. We are a party to Agenda 21 of the Rio Declaration. In the Rio Declaration, it has been suggested that the World Trade Organisation should constitute this Committee. Therefore, it is a mandate from another international Convention to which we are a party. We have already accepted it. There is some co-relation. This would give us an advantage because they have destroyed the environment much more compared to us. Therefore, it would be to our advantage. If we can play our cards well — I can say this very frankly to you, Madam, Deputy Chairman, and through you, to the House — if we can play our cards in a co-ordinated manner, in a co-operative manner, if we do not succumb to the pressures of the big powers of course, they would put pressure—we can gain.

Jagmohanji said that they are getting the largest share. Obviously, they are

getting the largest share. This is an unequal world. That is why I, myself, have said in my statement that there is enough heat to melt the entire arrangement if the inequalities are not removed. I have some figures which may be of interest to Members.

Here is a list published by G.A.T.T. of the 20 countries whose share in the world exports is more than 1 per cent. Of course, we do not come under this category. Their share in the exports is 2,907 billion U.S. dollars out of the total of—roughly—4,000 billion U.S. dollars. Then, there are others whose share is roughly about 1,100 billion U.S. dollars. What is the break-up? The European Union—546 billion U.S. dollars, United States 465 billion U.S. dollars and Japan 361 billion U.S. dollars. Therefore, these three countries—one group—and two other countries, dominate the world trade. They are first, second and third in export and import. It is a hard fact, it is a reality. And if you want to have trade, with whom shall you have trade? Surely, I cannot have trade in the Sahara desert or the Gobi desert. We shall have to trade with those markets where the people have the purchasing capacity. Therefore, these are important, these are relevant .. (Interruptions) ..

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him reply, please. I have to adjourn the House.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, on investment I would like to raise one point. I mentioned it, I am repeating it. There is nothing in this agreement—in the WTO, in the multilateral agreement which will compel a country, not to speak of India, to open any particular area for investment. That point I repeat that our investment policy decision was taken in July, 1991 when we decided that in 34 major industries we will allow foreign investment up to 51 per cent of the equity through automatic route through the Reserve Bank. That decision we took long before 15th December. It was a correct decision, and I do consider that was the most appropriate decision, because we required it.

If you look at our developmental strategy, from 1951 to 1979-80 we found that our general average growth rate was 3.5 per cent in real terms of GDP growth rate. We entered into a little higher growth rate in the 80s. The average was 5.6 per cent. And if we want to have 8 to 10 per cent growth, assuming our incremental capital output ratio remains at 4.1, my investment should be around 27 to 28 per cent. The present rate of savings is around 22 per cent. Therefore, this balance six per cent is needed. Either we shall have to satisfy ourselves with the lower growth rate, or, if we want to have a higher growth rate, this balance six per cent has to be obtained.

Should we obtain it by borrowing? And if we have it by borrowing, we know the type of distortions which had taken place. That route we followed. The Bretton-woods institutions have collapsed. What Jagmohanji has said is true—that what they said, what they committed, they never honoured. In the 50s it was decided that one per cent of the GDP of the developed countries should be transferred for official development assistance. Except some small countries, nobody did comply with it. It is well below one per cent; it is 0.7 per cent. That is a fact, and that too became diluted. So the option was to get your developmental assistance from the external sources, through borrowing, and borrowed money has its cost. Therefore, if it is considered that direct foreign investment through equity is better, then what is wrong with it? And the 4.3 billion worth of investment proposals which we have received, nearly 90 per cent of those proposals are related to infrastructure, mainly power projects or refineries or oil exploration. It is not what is being talked of, that it is tooth-paste technology. Unless we have technological upgradation—and this point I am trying to raise on a number of occasions—it will be very difficult for us to cope with the situation. Up to the 70s we were doing and even if we compare ourselves with China, our performance was nearer to that of China, and there was not so much of distortion. Today, I think, China is No. 11 in exports. Their export is \$93 billion, and we will end up with 22 billion. It happened because of the fact that a large number of non-resident Chinese, with the opening of their policies in 1978, came and made investment there, and they brought technology. We made a fuss over it. Let us not shy away from our own responsibility. I was the Finance Minister at that point of time. In 1982 when we tried to open non-resident investment, great fuss was made over it. Thereafter, there was no portfolio investment. There were deposits. When they found that the situation in the country was not favourable, they withdrew these. It happened again in 1991. While working out your developmental strategy and State policy, can you completely ignore the facts? Can I today completely ignore the fact, when I compare the situation which prevailed in the '80s?

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: May I take a minute? Can the Minister kindly enlighten us about what proportion of the actual investment that has come in belongs to the so-called core sector?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: This is the point I make, that 90 per cent of the investment is in the infrastructural sector.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA : That is about the approvals. I know about that. What about the actuals?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : The actuals are nearly \$700 million. . . (Interruptions)

Dr. Mitra was the Finance Minister of West Bengal. He knows the gestation period of a power plant particularly in West Bengal where it is from 48 to 60 months. Assuming that in other parts it is 36 months, one cannot expect that all of the approvals which have been given up to the 31st of December, 1993, amounting to US \$4.3 billion materialised. Up to now \$700 million have come, and nearly 90 per cent of them are for the core sector.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA : Would you supply us the figures?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Not now, not now. The Minister can send you the break-ups if he feels so.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Therefore, it is not correct to say that. My point is that we require investment. For that investment, what is the relevant point here? It is that in trade-related investment we should not make any discrimination. We did not make any discrimination. Do you expect that others will give technology to you on your terms?

Mr. Jaipal Reddy or somebody else told me that I should not expect a free lunch. I do not expect a free lunch. I do not want to have a free lunch. I want to pay for my lunch, but at the same time I would like to have a good lunch, not a rotten lunch. I would like to have good technology. If I want to have a good technology. I must make investment. If I want to have a higher growth, I must make investment.

We have heard of an alternative plan, an alternative development strategy and an alternative budget, but we cannot simply forget the hard, cold fact that very recently a national government had to pledge its gold to get a few hundred million dollars and that a State Government had to borrow from a private corporation to meet its own requirement. I am not passing any blame on anybody. What I am trying to point out is that this is the stark reality. In this stark reality we shall have to work out a strategy. We cannot live in a make-believe world.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI : In 1980 our interest was actually Rs. 7,000 crores. In 1989 it is Rs. 28,000 crores. It is four times. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : The hon. Member knows what happened after 1989. The Soviet Union collapsed. That area of trade was not available to us.

Madam, two, three other issues have been raised, and certain other clarifications have also been sought. I will reply to them very quickly, and then I will complete my reply.

Mr. Chimanbhai Mehta asked whether I agreed with the studies which Dr. Swaminathan had made. I entirely agree with him. That is why I am so confident. Why am I so confident? Wait till the kharif season.

In some parts of the country a campaign was run against me. My effigies were burnt. Before burning my effigies, they were beaten with broomsticks by women in Calcutta, with due respect to the women Members. . . (Interruptions)

It was in every part of the country. But I now will most respectfully submit to the hon. Members to give me some information if any chowkidar from the GATT has come to any part of India to prevent . . .

SHRI MD. SALIM : *

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please, Mr. Salim, keep quiet. Please keep quiet. Don't interrupt. This is not the way to behave. I am not allowing.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : The hon. Member should have some decency in using words. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am not allowing, Mr. Salim. Please mind your language. Please sit down.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : I am not taking it that way. If he talks like that, it speaks of his own taste. I leave it at that. What I am saying is if any Chowkidar has come to prevent a villager from using his Neem stick to brush his teeth. That too I was told in a joke. I was told in Bihar that *Tulsi patta* has been patented. Therefore, let us not indulge in these things. I am confident all these bluffs would be called off by the farmers, when they see the reality after the Kharif season. They will see that after every season of agriculture that all their traditional rights are being protected and maintained. We are not to bother about it. We need not cry hoarse. From their own experience in the field they will find whether this is beneficial to them or whether their rights are being taken away by some foreign agencies.

Mr. Mann, while making his observation has very correctly pointed out—and I say, yes, it is true—that our industry

*Not recorded.

is much more protected than our agriculture and our terms of trade are not in favour of agriculture. I agree with him. That is one of the reasons why we could not have major achievements. Of course, my leftist friends will agree with me that we have not been able to introduce land reforms in various parts of the country. If we could have done it, perhaps both investments and terms of trade would have been in favour of agriculture and its achievements would have been much larger than what we are having today.

On the basis of my calculations on some studies made by the UNCTAD about gains from trade—I have not gone by the World Bank calculations—even if our share in the international trade remains the same and even if I assume that there would be a normal growth, there would be a net increment of export earning to the extent of \$1.6 billion to \$2 billion per year.

Lastly, one hon. Member referred to some observation published in the Hindi daily, *Jagran* of Kanpur. I could not read that Hindi daily myself, but I was told that some news item to that effect did appear. But it was not correct. It was contradicted. I do not know whether it has come to the notice of the hon. Members or not.

I would not like to take more time of the House but I would again like to reassure the hon. Members that it is not the intention of anybody in the Government, be it myself, be it the Prime Minister or anybody, to compromise the basic national interests. If our interests are threatened—and I do not rule out the possibility—and when the issue of a unilateral action by a certain State to threaten our interests comes up and if our interests are threatened by their trade designs, we shall fight it out. We shall fight them in GATT. I can assure you that we shall fight to the last.

DR. BIPLAB DAS GUPTA: We are not satisfied with the reply of the hon. Minister ... (Interruptions)

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त (मध्य प्रदेश) : सदर साहिबा, एक मिनट ... (ब्यवधान) सदर साहिबा, मुझे यह अर्ज करना है कि शदा ने कुछ नई बात नहीं कही है। ... (ब्यवधान) मैं यह अर्ज करना चाह रहा हूँ कि उन्होंने कोई नई बात नहीं कही है, मैं भी कोई नई बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ। लेकिन मुझे ताजुब हुआ है कि उन्होंने जगमोहन साहब की तकरीर के एक हिस्से का जिक्र किया, लेकिन दूसरा जो इमोशनल डाइमेंशन का जो उन्होंने इजाफा किया था इस देश में उसका कोई जिक्र नहीं किया कि हमारा बेल्जियम सिस्टम बुलडोज़ किया जा सकता है। उसका कोई जिक्र नहीं किया और मुझे ताजुब हुआ कि शदा ने

यह फर्माया, आन्टरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह फर्माया कि कुछ मामलात कोर्ट्स के सामने है और कोर्ट्स के फैसलों को आने देना चाहिए। सवाल यह है कि थिग्न आर हैपनिंग।

“तातिरयाद फिराक आबुरदा शबद,

बीमारे बरगुजीदा मुर्दा शबद।”

(कृपया सही कर दें)

असल में मैं उम्मीद कर रहा था कि मिनिस्टर साहब शायद इसका जिक्र करेंगे कि जब यह ग्लोबल ट्रेड की एक्सरसाइज शुरू हुई तो उस वक्त से लेकर आज तक कितनी बार पैरा मीटिंग्स बदले गए।

نشری سکندر بخت ”مدھیہ پردیش“

..... صدر صاحبہ - ایک منٹ

”مداخلت“ صدر صاحبہ

مجھے یہ عرض کرنا ہے کہ دادا نے کچھ نئی

بات نہیں کہی ہے۔۔۔۔۔ ”مداخلت“

..... میں یہ عرض

کرنا چاہ رہا ہوں کہ انھوں نے کوئی نئی

بات نہیں کہی ہے۔ میں بھی کوئی نئی بات

نہیں کہہ رہا ہوں۔ لیکن مجھے تعجب ہوا ہے کہ

انھوں نے جگمohan صاحب کی تقریر کے ایک

حصے کا ذکر کیا ہے لیکن دوسرا حصہ اموشنل

ڈائمنشن کا جو انھوں نے اضافہ کیا تھا

اس دیش میں اس کا کوئی ذکر نہیں کیا کہ ہمارا

ویلیو سسٹم بلڈوز کیا جاسکتا ہے۔ اس کا

کوئی ذکر نہیں کیا اور مجھے تعجب ہوا کہ دادا

نے یہ فرمایا۔ آئریبل منسٹر صاحب نے یہ

فرمایا کہ کچھ معاملات کورٹ کے سامنے ہیں

اور کورٹ کے فیصلوں کو آنے دینا چاہیے۔
 سوال یہ ہے کہ ”تھکنگز آر ہیپیننگ“
 تاثر یا ق فراق آوردہ شود
 بیمار برگزیدہ مردہ شود۔
 ”برائے کرم صحیح کر دیں“
 اصل میں میں امید کر رہا تھا کہ منسٹر صاحب
 شاید اس کا ذکر کریں گے کہ جب یہ گلوبل ٹریڈ
 کی ایکسٹریکشن شروع ہوئی تو اس وقت سے
 لے کر آج تک کتنی بار پیرامیٹرز بدلے گئے۔

सदर साहिबा, वाकिया यह है कि हमारी इकॉनमी
 को... (व्यवधान)... और हमारे पास बाक-
 बाउट करने के सिवाय कोई चारा नहीं रहा है।
 सदर साहिबा, मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा हूँ... (व्यवधान)

شری سکندر بخت: صدر صاحبہ واقعہ یہ ہے کہ ہماری
 اکانومی کو... بددائلت اور ہمارے پاس واکل آؤٹ
 کرنے کے سوا کوئی چارہ نہیں رہا ہے صدر صاحبہ
 میں یہ عرض کر رہا ہوں۔

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह : मैडम, इस पूरे मामले में देश
 को और इस सदन को विश्वास में नहीं लिया
 है... (व्यवधान)

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : मैडम, समझौता
 किसानों के हित के विरुद्ध है, इसलिए हम सदन से
 बाक-आउट करते हैं।

(तत्पश्चात् कुछ माननीय सदस्य सदन से उठकर
 चले गए।)

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह : मैडम, हम पहले
 भी कह चुके हैं... (व्यवधान)... एक अच्छे
 वकील और प्रोफेसर की तरह से मंत्रीजी, आपने भाषण
 जरूर दिया है, लेकिन... (व्यवधान)... अब इसका
 फैसला जनता करेगी। इसलिए हम सदन से बाक-
 आउट करते हैं।

(तत्पश्चात् कुछ माननीय सदस्य सदन से उठकर
 चले गए।)

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI :
 Madam, we are not convinced by the
 reply of the Minister. The country is

[] Transliterated in Arabic Script.

sold out. The attitude of the Govern-
 ment is against the people. Therefore,
 we stage a walk out.

(At this stage some hon. Members left
 the Chamber.)

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT : Madam,
 the Government is completely ignoring
 the emotions and the agitating minds of
 the people of this country. The Govern-
 ment is ignoring to take the Parliament
 and the people into confidence. In view
 of the attitude of the Government and
 for compromising the economic sovereignty
 of this country, in protest we are staging
 a walk out.

(At this stage the hon. Member left
 the Chamber.)

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKAT-
 RAMAN : Madam, the Minister has not
 answered any of my points. Therefore,
 I am also staging a walk out.

(At this stage some hon. Members left
 the Chamber.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You
 are walking out, please walk out.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE—Contd.

Notification of the Ministry of Finance

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
 MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI M.
 V. CHANDRASHEKHAR MURTHY) :
 Madam Deputy Chairman, I beg to lay
 on the Table a copy (in English and
 Hindi) of the Ministry of Finance
 (Department of Revenue) Notification
 G.S.R. No. 393 (E), dated the 21st April,
 1994, prescribing basic customs duty of
 Rs. 55 per kg. and Rs. 50 per kg. as
 standard and preferential rates respectively
 for almonds in shell falling under sub-
 heading No. 0802.11 of the Customs
 Tariff Act, 1975, together with an Ex-
 planatory Memorandum thereon.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-5668/94]

THE PUNJAB GRAM PANCHAYAT, SAMITTES AND ZILLA PARISHAD (CHANDIGARH-REPEAL) BILL, 1994

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
 MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI
 P. M. SAYEED) : Madam Deputy
 Chairman, I move for leave to introduce
 the Punjab Gram Panchayat, Samittees and
 Zilla Parishad (Chandigarh-Repeal) Bill,
 1994.

The question was put and the motion was
 adopted

SHRI P. M. SAYEED : Madam, I
 introduce the Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The
 House is adjourned till 11 o'clock
 tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at
 two minutes past seven of the
 clock till eleven of the clock on
 Friday, the 22nd April, 1994.