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The Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) drawn up when the World Trade Organization came into force six years ago in 1 January 1995 is inequitable and heavily loaded in favour of developed countries. Though the developing countries expected to gain handsomely from the multilateral trade agreement in agricultural products, they have hardly anything to cheer about. The government should, in the next Ministerial Conference in Doha impress upon the developed countries the need to rewrite certain clauses of the AoA to make it fair and non-discriminatory which is the spirit of WTO. The three Bills – the Indian Patents Act, 1970 (Second Amendment) Bill 1999, Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers’ Rights Bill 2000, and Biological Diversity Bill 2000 – which are with the Joint Members of the Parliament for their suitable recommendations in conformation to TRIPS Agreement should be passed as early as possible so that we do not fall behind in the competition with the rest of the countries. As it is, the foreign countrymen are depriving us of our bio-wealth by patenting our rich biodiversity.

It has now been well established that the root cause of the distortion of international trade in agriculture was the massive support given by the developed countries to their agriculture sector. This led to excessive production by the farmers of the developed countries, subsequently dumping their goods in the international market and imposing import restrictions to keep out foreign agricultural products from the domestic market. With the result, the global trade in the agriculture was distorted as it was outside the discipline of the GATT.

It was for the first time that the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) was brought under the GATT discipline in the Uruguay Round, when
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the Final Act was signed in April 1994 at Marrakesh in Mexico. This came into force on 1 January 1995 as World Trade Organization (WTO). From this day onward, the articles of the AoA have governed the global trade in agriculture.

**Tariffication**

The AoA has focussed on three issues: market access, domestic support, and subsidies on exports. Market access is expanded by: (a) tariffication, (b) tariff reduction, and (c) market access opportunities.

Tariffication indicates that all non-tariff barriers (NTB) would be abolished and converted into an equivalent tariff. It was also agreed that in the developed countries, the ordinary tariffs including those resulting from tariffication, are to be reduced by an average of 36% with the minimum rate of reduction of 15% for each tariff item over a six-year implementation period. For the developing countries, they will reduce tariff by 24% over 10 years. In addition, the minimum access equivalent to 3% of consumption in the base period (1986-88) would have to be established for 1995 and 5% consumption by the end of six years, i.e. 1 January 2001. Surprisingly, tariff rate quotas were to be treated as imports in the minimum access.

The market access opportunities under this methodology have been made less effective by the provision of the special safeguard provisions under articles 5 (1) (a) and (1) (b) by introducing the concepts of trigger level of imports and trigger prices of the product concerned. It would be interesting to find out whether the market access opportunities to the developing countries in the case of farm exports have improved. It is doubtful that there has been any change in the agricultural trading system during the implementation period, i.e. up to 1 January 2001 compared to pre-Uruguay Round period (1994). A clear picture will have to be found out on the comparative position on the market access opportunities.

The reduction of 36% over six years was proposed as a 'simple average', the minimum reduction in each tariff line being 15%. The developed countries exploited this by undertaking small percentage reductions in areas requiring heavy protection from cheaper imports from the developing countries, on the one hand and high reduction in areas of least interest, on the other, to ensure compliance with the overall percentage reduction as envisaged under the Agreement. Consequently, developed countries continued to maintain import tariffs at very high levels: 300% on sugar and over 400% on banana in EU; almost 1000% in Japan and so on. In contrast, the import duties in India is much lower – 50% on wheat, 80% on rice, 60% on sugar, and 70% on edible oil. This shows that the import duties in the developed countries are much higher than the developing countries. The market access to the developed countries as envisaged in the AoA is not possible under these circumstances.

**Domestic Support**

The AoA lays down that the total support given in the base period 1986-88, as measured by the total aggregate measurement of support (AMS), should be reduced to 20% in the developed countries over a period of six years, i.e. 1 January 2001, and 13.3% in case of developing countries over a period of ten years, i.e. by 1 January 2005. Reduction commitments are to be applied to the total level of support and not in individual commodities.

The methodology applied for the quantification of AMS needs to be thoroughly revised if at all the concept of AMS is to be retained
in the new AoA. There are exemptions in Annexure 2 of AoA. Similarly, the concept of external reference price calculated for the base period of 1986-88 needs re-examination. The methodology used may bring out the weaknesses in the system of calculations of AMS. The AMS calculated in the developed countries is much greater than that of calculated through notifications by them.

For developed countries, the existing AMS being higher than the de minimis level of 5%, they were required to undertake reduction. In OECD countries, during 1986, total support to agriculture - comprising producers' support, and support to general services (research marketing and infrastructure for agriculture) was $258.7 billion. As a percentage of the value of agriculture production, this was 52%.

By 1997, even as support to agriculture increased to $265.0 billion, as a percentage of value of agriculture production, it declined to 42%. The decline was fortuitous in view of sharp increase in value of agricultural production, caused primarily by the increase in international prices of agricultural products. In the subsequent two years, there was a massive increase in support rising to $33.2 billion in 1999, which in percentage terms worked out to 55%.

Clearly, the developed countries have not honoured their commitments, as reflected in the rising AMS level, from 52% in 1986 to 55% in 1999. Even if they had met the target, the OECD countries, a reduction of 20% base year would have led to an AMS of 42%. Ironically, even this would have been substantially higher than the maximum of 10% that the developing countries including India can maintain under AoA.

**Minimum Support Price for Wheat**

The Agriculture Ministry is in a quandary over the suggestions made by the Commission for Agricultural Costs and Prices (CACP) to reduce the Minimum Support Price (MSP) for wheat this year by Rs 60 per quintal to Rs 520, whereas, the Centre had fixed the MSP for wheat at Rs 580 per quintal.

Perturbed by the decision of the CACP for not increasing MSP for Rabi crop this year, Punjab and Haryana Chief Ministers Mr. Prakash Singh Badal and Mr. Om Prakash Chautala had rushed to Delhi to seek Prime Minister's intervention in the matter. The issue of MSP is of prime importance for politicians when the state goes to polls. However, no positive response had been given to both the chief ministers for increasing the MSP.

The CACP has sought to target wheat procurement at around 11 million tonne (m.t), which could be achieved, "if the MSP for the year 2000-01 is fixed at Rs 520 per quintal". The CACP has contended that in the recent years wheat procurement levels have increased from 8.16 m.t in 1996-97, to 9.3 m.t in 1997-98, 12.65 m.t in 1998-99, 14.4 m.t in 1999-2000, and a record of 16.35 m.t in 2000-01. On the other hand, since the launch of the Targeted Distribution System (TDS) in June 1997, total wheat off take (excluding exports and open sale to millers) had fallen from 9.2 m.t during (1996-97) to 7.7 m.t, 8.4 m.t, and 5.7 m.t in the following years. The off take has been 30% below last year’s already depressed levels during the current fiscal figures.

According to the CACP the consistent annual gap of roughly 5 m.t between procurement and off take (even after accounting for the exports and open sale) was the major factor behind the rise in FCI's stocks annually, which cannot be matched without balancing the procurement and off take of grains.
The CACP has projected in its report that the wheat procurement at 13 m.t, assuming an unchanged MSP along with normal harvest and wheat prices exhibiting their seasonal rise during January-March (the lean quarter immediately preceding the new marketing season). However, if open market prices during January-March remained the same during that period of last year, procurement would touch 15 m.t with an unchanged MSP.

The problem for the government is that market prices are currently ruling even lower than last year's levels. Wheat dara is now quoting at about Rs 625 per quintal in Delhi, as against Rs 695 per quintal during this time of last year. "Procurement levels are largely influenced by the price trends prevailing in the lean period preceding arrival of the new crop. If the lean season sentiment is weak, private trade would obviously refrain from buying in the main harvest period", says the report.

An official of the CACP felt that given the bearish price trends now, "we would not be surprised if the entire crop arrivals in the market devolves on the government pushing up procurement even beyond 17 m.t". The only alternative before the government then, is to announce an actual reduction in the MSP to restrict procurement to the desired level of 11-m.t.

"While the government can also announce a quantitative limit on the total procurement volume, this may not however, be feasible because it would challenge the very concept of MSP, under which the FCI is committed to buy unlimited quantities of the crop offered by farmers at the given support price. A better way out would be to reduce the MSP and make it more attractive for the farmers to sell their produce to the private business enterprises", said the official.

The CACP claims that a Rs 520 per quintal MSP for wheat was is reasonable, since it covered the entire 'C-2' costs of the farmer, which now came to about Rs 480 per quintal. The C-2 costs include all actual expenses incurred in cash and kind; interest on value of owned capital assets, rental value of land and imputed value of family labour. The only component that is excluded here is the remunerative price because of the farmer's 'managerial function'.

While the CACP feels that reduction of Rs 60 in the MSP is the only way to stabilize wheat stocks at the existing levels, it is, however, doubtful whether the Agriculture Ministry would be open to the idea. On the other hand, if the MSP retained at the last year's levels, the Government may have to obtain at least 17 m.t. The situation would worsen if the political pressures - especially with the elections to a number of State Assemblies are due in February/March - has forced the government to increase the MSP of wheat to Rs 610 per quintal for vote catching from 76 % farmers' population. This in any case has not helped the government for harnessing votes in Tamil Nadu, Pondichery, West Bengal and Assam.

As on July 2000, the FCI's wheat stocks, at 27.76-m.t level were almost twice the stipulated 14.3-m.t level for that date. If this trend continues, the FCI may have to obtain unto 35 m.t of wheat in the next fiscal, which will further add misery to the Agriculture Ministry.

Export Subsidies

According to AoA, the export subsidies for the developed countries were to be reduced by 36 % over six years and for developing countries the reduction commitment was again, 24 % in ten years. Herein again they
have undertaken the least reduction in areas with tremendous export potential, and heavy reduction in less important items to 'ensure on paper' compliance with the overall average. While this has enabled them to maintain a high level of export subsidy, developing countries like India, which did not subsidize exports or where subsidy levels were low, in the base year, do not even have the option of introducing/raising subsidy, as the same is prohibited under the agreement.

During the negotiations, the export subsidy needs to be defined appropriately (including the selection of base period), and the subsidies subject to reduction commitment need to be listed.

In the export subsidies, India should insist that the reduction commitments in the new Agreement, in terms of both value and volume, have to be of much larger dimensions with smaller list of exemptions. Tariff rate quota (TRQ) exports should also be subject to reduction commitments of export subsidies.

Agriculture and Intellectual Property Rights

In order to improve agriculture industry in the developing countries an important agreement, i.e. Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement was introduced as part of the WTO. This agreement will help the signatory countries to protect their intellectual property, microorganisms, and biological diversity and plant varieties in case they change their laws according to the agreement. India is seeking to implement its obligations concerning TRIPS Agreement and Biodiversity Convention of the UN of which it is a signatory.

The Bills have already been introduced in the Parliament. Two of the Bills, the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Bill 2000, and the Indian Patent Act 1970 Bill (Second Amendment) Bill 1999 constitute India's response to some of its obligations to TRIPS agreement. Biological Diversity Bill 2000 seeks to implement the principles of the Biodiversity Convention in domestic law. The Joint Committee of Parliament on the Plant Varieties and the Farmers' Rights Bill is the only one that has completed its task and is ready to place it in the next session of the Parliament for passing it.

"The three Bills have their own distinct focus but they share in common an attempt to define property rights (real property rights) over biological resources and property rights over knowledge or inventions. The allocation of real and intellectual property rights over biological resources has become an important issue in recent years both in India and abroad. This is linked to increasing concerns over the conservation of biological and genetic resources related to biodiversity (IPR).

Biological Diversity Bill 2000

The biodiversity Bill 2000 is in line with UN Convention on Biological Diversity. The salient features of this bill are:

- It prohibits the transfer of Indian genetic material outside the country, without approval of the Indian government;
- It stipulates that patents or other IPR over such material, or other related knowledge can only be taken after seeking permission in advance;
- It provides for levying of appropriate fees and royalties on such transfers and IPR;
- It regulates access to such material by Indian nationals also, to stop over-exploitation;
- It provides for the sharing of benefits of various kinds, including transfer of technology, monetary returns, joint R & D, venture capital funds, and joint IPR ownership;
- It provides measures for habitat and species protection, EIAs of projects which could harm biodiversity, integration of biodiversity into all sectoral plans, programmes and policies;
- It gives local communities a say in the use of resources and knowledge within their jurisdiction, and to charge fees from parties who want to use these resources and knowledge; provides for the protection of indigenous knowledge, through appropriate legislation or administrative steps such as registration at local, State and national levels;
- It stipulates that risks associated with use of genetically modified organisms, will be controlled through appropriate means;
- It provides for the designation of institutions as repositories of biological resources.

The Bill envisages the creation of authorities and funds at national, state and local levels. It has serious infirmities. It omits from its purview all claims of IPR that are made under the proposed Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers Rights Bill. Unfortunately, the Plant Varieties Bill does not provide for prior consent from farmers or compulsory benefit-sharing arrangements where farmers' varieties or knowledge is used. Hence, such an exemption provides a major loophole for corporations and scientists to gain monopolistic IPRs on plant varieties.

**Patenting of Plant Varieties**

India is the home of 45,000 plant species and 75,000 animal species. Ninety percent of the world's biological resources emanate from the underdeveloped world of Asia and Africa. Yet MNCs hold 97 of all patents worldwide. In the past 15 years, the USA alone registered 10,778 patents on plants.

At the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), patents applications went up from 3,000 in 1979 to 67,000 in 1997. Developing countries like India are at the losing end of the new patent regime. According to the USA based Rural Advancement Foundation International (RAFI), if contributions of peasants and tribal people from the developing world are taken into account, the US will owe as much as $2.7 billion to the developing countries.

TRIPS Agreement provides that patents should generally be available in all fields of technology. India also has the specific obligation to protect plant varieties either through patents or through sui generis system. As far as plant varieties are concerned, a specific International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) introduces a particular kind of monopoly intellectual property rights known as plant breeders' rights (PBR). These rights also seeks to foster the development of a seed industry but differ slightly from patents in so far as they provide some exceptions for other breeders to do research on the basis of the protected variety and some exceptions for the benefit of the farmers. However, the latest revision of the UPOV adopted in 1991 has strengthened the rights of breeders to such an extent that the distinction with pat-
ents is becoming increasingly blurred. UPOV has acquired significance in recent years for India since it has been proposed as a possible *sui generis* system for countries having to introduce IPR over plant varieties.

**Indian Point of View at the Review Committee Meeting 2K**

In the mandated review of the Uruguay Round of AoA in September 2000 for continuing the reform process, India categorically said that in countries where agriculture is the mainstay, "it would not be possible to accept that the agriculture sector could be treated in the same manner as other sectors in the WTO".

One solution, namely free trade and market-based agricultural system, could not solve the problems that these countries were facing, the Indian representative said at the September 2000 Geneva meeting of the WTO, adding that "agriculture, for the developing countries, is too serious a matter to be left to the markets alone to determine".

India's preliminary views presented in Geneva were in the run-up to stock taking exercise scheduled to be held in March 2001. Already four rounds of meeting were held in March, June, September and November 2000, respectively. Amplifying its concern on AoA, India pointed out that given the entrenched distortions in the international farm products market, the livelihood and income entitlement of farmers in developing countries need to be safeguarded from unfair competition at least in the medium term.

At the June meeting, India said that based on specific findings and lessons learnt during the implementation period of the existing agreement, India would formulate its initial proposals and in course, it will be presented in the committee. By doing so, India would "look forward to constructive and positive negotiations for establishing a fair, equitable and market-oriented agriculture trading system, which is consistent with the food security and rural employment need of developing countries like India".

Pointing out that the implementation of the agreement was expected to effect a structural change in the world food grains market with reduction commitments by developed world leading to a shift in cereal production from highly subsidised regions to low and non-subsidised regions. India noted that empirical evidence corroborated that "there has not been much change in the pattern of the world cereals production and exports".

India said that the persistence of the high domestic support to agriculture in many advanced countries was encouraging over production at high cost to their economies. The export subsidies disposed of excess supplies in these countries further artificially depressed the prices of the commodities in the global markets, "wiping off the competitiveness and comparative advantage of the developing countries".

While the share of the developing countries exports to destinations other than North America was 43 % in 1998, up from 39.5 % in 1990. The growth in exports to other developed countries has been "discouraging". Among the three major developed regions, Western Europe is the most important market for agriculture exports from developing countries. Its share in the agriculture exports from the developing countries declined from 30.5 % in 1990 to 28 % in 1998. Japan imported less from developing countries with its share also sliding from 14.5 % in 1990 to 11.5 % in 1998.

India fervently hoped that the Cairns group would put to use its enormous clout for fostering disciplines to deal with the trade distorting subsidies being provided by developed countries rather than trying to
"develop uniform disciplines for all Members thereby affecting adversely the interest of many developing countries whose development depends on the development of their agricultural sector".

**Review Meeting of AoA in March 2001**

India at the review committee meeting of AoA of the World Trade Organization (WTO) has placed four demands for the protection of agricultural goods and protection of farmers.

The first is the call for the developed countries to reduce their tariffs on agricultural products to provide easier market access to developing countries as laid down in the AoA.

The second is the proposal for a 50% cut in import duties from the level existing on 1 January 2001 the first year of negotiations for the AoA that has been made in a paper submitted jointly by India with several other developing countries.

The third is the call for a safeguard mechanism for all developing countries along with a provision for imposition of Quantitative Restrictions (QRs) under specified circumstances in case of a surge in the imports or decline in prices.

The fourth is a demand that as a special and differential measure, the developing country members should be allowed to maintain appropriate levels of tariff bindings, keeping in mind their developmental needs and high distortions in the international market.

The paper on market access points out many products of export interest to developing countries that will continue to face high tariffs as the AoA commitments envisage cuts on items in which there is little trade. On the other products like sugar, rice or dairy products, high tariffs will continue. The Indian proposal therefore suggests that there should be a 50 percent cut in tariffs during the first year of talks to build confidence among the less developed countries of the WTO. It should also ensure that the reform process continues during negotiations.

Illustrating the kind of high tariffs in the North, the paper quotes a joint WTO-UNCTAD study which found tariff peaks in the OECD countries reach 350% and above in extreme cases for some products of interest to developing countries. The most important areas with highest tariff rates include the major agricultural staple foods, cereals, meat, sugar, milk, butter, and cheese as well as tobacco products and cotton. In the EU, the out of quota tariff for bananas is 180% while in Japan the tariffs range between 460 to 600% for dried beans, peas and lentils and in the US, groundnuts in the shell attract a tariff of 164%.

If the industrialized countries have high tariffs, and India is arguing for high tariffs in the Third World, our budget should have reflected Indian point of view. Instead, the Finance Minister Mr. Yashwant Sinha has maintained extremely low import duties of 50% for wheat, 80% for rice, 70% for tea, coffee, copra, coconut, and only 45% for soyabean oil. India needs to enhance the duties commensurate with the duties of the industrialized world.

While the low duties allow cheap imports and destroys Indian agriculture, the Finance Minister refers to these as "safeguarding the interest of farmers". The low duty structure is aimed at serving the interests of the MNCs, because they will be able to export agriculture goods to developing countries which will be cheaper.

The budget is totally silent on policies to prevent the collapse of farm sector especially the prices. *Kisan* cards are not much use to farmers driven into debt and displacement by artificially low prices. Instead of
ensuring that the farmers get a fair price for growing food staples and that the food security is not compromised, the Finance Minister has announced excise duty exemption for the food processing industry.

India therefore needs to impose high rates for import duties for agricultural products to protect farmers. This gap between India's negotiating position in the WTO and domestic policy weakens its stand in the WTO and is a threat to the farmers.

**EXIM Policy**

The Indian consumers will now have a wider variety with the full scale dismantling of the remaining 715 export curbs at one stroke in the 2001-02 Export Import (EXIM) Policy, signalling the domestic industry to shape up or ship out as they will have to compete with global players. The salient features of the EXIM Policy announced by the Commerce Minister Mr. Murasoli Maran on 31 March 2001 are:

- Remaining 715 Quantitative Restrictions, mostly consumer items, agriculture products, textiles, clothing, and urea removed with effect from 1 April 2001.

- War-room established to play a watchdog role in monitoring about 300 sensitive import items.

- Import of second hand cars allowed subject to some riders, as also poultry and agriculture products and textiles. Import of farm products such as wheat, rice, maize, other coarse cereals, copra and coconut through state trading agencies only

- Export promotion schemes such as EPCG to be extended to agriculture exports.

- Farm-to-port approach in the agri-economic zones (AEZ) and a new agricultural exports policy on the envil.

- Annual Advance Licensing Scheme, advance licences, duty free replenishment certificate, export promotion capital goods scheme strengthened with further sops to Special Economic Zones.

- Market access initiative scheme outlined to boost exports

- Default of export obligation fulfillment gets a breather.

The most important thrust in the EXIM Policy is the thrust for agriculture, which of late has been languishing on stagnant domestic demand and low prices and could do with little market. Those who ship agri-produce will now get the export house/trading house status and other incentives attached with it. Agri-export zones (AEZs) are to be created with the help of the willing State governments so that the best of the domestic produce such as the apples of the Himachal Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir or Alphonso mangoes of Maharashtra find their due markets overseas. However, facilitation may not be adequate, because the most domestic produce fail to meet the global quality standards on a sustained, consistent basis. This means that State governments and their agri-horticulture departments, research institutions, and biotechnological departments must take on their supportive roles more purposefully if quality is to be assured and agricultural incomes are to get a boost from exports.

Clearly, horticulture crops which include fruits, vegetables, spices, floriculture, plantation crops, cashew, medicinal and aromatic plants would need to be focussed on as they have tremendous potential for diver-
sification and value addition. Production of major horticulture crops such as fruits, vegetables, coconut and spices, has expanded over the years, but post-harvest losses of perishables continue to be high. Adoption of scientific post-harvest practices is the key to prevention of losses, but that would call for educating the grower and setting up primary processing facilities such as sorting and grading close to the production centres. In addition, marketing infrastructure (storage and transportation, including cold chain) will have to be established with proper road links. Absence of quality related pricing is a great disincentive. Standardization of produce quality based on the requirement of the processors is an important first step in the marketing. All these issues have to be addressed simultaneously and holistically if the concept of AEZs has to succeed.

The lifting of QRs also threaten human and animal health. EU is presently facing scare of mad cow disease and other factory farming linked epidemics and the majority of the Europeans are therefore adopting vegetarianism. After lifting of QRs India has opened the markets to health hazards through meat imports.

The WTO allows QRs on grounds of protection of animal and human health under Articles XX and XXII of the GATT under sanitary and phytosanitary measures that should be invoked immediately to stop meat imports in India in the light of epidemic in the West. Prevention of Food Adulteration Act 1954 should be strictly enforced for all imported edible/food products.

**Conclusion**

The first challenge in the removal of the QRs on imports is the fear that there will be a flood of imports for which certain protection measures like quality control, proper packaging, anti-dumping duties, and other high levels of tariff protection have been imposed despite the fact that these tariffs may be under threat from the developed countries when they may take us in the dispute settlement body of the WTO for the reduction of these tariffs. Action under protection of animals and human beings under the WTO norms by passing legislation should be adopted because the mad cow disease can come to our rescue.

The second issue is the constituting of a "Food Security Box" that will facilitate higher levels of protection and codify provisions that already exist in the WTO agreements. India is demanding adequate market access for the developing countries during the review committee meetings on AoA. It will help India to become an aggressive agriculture exporter.

The third issue that India is insisting the developed countries is to reduce the subsidies on agriculture goods as laid in the AoA. This should be pursued vigorously and monitored regularly with better coordination among the developing countries. It should be ensured in the next Ministerial Meeting being held at Muscat in November that the developed countries have implemented all the provisions of the AoA by January 2001 (six years period) as laid down in the agreement. If it is confirmed that they have reduced the tariffs under AoA then the developing countries will automatically get the market access in the developed countries, because with the removal of tariffs agriculture products in the developed world will get costlier, which in actual practice not happening so far.

Lastly, the three Bills that are now before the Parliament do not question the current international framework. Even though it can be
argued that India’s choices are limited as long as it chooses to remain a member of the WTO, the Plant Varieties Bill illustrates the fact that even where international treaties give countries some leeway, this is not necessary being fully used. Even if there are contradictions like the TRIPS and Biodiversity Convention, India must fulfil all its international obligations and keep raising solutions to controversial issues at the next Ministerial Meeting on WTO being held at Qatar in November 2001.

Lastly, India must pass the Patent Acts, 1970 (Second Amendment) Bill 1999, the Biodiversity Bill 2000, and the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers’ Rights Bill 2000 to protect Indian biodiversity losing to developed countries and protecting the farmers’ rights from the onslaught of the WTO. The fault lies with India and not with the WTO.
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