

15.08 hrs

Title: Discussion regarding Fourth Ministerial Conference of WTO held at Doha.

MR. SPEAKER: The House shall now take up discussion under Rule 193. Shri Rupchand Pal.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when on the 11th of September, the World Trade Centre, the Headquarters of Pentagon and the White House were attacked by terrorists, there was an apprehension in the whole world that following the terrorist attacks, the Conference at Doha, Qatar might not take place at all, and that it may be deferred. But ultimately, the Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha took place.

The outcome was a great set back for the developing countries and the concerns of the developing countries were thoroughly ignored; and a new agenda – all sorts of new issues – was pushed through by the United States and its allies. The hon. Minister had gone to Doha with a mandate of the Cabinet and the people of this country to oppose the new round of talks,

to seek a review of the Implementation Issues and for reconsideration of the textile measures to protect Indian interest.

But if you analyse the outcome, India, in spite of a few apparent gains, I repeat, 'apparent gains', had succumbed to the pressure of the developed, powerful economies of the world. The Minister, immediately after agreeing to the final draft, while coming back had said that India had made significant gains. In the statement itself, he says that the Ministerial Declaration contains significant achievements for India. In one of the interviews he had gone to the extent of describing WTO 'Ministerial Conference' as an Olympic game from where India had come back, at least, with two Gold Medals. The first Gold Medal was in respect of the Implementation Issues and the second Gold Medal was that they could defer after a valiant fight the incorporation of, what goes by the name, Singapore Issues; the four new issues in relation to investment and trade, competition and trade, transparency in procurement and trade and lastly, trade facilitation.

If we compare the reaction of the Government of India pertaining to the draft, that is the September Draft Declaration and the Final Declaration, we find that Government had succumbed to the pressure in spite of some apparent gains. I shall come to the apparent gains later on. Even before going to what the Minister had stated about the Draft WTO Doha Ministerial Declaration, may I seek the indulgence of this House to make a mention of the submissions made by a good number of countries belonging to the developing world through a number of NGOs? I am just mentioning a few observations they have made in the submissions:

"We consider the Draft Declaration as illegitimate and a threat to the development and economic and social viability of developing countries. "

They had made certain demands and proposals. In particular, a demand was made for rejection of paragraphs on launching up negotiations on the new issues.

A demand for changes in the methodology in the decision making process has also been made. This can be seen from the reaction of the Minister on 24th October.

15.15 hrs (Shrimati Margaret Alva in the Chair)

He said that the Draft Declaration is against the interest of the developing countries; the Draft Declaration is biased, discriminatory, and India will never agree to such a Draft Declaration. What happened in Doha that ultimately he came back and said that we have made significant gains? One area is being emphasised. I am reading it. It is with regard to TRIPS. It says that in respect of public health, India had made a major gain and of course, it was made through a separate Declaration. There is some euphoria in certain quarters that what we have achieved through the Declaration of the TRIPS Agreement and public health is a major achievement. I do not agree that it is at all a major achievement. As the hon. Minister knows, this Declaration which is considered to be a major achievement had to pass through its tortuous ways, and ultimately Canada, the United States, and Switzerland had their final say.

What was the demand? The demand of the Ministers of developing countries, particularly, Brazil, India and many others, was that in the Health Care Declaration Proposal the words 'nothing in the Agreement shall be used to prevent countries from taking measures to protect public health' should be incorporated. But a handful of rich countries like Switzerland and the United States refused to accept it.

Meanwhile, Canada itself had violated the Patent regime in the backdrop of anthrax and its medicine. The United States temporarily followed suit. How could the patent regime deprive the people of even developed countries in a

particular situation of the necessary medicine and public health care? It was proved by countries like Canada and United States. But these very countries did not agree to the proposal of the countries like India which wanted them to add "Nothing in the Agreement shall be used to prevent countries from taking measures to protect public health". Instead of that, what was agreed to is there in the Declaration. They say that we agree that the TRIPS Agreement does not and should not prevent. Is it true? TRIPS has always been preventing them.

They added that to further dilute the situation, this demand has been made by the developing countries. In this situation, we affirm the right of the WTO Members to use to the full, the provisions in the TRIPS Agreement which provide flexibilities for this purpose. No one can go beyond the parameters of WTO Agreement and it is reiterated here that whatever is said through the separate Declaration, you are bound by WTO Agreement only which is flexible enough. This is about the health care.

About the compulsory licence, they say that each member has a right to determine what constitutes a national emergency or rare circumstances of extreme urgency. It is being understood as public health crisis. What will happen to the usual and normal public health care for a country like India? They are mentioning about extreme emergency epidemics like TB, malaria, HIV, and AIDS.

Sir, thanks to 1970 Act, India had developed a lot in drugs and pharmaceutical sector. It made tremendous progress. The medicines available at affordable prices for the Indian people are far too cheap when you compare them with the prices prevailing in countries like Pakistan, Canada, the United States, and those who have already gone for the product patent regime. The Act of 1970 is a model Act for all the developing countries. We have a very large manufacturing capacity.

There have been a demand for parallel import for least developed countries and least developing countries like Afghanistan and many African countries. India is in a position to supply necessary medicines to them. It is not to be allowed. Whatever is being said in the Declaration is within the parameters of TRIPS Agreement only. Some one says that TRIPS was very rigidly interpreted by some people so you can call it TRIPS-plus. This is the observation made by the European Union Trade Commissioner. It can be called a diplomatic bypass to be-fool the developing countries like India. Ultimately, as it has happened elsewhere, we were asked to open up. We went for quantitative restrictions and all those things. We brought down subsidies. In certain sections of this House, it has become a passion to say every time that the subsidies for the fertilisers and all these things should be brought down.

What have they done? The European Union has said that international prices of agricultural products, in comparison to Indian prices, are quite low. The main reason for the low prices of agricultural products in USA and OECD countries today is very high subsidy of 200 times to 300 times. Agricultural subsidies continue to multiply in these countries particularly in European Union, Japan, OECD countries in the garb of green-box exemption and income support. Some countries have very cleverly shifted it from production subsidy to processor subsidy.

I am giving you certain figures to show how in these countries they have been continuously raising their subsidies, shifting subsidies in different garbs like income support and all the new gold names. In Japan, support in the form of subsidies and other mechanism amounts to an equivalent of 33,000 US dollars per farmer. For the European and American farmers it is 30,000 US dollars per farmer. The total subsidy to OECD agricultural producers is to the tune of 362 billion dollars. Are they going to bring down these subsidies? We have made a demand. They said, wait, they would look into it. It is an expression of good intention.

We have said that implementation issues like anti-dumping duties, textiles, agriculture, etc. will have to be taken up first; otherwise we shall oppose. What has happened to these implementation issues? No major implementation issue has at all been taken up for consideration. Rather, they have merged them for a new round of negotiations, of course, in a different name called Trade Negotiations Committee and Work Programme. What do they say? They say about the Work Programme that "we agree that negotiations on outstanding implementation issues shall be an integral part of the Work Programme". And you are bound to accept it. Through the mechanism of Trade Negotiations Committee, this Work Programme which is actually a new trade round with a pro-rich economic agenda which they are trying to push through, will have to be concluded not later than 1st January 1995.

The hon. Minister had stated on 24th October that:

"I am constrained to point out that the draft Ministerial declaration is neither fair nor just.

They are not including my own certain key issues. It was a negation of all that was said by a significant

number of developing countries including India."

After coming back to India, he fought valiantly.....(*Interruptions*) He said that he won two gold medals...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): There may be a message from 10, Downing Street routed throughâ€¦...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Dasmunsi, please do not interrupt.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : I am just trying to help him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know that you are helping everybody. Now, Shri Rupchand Pal, you have taken 20 minutes. Please conclude.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Now, it is being said that we have been pressurised and we did not know what was to come. Till 13th of November, we fought valiantly and on 14th morning, we had been provided with a draft which we could not but accept. But we were assured then that with the statement of the Chairman, our concerns will be accommodated. After he has accepted, we said that we incorporated explicit consensus. It was the consensus of only 144 countries of the WTO which would be taken before the launching of negotiations. The Indian amendment was incorporated 'explicit'. What does it mean? Immediately after the conclusions at Doha, what was the interpretation of the EU Trade Commissioner? What was the interpretation of the United States? What was the interpretation of the Doha Declaration about the work programme and whether it is a new round or not a new round? They said that we have to decide only the modalities and that everything had been finalised in the Declaration. Still the Minister has said that we have made significant gains. After the fiasco in Seattle and after the incident of 11th September, the whole capitalist world in deep crisis wanted to have the markets of the developing countries. So, they pushed through their agenda and we had no option but to surrender. Why? It is because firstly, we suffered from a grand isolation. We had hardly any strategy. Our negotiating style had not been developed. It is not mature enough to match the offences of the developed countries. We have no think tank worth the name taking into account the inputs from different areas like economy, law, agriculture and everything.

Now, after the initial attempts to co-ordinate, whoever had been with us had left us ultimately. Why? This needs introspection. India had been leading the Non-Aligned countries, developed countries, Group of 77 and others. What happened to India? In the post-Pokhran situation, India was not believed by many neighbours and other developing countries because of our continuous surrender to the pressure of the US and its allies. No one believed us and maybe of our big brotherly attitude to small countries, neighbours had left us at the right moment. We were alone.

But, how was it that for all these years, we had been coordinating with so many countries? All these friends had left us. It needs some introspection. We have surrendered on certain areas which involve sovereignty of the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am just telling you that you have taken half an hour.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL: I will take ten more minutes and conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already taken half an hour. So many Members are there to speak and the time allotted is only three hours.

SHRI M.O.H. FAROOK : Madam, we congratulate the hon. Minister. But he should have the guts to stand up and say, 'No' here also.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : The new issues are investment and trade. India does not consider them to be trade issues. Still, we have to agree to this. What will happen ultimately? I would like to have an answer on this. Will you use your veto if there is a pressure on you to agree to the new Singapore issues, like investment, competition, transparency and procurement? These are the sovereign rights of the country. These issues have to be determined by the domestic policy. What will you do? There is a question. Will you seek a vote? There has never been a voting in WTO. The House has to be informed as to what will be your stand in such a situation? It is because these four SinGapore issues are vital to our sovereignty. What has happened to textiles? Bluntly say, 'No'. What will happen to environment? In the name of eco-friendly products, our own products will be debarred from entering their markets. How do you propose to compensate these losses that we are visualising?

On agriculture, they have promised that they will bring down the subsidies. How do you propose to fight the case in the coming two years? Then, coming to anti-dumping provisions, the U.S. has assured that it would have greater

discipline in implementing anti-dumping provisions. In TRIPS cases, it is recognised that future interpretations will incorporate Basmati, Alphonso mangoes and Darjeeling Tea. How do you propose to negotiate? Then, there is an assurance against bio-piracy in products like, neem and turmeric. How do you propose to fight these cases as it emerges after the negotiations at Doha?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are a lot of Members to speak.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Madam, I have not taken much time. I will conclude.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (BOLPUR): The initiator is generally given a long time to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thirty-five minutes for the initiator is a fair time.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : We have entered a new phase. The WTO Agreement is being widened and broadened. In every round we have seen new things being incorporated. This time we find the incorporation of these basic and new issues, which involve the sovereignty of the nations. How do you propose to fight them? How do you propose to organise our friends, and like-minded countries, within a short period so that when we go to meet next time, we have more friends, more common programmes and more power to resist the pressures of developed countries?

Lastly, you have said that WTO is not rule-based, but it is power-based. China has proved, through its entry, that if you have economic strength, you can bargain from the position of strength. What we need is strength. If India does not have the economic strength to bargain, India will be no where in future.

Mr. Minister, how do you propose to develop the strength of the country? You should spell it out on the floor of the House at the time when you reply to this debate.

With these words, I conclude. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Next, Dr. Ramkrishna Kusmaria to speak. (Interruptions)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Madam, I think my name is there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am just calling the names as left by the hon. Speaker.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I think my name is there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your name is there. You will be called. Your name is on the List. But, as per the List given by your party, you stand at the third position.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : My name is there. I do not know how it came to the third position....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why do you say that? I have got the List signed by your own party Whip. Why are you arguing with me?

डॉ.रामकृष्ण कुसुमरिया (दमोह) : समापति महोदय, आप पहले इन्हे बोलने दीजिए। मैं इनके बाद बोल लूंगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you want to give up your turn and give it to him, it is up to you. You can give the turn to him....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to make it clear that we go by the signed List given by your party Whip. Dr. Ramkrishna Kusmaria's name stands as number one. If Shri Swain wants to speak first, and if Dr. Kusmaria is giving up his turn, I have no problem. Shri Swain, you can speak.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Madam, if you allow me, then, I will speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But do not say that we have changed the order. It is your party which has given that order....(Interruptions)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE) : Madam, when the debate was initiated by such a prominent Member like Shri Rupchand Pal, I had a lot of expectations that he would definitely raise some new issues. But he raised the same old issues which were raised time and again in this House. The hon. Minister had already replied to those issues about ten times in this House. He raised the same issues like agriculture, subsidy, quantitative restrictions and drugs. At the same time, he also said so many interesting things.

He said that it is a great setback for the developing countries....(Interruptions) He said that the Doha round was a great setback. He said that in spite of a few apparent gains, India succumbed to the pressures of the powerful countries. He also said that the sovereignty of this nation is at stake.

I would just say one thing. Let us go to the Western media. How did the Western media describe India? The Western media described India as intransigent, obstructionist, deal-broker etc. If we succumbed to their pressures, why did they accuse us like this?

Next, the hon. Member Shri Rupchand Pal said that the hon. Minister fought valiantly. We have also said that he fought valiantly. Now, he says that the hon. Minister fought valiantly and that is why he is happy. But he is very unhappy that we could not accommodate the other small countries and under-developed countries. Is it not a case of juxtaposition? On the one hand, you say that you fight valiantly and, on the other hand, you say that you be very polite to others. These two things are simply not possible.

There was a national mandate behind the hon. Minister asking him to fight. The industry, the trade, all the opposition parties, the ruling party, the NDA partners and everybody wanted the hon. Minister to fight and he fought valiantly. That is the main reason why even countries like Pakistan and others, who also supported us initially, did not support us at the later stage.

What actually had we wanted? We wanted three or four things. Firstly, the protectionists anti-dumping laws and rules which America and Europe use liberally to stop imports from developing countries, are to be liberalised. Secondly, Europe-Japan-America are to phase out their huge farm subsidies. Thirdly, in case of emergency, involving public health, the interest of consumers should override patent rights of pharmaceutical companies. Fourthly, America and Europe will reduce the duties they levy on import of textiles and other labour-intensive manufactured goods from developing countries. Last but not least, the movement of skilled manpower from developing countries to rich countries will be facilitated further. These were the major reasons for which India fought. What have we got?

With regard to implementation, India managed to get its concerns of outstanding implementation issues recorded in the Declaration and made it a part of the Work Programme. This is one of the achievements. With regard to draft patents, National Governments were allowed to disregard patent rights in case of epidemic and in case of emergency concerning health. This is not a blow to India and the underdeveloped countries. This is rather a blow to the USA drug manufacturers. They were very sorry that rather the USA had to succumb to the pressures of the underdeveloped countries. It is not India who succumbed to the pressure of the USA. It is just the reverse.

Shri Rupchand Pal is a Member of the Patents Committee also. He knows as to how we had fought; as to how we had fought to retain this compulsory licence clause there; as to how we had fought in the Committee so that no multinational drug company could enter India; and as to how we had fought to see that the drugs are available to the people of a very affordable price.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Madam, I am on a point of order. As these are the proceedings of a Parliamentary Committee, we are not allowed to refer to them in Parliament, until the report is presented.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Madam, I have not gone into the details. I have just broadly spoken.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Swain, please do not refer to the Report of the Parliamentary Committee.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : All right, Madam.

It is not simply true that India lost its battle there. It is rather America and Europe who lost the battle concerning their manufacturers. I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister who has achieved such a gain for India. But it might somehow put our drug manufacturers also into difficulty, who by the process of reverse engineering, produce a lot of cheap drugs. They can also export it to other countries. But this might rather put them into trouble, i.e. our drug manufacturers.

My fifth point is regarding agriculture, work programme to review market access, reduction and ultimate phase out of support and subsidy by the rich nations. Anyway a beginning has definitely been made. On that day, the hon. Minister was saying that if we want to give subsidy, we can go up to Rs.42,000 crore. Do we have that kind of money? Yes, it is very easy to say that as to how to give subsidy at the level the USA gives but is it possible for India to do the same? Do we have that much of money that we can provide subsidy to 70 per cent of the people of India who are agriculturists? It is simply not possible. We should be rather very practical with regard to this. Merely saying so does not lead us anywhere. Rather because of our agreeing to phase out the subsidy, Indian agriculturists are going to have an export market within a very short period.

Regarding environment change, I would like to say that the European Union was brought to the negotiating table but nobody is talking about the expensive standards as yet. India faces the similar standards in multilateral loans and negotiations in this case can only help the Third-World countries where India is also a Member. From environmental angle also, India is also going to gain.

I am putting another question before the House. Should we not look after the environment angle? Is it not going to hamper the future of India? Should we not say so? I would rather say that India should take excessive interest with regard to environment issues otherwise if we do not look after the environmental issues, I would say with the population of India increasing, we would not be able to provide food after a period of 10 or 15 or 20 years.

Now, I come to competition and other issues related to Singapore. India managed to postpone negotiations by two years on what we call 'non-trade issues'. Whether mistakenly or deliberately, Shri Pal did not mention that there is a clause for explicit consensus. After two years, a Resolution, could only be passed in the Fifth Ministerial Conference if there is any explicit consensus, that is, veto. When veto is there in the hands of India and with the underdeveloped countries, then, how have we lost to Superpower? We have not lost.

With regard to anti-dumping, I would like to say that the USA agrees to review laws that can be manipulated to sort out foreign competition. This round has definitely gone in favour of India and the underdeveloped countries.

With regard to textiles and garments, demand to advance quota has been rejected. I agree that it was rejected. The matter was sent to the WTO panel but I also agree that it is not going to cause much harm to India because the quotas are ending only in 2005. The quotas are for only four years. So, it is not going to give much of a loss to our country.

15.52 hrs (Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya *in the Chair*)

Finally, we have made another gain and that is the movement of the skilled manpower from developing countries to rich countries would be facilitated. This is another achievement by our hon. Minister. India has gained substantially and we have really done a very commendable job at Doha.

I have some suggestions to offer in this regard. Through you, Sir, I would like to tell the hon. Minister as to why we were isolated. I think that our style has got to change. Brazil is a very tough negotiator but they are not disliked like us. Nobody tells that they are intransigent or dealmakers. If we really want that other developing and underdeveloped countries should also be with us, then, our style on negotiations must change.

Genuinely multi-disciplinary team of sectoral experts, economists, trade administrators and the lawyers, who would provide sustained intellectual support to both the strategy and specifics of Indian negotiations should be formed. There should be some specialists. I do not agree with the contention that only the bureaucracy would handle it perfectly. There must be some experts. They may come from outside the realm of Government also. There are so many other experts, WTO experts, and economists outside the bureaucracy. They can also be brought and their suggestions could also be taken. They should be taken wherever we have negotiations with other countries.

They should be there to give us their inputs.

We must keep our bilateral negotiation windows open specifically with the United States of America. The name of the USA might be *pariah* to some people. But it is in our national interest. The USA is the greatest buyer and could become the biggest market for India. So, let us have a bilateral agreement with them.

We were fighting valiantly with the WTO. At that time, all small countries were with us in the initial stages. They started bilateral negotiations with other countries. We did not do that. We say that we would just fight it out. We went on fighting and they made a deal. That is why they ultimately succeeded. If we, actually, failed and if it is a setback for all the developing countries, why is it that all other developing countries kept quiet? It is because they gained. They actually gained by making these bilateral arrangements with the USA or the European Union. We must keep our windows open. We must negotiate. The negotiations must be official and also non-official. It could be held at both the levels.

Another point is a bitter truth. We talk about tariff. We always say that the tariff rates should be increased so that no agricultural products or other products could come from other countries. But it is also true that tariff rates in India are now the highest in the world. So, is it not going to dilute our bargaining power because we have imposed so much tariff on anything coming into India? That is why that has also diluted our bargaining power. I appeal to the hon. Minister and the Government that they should also think about it. By simply raising the rates of tariff is not going to help India in future.

We must ensure that the domestic legislations, like the policy about competition, procurement by Government, bio-diversity protection, Patents Act are in place soon. Many hon. Members say, "What is the hurry? Why should we pass such Bills?" I think, because we are not passing such Bills, we are at a disadvantage at the global forum, that is, at the WTO. The other countries are just poking their finger at us and say: "If you are not passing these Bills, you are totally intransigent." This sort of accusation is being made against us. So, we want that sooner these Bills are passed, the better it would be for this country.

About contentious issues like environment, investment competition and labour standards, we will have to think positively. We will have to think about environment. We will also have to think about labour standards. Is it not our duty to do away with the system of child labour in India? Is it not our aim? Should we not do it? If somebody says something about the labour standards and he means it the child labour, it should be our endeavour and national duty to do away with the system of child labour. That is why, I think, it has given us an opportunity. The WTO has given us an opportunity to do away with this slur on our nation.

Last but not least, India can now forge ahead and co-exist with China. China is a force. After waiting in the queue for 16 years, now, China has made an entry to the WTO. If we combine together with China, I think, there are a lot of common interests between these two countries. We could combine with China and have a bilateral trade agreement with that country. I think, we will have a lot of common interests.

16.00 hrs.

We can have all this profit for India also.

With these words, I compliment the hon. Minister, Shri Maran and Shri Rudy for this. Ultimately, I conclude with these words that WTO is an opportunity and it has given the opportunity to India to become a super power. This is the time when we should improve our quality and we should have our negotiating skills. In that way, in this millennium, under the leadership of hon. Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee, India will become a super power.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Mr. Chairman Sir, as Shri Rupchand Pal pointed out, in his opening speech at Doha on the 10th of November 2001, the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry described the Draft Declaration before that Conference as "neither fair nor just". He went on to characterise as "meaningless" the claim made by the champions of the Draft that "the needs and interests of the developing countries have been placed at the heart of the Work Programme."

Earlier, in an interview to C. Rammanohar Reddy of *The Hindu*, the hon. Minister had called the Draft a "bombshell". He had said, "it is a bombshell", which "does not reflect the interests of the developing countries." Now, in his Lok Sabha Statement of 22nd November, the hon. Minister says that he is glad to inform the Members that "we made major strides towards realising our goals" and that "the ministerial declaration contains significant achievements for India".

This seems an extraordinary turn - around for a Minister who said at the final plenary of the WTO in Doha on the 14th November, "The Declaration fails to reflect India's concerns and demands in a substantive manner." He went on to tell Sukumar Muralidharan of *Frontline*, when he returned to India, "Developing countries, I would say have no role in setting the agenda. A rule-based body is becoming -- it is a transitive verb -- a power-based body." Shri Rupchand Pal quoted this too.

What does the hon. Minister want us to understand? Are we to say that proto-Maran has contradicted to Devteno-Maran? Are we to say that there is a Maran Mark-I and a Maran Mark-II? Are we to say that there is a pre-Deepawali Maran and a post-Deepawali Maran? It is a complete contradiction. It is he who has pointed out in words that ring and reverberate in the hearts of every Indian that the Draft Ministerial Declaration is neither just nor fair. He has said it in the following words that reverberate in the hearts of every Indian that there is a "power playing game" going on. He has said, in words that reverberate in the hearts of every single India that we are not being treated as we deserved to be treated".

Suddenly, this trade terrorism is converted into our having made major strides and secured major achievements. Therefore, the only way of discovering why Shri Maran has changed his mind is to compare the Draft Ministerial Declaration, which he condemned with the Final Declaration, which he has hailed.

When one does compare the Draft with the Final, one finds that, out of the 45 paragraphs in the Draft Declaration, as many as 37 have been retained in the Final Declaration with no change at all.

Sir, 37 out of 45 paragraphs of the Draft Declaration are there with no change in the Final Declaration. Only eight of the 45 paragraphs have been amended, and another seven paragraphs have been added. When we look at the eight amended paragraphs, we find that three of them, namely paragraphs 9, 10 and 16 of the Draft Declaration, relate not to us but to the least developed countries and to the new entrants. So, out of eight, those three do not really concern us. In one of them, paragraph 31 of the Draft Declaration, there is a very minor revision. It says, in the Final Declaration, that it is not the General Council but a Working Group of the General Council which will consider questions of trade and transfer of technology. It is a minor procedural change.

There are four remaining paragraphs of the eight, which have been amended. I refer to paragraphs 6, 8, 20 and 27

of the Draft Declaration, which have been amended, but blatantly against our interest. The amendment does not serve us. It harms us. Let me explain why because this is very important to understand. The changes that have been made are only in eight paragraphs, half of those changes are against us and, therefore, I have to explain why. Take the following key sentence from the original paragraph 6. I want the Minister to explain to me why he agreed to this sentence being dropped. It says: "We agree to ensure that measures taken to address such concerns – health, safety, environment protection - shall not be used for protectionist purposes." It is one of the few really excellent sentences in the Draft Declaration, and Shri Maran agreed that this sentence be dropped.

Then, I turn his attention to paragraph 8 of the Draft Declaration, which contained an excellent sentence for us, which for some reason inexplicable, Shri Maran has agreed to being dropped from the Final Declaration. It is the sentence that reads – please listen carefully – It says: "The ILO provides the appropriate forum for a substantive dialogue on various aspects of this issue, namely core-labour standards." This is the sentence behind which all our social concerns lie and this is the sentence that Thiru Maran has removed like removing an umbrella in the middle of a cyclone. Why did he agree to this sentence being dropped? What is wrong with this sentence? What is offensive about this sentence? Why did Thiru Maran agree that this excellent sentence in the Draft Declaration, one of the few excellent sentences in the Draft Declaration, be dropped? And Shri Kharabela Swain expects me to believe that it was the Americans who buckled under Thiru Maran's pressure, whereas Thiru Maran succeed in standing up to American pressure.

The third sentence is in paragraph 20. In the Draft Declaration, there was a reference to a possible multilateral framework. In other words, there was no agreement on the multilateral framework. Maybe, perhaps, "a possible" multilateral framework' was the phraseology in paragraph 20 of the Draft Declaration, and this has now changed, and this is in the area of trade facilitation, to "recognising the case" for such a framework. If you say, 'recognise the case for a multilateral framework', then what remains of the argument that you are putting forward that this has nothing to do with trade? At least in the draft, when the word 'possible' was used, you could have got out of an impossible situation. But by agreeing to this change in language, Thiru Maran has put us firmly in the quagmire. There is no way in which we can escape.

And the fourth sentence that he has allowed to be changed is that in paragraph 27, various phrases and sentences have been added in the Final Declaration, which have the effect of reinforcing the argument of the developed countries in favour of trade- related environment measures. I want Shri Kharabela Swain to listen to this carefully. They could be and they will be, used as protectionist measures. We have no objection to the protection of our environment. We do object to the Americans or anybody else telling us what our environmental standards should be, and then interpreting our adherence to those environmental standards as not being in compliance with their requirements and announcing that it is not; and thus preventing our goods from going into that country. Understand what the issue is. The issue is not environmental protection. It is the use of environmental standards as a non-tariff barrier against the exports of developing countries. Shri Murasoli Maran has let us down there.

As regards the seven additional paragraphs that have been either extensively re-written or added, I will be dealing with them subject-wise when we come to it.

The next thing I want to do, Mr. Chairman, is compare this very well hidden document with the Final Declaration. After the official meeting in Singapore and the bold stand that Thiru Murasoli Maran started taking in various public forums, the representative of India in Geneva brought, in the General Council, to the attention of his colleagues the various concerns that India had, and then followed this up with very specific drafting suggestions. It is a document bearing No. WT/GC/W/460, dated the 6th November, 2001, three days before Shri Murasoli Maran reached Doha. This document had been issued by the Permanent Mission of India in Geneva, and it contains, to the best of my count, 38 drafting suggestions to the Draft Ministerial Declaration. Now when I say 38, there are not 38 entries. Some of the entries have more than one amendment. So, I tried to count them all. Now, 38 drafting suggestions have been made by India. Thirty-six were summarily rejected. This is our standing. This is a super power's negotiating ability. Shockingly, the biggest developing country in the world, India, a country whom I have had the honour of representing in numerous trade forums including GATT which was listened to with the utmost respect, has now dropped so far in international esteem. That, out of 38 drafting amendments, 36 are just brushed aside by the international community. And we have the gall to arrive in this House, in the highest forum of India's democracy, and say we have come back with significant gains, major achievements and huge strides. Sir, none of the remaining two was fully accepted, but partially accepted. What was it? Please measure the strength of Indian diplomacy. We had proposed with regard to regional trade arrangements where the Secretariat had said that these regional trade arrangements have a unique role to play. India said, "No, change 'unique' to 'important'". My heartiest congratulations to the Minister, Shri Murasoli Maran. The word 'unique' was changed to 'important'. It is the only

achievement he had in Doha. The second one is that there was to be a sentence we asked to be deleted in the section on trade and environment. They agreed to delete that sentence which was against us, but insisted in exchange that another sentence which was in favour of us should also be deleted. What sort of a diplomatic achievement is this?

I also want to compare the hon. Minister's Statement with the Final Ministerial Declaration. I am talking about the Minister's Statement made here in the House on the 22nd November. I want to compare that with what appears in the Final Ministerial Declaration, in comparison to the Draft Ministerial Declaration, which he so correctly described in Doha as being unjust and unfair. The Statement is here before me. In paragraph 3, on the 22nd November, Thiru Murasoli Maran informed this House:

"The recognition of asymmetries for the first time was a major gain."

This is not for the first time that it has happened. Special and differential treatment for developing countries has been an integral concept of GATT ever since its evolution. In the time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, we succeeded in persuading our fellow members of GATT that there should be a separate part, Part IV of GATT, meant only for special and differential treatment. We have had a recognition of asymmetries not merely in words but in legal form in GATT for the last 34 years and the Commerce Minister of India comes to this House of Parliament and tell us that this is the first time that there has been any recognition of asymmetries!

Let us see, what is more; what was it that Thiru Maran's Ministerial colleagues refused to accept at Doha. Now, I am comparing his speech with the Final Declaration. Thiru Maran, in his opening speech, made approximately five or six excellent and valid suggestions in the deep Indian national interest. He brought out the concept of the development deficit. It is in his speech – the development deficit. We had urged in that 6th November document that I was referring to that there should be a reference to the development deficit. Where is the reference to the development deficit in the Final Declaration? Your Ministerial colleagues, Mr. Minister, extending from the North Pole to the South Pole and from the Pacific to the Atlantic, refused to support you in recognising the concept of a development deficit.

They also refused to support you on a suggestion:

"Trade liberalisation has yet to benefit many poor people, particularly in the developing countries."

It is a self-evident truth. It is the most important truth for India. It is a matter of high commendation that Thiru Maran should have brought this to the attention of the international community. It is also a matter of deep condemnation that he failed to carry his Ministerial colleagues, a majority of whom are from developing countries, in getting this phrase into the final agreement.

It is extraordinary that his Ministerial colleagues at Doha did not accept:

"More needs to be done so that all can benefit fully and equitably from the system."

His colleagues refused to accept that the multilateral trading system needs to be: "shared more broadly and in a fairer manner."; or even as Thiru Maran said: "To underscore the importance of the development dimension of international trade." The phrase does not exist in the Final Declaration. It is really sad that all these phrases actually exist in the Draft Seattle Text without square brackets. This means, without dissension, at Seattle, all these phrases have been agreed. The Indian delegation pulled out these phrases from the Seattle Draft Text. They placed them before the Ministerial Conference and the Ministerial Conference refused to go along with Thiru Maran that all these need reflected in the Final Declaration and we call this a 'major achievement'!

Let me now adjourn to another sentence in Thiru Maran's statement of the 22nd November before us.

He has said: "India had strongly opposed the linkage of core labour standards with trade. The Declaration reaffirms that ILO is the appropriate forum to address the core labour standards." I do not know which Declaration Shri Maran is talking about. Maybe, he has a secret Declaration with him. But he has circulated a Ministerial Declaration with his Statement. I have read it. I am not absolutely sure that Shri Maran has read it because I do not know where he has succeeded in getting this Statement from. On the contrary, as I have already pointed out, Doha deleted from paragraph 8 of the Draft Declaration, the sentence "The ILO provides the appropriate forum for a substantive dialogue on various aspects of this issue." I have a suspicion that they had written the Statement before they went to Doha and that they forgot that the sentence that they had referred to had been dropped at Doha. Otherwise it is

inexplicable that a sentence which does not exist in the Final Declaration is brought before this parliament and is claimed to exist. How can he possibly do this to us? Please note what Doha has done there in the Ministerial Declaration. In Doha, the Ministers "take note of the work underway in ILO on social dimensions of globalisation." This is there in paragraph 8 of the Final Declaration. He translates this weak, inappropriate, unimportant sentence into the claim before this House that India had strongly opposed the linkage of core labour standards with trade and that the Declaration reaffirms that ILO is the appropriate forum to address the core labour standards.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Mani Shankar, please wind up.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Wind up, Sir! I have hardly started.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (LATUR): Sir, we, in the Business Advisory Committee, had decided that these are very important issues and there should not be time constraint, specially for the Members who have studied and who are making very good contribution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know that, but the allotted time is only three hours and there are other names also from the Congress side.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : We can extend the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I only said 'wind up please'.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Sir, my submission is that if it is necessary, we can extend the time.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, in that case, I should also have been given some more time.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : You should have been on our side. Then you would have had Shri Shivraj Patil to defend you. There you have nobody to defend you. So, you are at loss. Come over here.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the most shocking sentence in the whole of Shri Maran's statement is the one which I am about to read out. I had read it out to him when we had a debate on Shri Sunil Khan's Private Member's Resolution on the same subject. But because not everybody was here then, let me read out that sentence again. "The key concerns of India in agriculture have been adequately safeguarded in the Declaration." This is the Union Minister of Commerce and Industry, Government of India talking on behalf of all the Treasury Benches and making the outrageous claim that all the interests of India in agriculture have been adequately safeguarded in this Declaration. Sir, contrast this with what the Minister himself said at Doha in his opening statement. He made three key demands of the developed countries: (1) 'Elimination of large scale domestic support to agriculture in development'; (2) 'Elimination of other trade distorting subsidies'; (3) 'Removal of all unfair barriers facing farm exports of developing countries'. These three key demands are totally in conformity with the interests of the Indian *kisans* and the Indian *khet mazdoors*. My heart swells as an Indian - notwithstanding the fact that Shri Maran is with the party that he is - with pride that we did have at least one Minister in the Treasury Benches who could go out to an international conference and tell the truth that this is our minimum demand.

But, Sir, what has happened? We had a section on agriculture in the Draft Declaration. The section on agriculture in the Final Declaration is – word by word, comma by comma, full-stop by full-stop – exactly the same as it was in the Draft. When he goes, he says that all this is needed to make it adequate for us. When they refuse to accept a single word of what he says, he comes back and says whatever they gave us earlier is adequate. What a Janus-faced foreign trade policy?

At Doha he said that we will not be held hostage to unreasonable demand. This was in the context of agriculture. And yet, the same para is there, the same words are there, the same punctuation is there. We are still being held hostage to exactly the same unreasonable demands. But the hon. Minister has forgotten it.

I really want to know from where has Thiru Maran suddenly got his southern comfort. Instead of smugly belief that our interests in agriculture are adequately safeguarded, we need to recognise in this House, but most particularly on the Treasury Benches, that the pre and post Doha scene on agriculture remains exactly the same. All those phrases from which he is today trying to draw solace were already agreed in the draft Declaration before he went to Doha – phrases like comprehensive negotiations, substantial improvement in market access, phasing out of export subsidies, substantial reduction in domestic subsidy, special and differential treatment for developing countries. If the Maran of pre-14th November was so angered by the draft on agriculture as to threaten to wreck Doha, what happened on 14th November to so thoroughly assuage him? Nothing. The hon. Minister has claimed both in this House on the occasion of the debate on Shri Sunil Khan's Resolution and in the other House in the debate on his Statement there, that he had prevailed on the developed countries at Doha to phase out farm subsidies. He said it here; he said it there. We have just had his *Shagird* Shri Kharabela Swain tell us that that is a great achievement that farm subsidies are being phased out because these powerful, developed countries have had to bend in front of

the *Sohrab*; those *Rustoms* are now defeated.

Thiru Maran has even quoted the *Asian Wall Street Journal* in support of this claim. The fact is that the developed countries have covered their so-called commitment with the phrase "without pre-judging the outcome of the negotiations". So, without pre-judging the outcome of the negotiations, they kept all their cards with them and are playing it at close to their chest and they are asking you to be a dummy in this bridge game and to reveal all your cards for them to see.

Sir, I do not want to charge the hon. Minister with misleading us in this context; but specifically I want to draw his attention to the fact that the phase-out of all forms of subsidy is not in the final Declaration.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, you have already taken 30 minutes. How much time do you still want to take?

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Sir, I need another half-an-hour more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already taken half-an-hour.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Yes Sir. I need another half-an-hour and I think our Party would be willing to let me have that time. Thank you.

Sir, specifically, they have only agreed in a very round-about way to phasing out export subsidies. We cannot mix up domestic subsidies with export subsidies because out of the total OECD support to agriculture which amounts to 326 billion dollars, only a small, tiny fraction is constituted by export subsidies.

So, even if they phase out all export subsidies – Sir, I do not believe for a moment that they will – we are still going to be landed with hundreds of billions of dollars being legitimated support under the Final Declaration at Doha. Sir, OECD domestic subsidies in countries where only two per cent to three per cent of the GDP comes out of agriculture and where only two per cent to six per cent of employment is in agriculture, account for over 80 per cent of global domestic subsidies to agriculture. I owe this figure to Thiru Maran's intervention in the Rajya Sabha. I got it from him. The US' domestic support alone at 128 billion dollars is greater than the total value of Indian agricultural output, which is far below it at 90 billion dollars. Sir, our product-specific subsidies are negative, our total subsidies are far below the permissible levels and we have no resources, as Thiru Kharabela Swain pointed out, to help our *kisans* to the extent that the WTO allows us to go. So, in these circumstances, we have to find a level-playing field for our agricultural exports to compete with their domestic production or their agricultural exports.

Now, pre-Deepavali, Thiru Maran knew all this, which is why he was fuming when he went to Doha. Post-Deepavali the same Thiru Maran seems to be suffering from amnesia of a motivated kind. It is forgotten. If the Government will not recognise the truth of the failure at Doha, how can we expect them to take corrective measures to protect our *kisans* and our *khet mazdoors*, or how can we have any credibility in WTO forums? Sir, even if the hon. Minister is welcome to fool some of the media some of the time, but he cannot fool all of this Parliament all of the time.

As regards the section on agriculture in the decision on implementation, apart from taking note, that is what he does, of three reports of the Committee on Agriculture and urging restraint on Members resorting to the green box, and the same old tired cliches about food security and rural development, there is no development of any significance at Doha which matters to the Indian *kisan* and the Indian *khet mazdoor*. What Thiru Maran appears to have forgotten when he is boasting about what they have done on food security is that at Marrakech itself, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, who was then our Minister of Commerce, ensured that consumer subsidies are not computed in the aggregate measure of support. So, there has never been a threat to our food security from the WTO. Whatever Thiru Maran's colleagues may have said when they were on this side of the House and we were on that side, I argued with them then that there was no threat to our food security. The fact is that the only threat to our food security in India comes from the Minister, Shri Shanta Kumar. He is the biggest threat to food security in India. As for rural development, I want to know what is this threat that Thiru Maran perceives from the WTO and what measures he has taken to counter it. Has he obtained one *khota paisa* at Doha for rural development? How does he expect that the rural poor will feed themselves by eating his words? These are all completely false claims and we do not expect a Minister of the intellectual standing of Thiru Murasoli Maran, a man whom I highly respect for the loud voice he raised at the beginning in Doha, to come to us and not only lead us up the garden path, but worst still, lead himself and his Government up the same garden path.

Is it not extraordinary that the Minister's Statement of 22nd November skips any reference to textile and clothing? What is the Minister trying to highlight? At Doha, the Minister said : "Sensitive industries including small-scale industries sustaining a large labour force are being destroyed." That is what the Minister said.

But nothing happened at Doha to stem this destruction. This is why neither textiles, nor clothing nor small industries

has been referred to by the Minister in his own statement. He hopes that we would forget what he has forgotten. I am afraid, we do not forget. We cannot forget that at Doha, in the Doha Declaration there is not one single word in all those 52 paragraphs about textiles, clothing or any other specific industrial product of export interest to India. Here, I would like to mention steel which according to newspaper reports today is going to be banned for import by the United States from India. All that we have is this high sounding decision on implementation. I want the hon. Minister to explain, what provisions of the section in the decision on textile and clothing gives him any cause for satisfaction? It is because it is from him that I learned – when I listened to him in various forums here in India – that he was deeply dissatisfied with the way in which our ability, not only India's but the developing countries as whole, to export textile and clothing is being dealt with by the WTO. What I want him to do is to honestly admit that we gained nothing of substance. We cannot complain to him. Who gained was the so called 'small suppliers' of textiles. That is a category that does not include India. There are some crumbs thrown to them. Why?

Sir, I want Shri Swain to listen to this very carefully. They have done it in order to divide the Group of 77. We started out as a Group of developing countries. Then they got it changed saying that some countries are more developed than us in that Group; then they said that there are some less developed countries than us in that Group; then they said that there are some small economies; then they said that there are some ocean-bound economies; then they said that there are some ice-bound economies and now they have introduced the concept of small economies. They engaged in treating us like *booty kabab*. We have Shri Swain, who comes over here and tells us that Shri Maran stood up to the Americans and the Americans have succumbed to Shri Maran. What kind of perception of foreign policy is this?

Sir, in his statement, matching this remark on agriculture is the extraordinary remark, "in services, the movement for natural persons has been given primary focus". This is the remark of Shri Maran.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now. The total time of your party is over now.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Sir, I am trying to conclude.

Sir, Thiru Maran says, "in services, the movement for natural persons has been given primary focus". I hope, you would forgive me for describing this statement as rubbish. It is not there. Unless the hon. Minister clarifies this satisfactorily, I am afraid, we might have to move a privilege motion against him for misleading the House in this matter. Will the hon. Minister, in his reply quote a single sentence or even a single phrase from the Doha Declaration or its annexed documents that substantiates the claim that he has made?

Sir, I quote from that document. It says:

"We, " that is the Ministers at Doha,

"recognise the work already undertaken and the large number of proposals submitted on the movement of natural persons."

That is all that the Doha Declaration says. Now compare what it says with what he claims it says. Where does it say that the movement for natural persons has been given primary focus?

Sir, indeed even the hon. Minister, whose speech at Doha otherwise was outstanding, failed to refer to the movement of natural persons in their generality in his opening speech at Doha. He restricted himself to the movement of professionals? Why? Why did he restrict himself to the movement of professionals? Is the Government of India interested only in IIT and IIM graduates? Does the hon. Minister not know that there are millions of ordinary labourers, *mehnat kast mazdoors* who are desperately seeking to go abroad for employment? The fact is that, be it professionals or labourers, the hon. Minister has been able to bring nothing back from Doha beyond the pitifully little that was already there in the draft that he himself denounced.

We cannot let the hon. Minister get away with misleading the House in this manner. He then makes a remark about a matter on which Shri Kharabela Swain is exactly as well informed as I am and as Shri Rupchand Pal is, and as Thiru Murasoli Maran ought to be, because all of us are members of the Joint Committee on Patents and we have been doing nothing but breaking our heads on this for the last one and a half years. What Thiru Maran says is,

"A separate landmark declaration on TRIPS and public health is a major achievement in which India played a key role. It recognises the affordability and availability of medicines as a universal right."

First, would the hon. Minister please explain to the House why there is a separate declaration on TRIPS and public

health instead of incorporating these paragraphs in the main body of the declaration? Second, will the Minister confirm to us that not one comma of the original TRIPS agreement has been changed or can be changed? Our onerous obligations in TRIPS remain today exactly what they were before he went to Doha. The only defence that we get from these documents is an increase in our comfort levels, to interpret these provisions liberally. But, not a word can be changed, not a comma. It is just an increase in the comfort levels. In any case, as Shri Rupchand Pal has pointed out, flexibility applies only to pandemics. It does not apply to everyday maintenance of the public health system which we in India have built up behind the protective walls of Indiraji's Patents Act of 1970.

I was the Private Secretary to the Minister's predecessor and was sitting in the officials gallery in 1970 when Parliament passed that Patents Act. That Patents Act has given India the single most significant and satisfactory public health system of any developing power. That is what is not there. That is what your own colleague, your Minister of Health has repeatedly stated. I believe that it is a gravely misleading view to claim that the concept of affordability has been included in the declaration. It is not. This is a vital matter because the World Health Organisation has long recognised that medicines must be affordable whereas WTO refuses to go beyond the expression 'reasonable'. Nowhere in the declaration of TRIPS and public health does the word 'affordable' appear. Then, on what basis does the Minister make his absurdly hyperbolic claim that 'affordability' has been recognised as a 'universal right'? Indeed, nowhere in the main text or annexes to the declaration does the expression 'universal right' appear.

This House has the right to get honest and truthful statements from the Government. Privilege is involved. We demand a full and truthful clarification of the hon. Minister's patently inaccurate and misleading claim in this regard. I request him not to quote *The Economist* in his defence as he did in the Rajya Sabha because the only reference to prices of medicines in the declaration is in the sentence, 'we also recognise the concerns about its effect on prices.' There is no reference to affordability. There is no reference even to reasonable prices. All that the Ministers have recognised is that there are some concerns about the effect of patents on prices.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Aiyar, please conclude now.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I will bow to you and not complete my speech. But please allow me to finish the portion relating to public health.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please cooperate with the Chair.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Please be a little kind and let me finish it on public health.

While reiterating our commitment to TRIPS agreement this phrase applies twice in this declaration that *Thiru Maran* has said.

The Ministers including himself have reiterated all their commitments. We are told that this is a landmark, this is a miracle...(Interruptions)

डॉ. जसवन्त सिंह यादव (अलवर) : सभापति जी, एक बात तय हो जानी चाहिए कि आप हमें भी इतना ही समय देंगे जितना माननीय सदस्य ले रहे हैं। एक घंटे से ऊपर समय इन्हें बोलते हो गया है। हम बोलते हैं तो आप हमें धमका कर बैठ देते हैं। (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : यादव जी, आप बैठ जाइये।

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I congratulate the hon. Minister on fooling *The Economist*. But I protest at his attempt to fool this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, please conclude now.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I am, Sir, not being permitted to complete my speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members are objecting. You have already taken too much time.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Sir, I am not being permitted to complete my speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am only requesting you to conclude.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Mr. Chairman, Sir, let us take the sense of the House and extend the time, if it is necessary. This subject is very important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : If we do not discuss WTO; if we do not discuss GATT; and if we do not discuss Doha Declaration, what do we discuss?... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has already spoken for 45 minutes.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : True. But the issue is big, as big as the world is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But there are other Members also waiting for their turns to speak.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Let us decide it and extend the time if it is necessary...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Business Advisory Committee had allotted three hours for this discussion....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Let them have the time. This is a very big issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have only requested him to conclude.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : That is right. I can understand your difficulty.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, please finish your speech as early as possible....*(Interruptions)*

डॉ. जसवन्त सिंह यादव : सभापति जी, आज बहुत सारी शायियां हैं जिनमें हमें भाग लेना है और हमें भी बोलना है। एक घंटे से ऊपर इन्हें बोलते हो गया है।^१ (ब्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : यादव जी, आप बैठ जाइये।^१ (ब्यवधान)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Sir, I would like to concentrate the absolutely last para of my intervention on the hon. Minister's idle boast that on the four Singapore issues: "a decision regarding any negotiation would be based on explicit consensus."

First, Sir, the concept of an "explicit consensus" was not an innovation at Doha. It has been there since the Second Ministerial Meeting in Singapore.

Second, whatever the hon. Minister might claim, the fact is that the so-called Singapore issues have been definitively and unavoidably brought on to the WTO Agenda because our delegation at Doha was so incompetent as to allow the expression "possible agreement" in the Draft Declaration to be changed into "recognising the case for a multilateral framework" in respect of three of the four Singapore issues: trade-related investment; trade-related competition policy; and trade-related Government procurement.

Sir, a similar thing I have talked about already. Thiru Maran has already recognised the case for trade facilitation in that context. Sir, the argument over whether WTO's remit can or should be extended to these non-trade areas is finished.

This House cannot let the hon. Minister get away with pretending that he won a point; the fact is that the developed countries have bullied even Thiru Maran to surrender.

The extent of our failure is best measured against the statements which Thiru Maran himself made at Doha.

I refer to para nine of the hon. Minister's opening speech where he flagged all the relevant questions, none of which has been answered.

I refer to para 13 of his Doha speech where he said, "WTO is for multilateral trading only." Is that the situation today? He said, "The roadmap already chartered by the Uruguay Round should be the future work programme." He is absolutely right. But has the rest of the world agreed? No.

Having failed to win his argument in Doha, the hon. Minister is now trying to pretend that : 1) there is no more talk; and 2) there must be explicit consensus.

In the Rajya Sabha, the hon. Minister stated that the Uruguay Round was the last round because WTO is a permanent forum for negotiations. We agree with him. He is entirely right. There is no scope for a new round because we have got a permanent forum. But in that case, will the hon. Minister explain why he told the correspondent C. Ram Mohan Reddy at Doha on 10th November -- it is reproduced in *The Hindu* on the following day also -- that "a new round of trade talks at the WTO is not necessary, it is evil."

These were his words. He said, "It is not necessary; it is evil." Now, he says that there is no new round. He cannot have a new round, since there is a permanent forum.

Fooling everyone else is politics, but fooling himself is, I am afraid, an evil! ...*(Interruptions)* Are you on this side now? ...*(Interruptions)* I am just about to finish. ...*(Interruptions)*

With regard to 'explicit consensus', the first point is that there can be no negotiations on modalities that are not related to negotiations on substantive issues. It is just sophistry to pretend that there is going to be modalities on negotiations. Secondly, if Thiru Maran could not wreck Doha by walking out, with what credibility will India be able to maintain its opposition to a new round at the next meeting? By failing to fulfil its empty threats at Doha, Indian diplomacy has been crippled fatally in the WTO. Thirdly, either the threat should not have been made or it should have been carried out. By dithering, Thiru Maran has reduced Indian trade diplomacy to impotent posturing, empty rhetoric and ritual grand-standing. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, I am calling the next hon. Member.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR: Sir, all is not lost. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is too much.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : WTO is still a democratic body where we can, by getting a majority vote, succeed in getting what we want to do. But to turn those numbers to our advantage, you have to synergize foreign policy with foreign economic policy.

Sir, I have with me, Bush-Vajpayee Joint Declaration on the day before Thiru Maran's speech at Doha. There was not one word on the WTO and there was not one word on Doha. While Shri Vajpayee was pledging himself to joining the Americans in isolating Osama bin Laden, his trade representative in Doha is mobilising everybody together to isolate Thiru Maran at Doha. Is this the way in which foreign policy has become the hand-made? Then, I have Shri Vajpayee's speech at the United Nations. ...(*Interruptions*) Thiru Maran is fighting the battle of his life for the poorest farmer, the poorest worker, for small industries that are closing down, for textile industries, for textile workers. And this man is setting himself up to fight for the cause of the poorest Indians; what does Shri Vajpayee do? In the whole of his speech, there are not even one hundred words, dealing with WTO; and what he does is poetry and mixing his metaphors. He says that they have not given us a cheque that bounced. And then he says why should we give them a blank cheque? It is they who should be giving us the blank cheque. It is this kind of mixing up of metaphors. This kind of resorting to poetry is not statesmanship. We have to synergize foreign policy with foreign economic policy and we should have a rejuvenated Non-Aligned Movement backing the Group of 77 or any other body dealing with economic issues. It is only through such synergies that we will be able to use the WTO's democratic norms to secure for ourselves that equity and that justice of which Thiru Maran spoke, when he was there. But short of that, I am afraid, Sir, it will not be helpful. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Ummareddy Venkateswarlu.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Such independence, courage and synergy will come only when the NDA Government ceases to exist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have called the name of another hon. Member. Please conclude.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Our deep and grateful thanks to Thiru Maran.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, please cooperate with the Chair and conclude.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : He has brought that day much, much closer. Thank you, Sir. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I merely want to say that I do not subscribe to his conspiracy theory and hallucination.

PROF. UMMAREDDY VENKATESWARLU (TENALI): Mr. Chairman, very-very valid points have been put forth by the initiator, as well as the other speakers from both the sides, on a very important issue about the Doha Conference and the participation of the Indian team. Indian Delegation headed by the hon. Minister of Commerce, Shri Murali Maran, I feel has got the best possible outcome in the circumstances that prevailed in Doha. There are no two opinions as far as the outcome is concerned. I am particularly happy that for the first time the Indian Delegation, as a negotiating team headed by Shri Maran, withstood the pressures from the developed countries during that period of five days between 9th and 13th – under unavoidable circumstances, having been extended by one more day up to 14th. A lot of tensions were prevailing. The entire globe was looking at Doha discussions thinking whether the discussions will be ended with a meaningful declaration, whether at all there will be a

declaration or it will just end like a Seattle conference. So, at that particular point of time we must congratulate the very strategic plan that had been evolved by the Indian Delegation to withstand the pressures that had been mounted by the developed countries.

16.56 hrs (Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh in the Chair)

While almost all the rest of the developing countries had buckled out the issue, it is the Indian Delegation which had provided leadership at that point of time. This is where, I emphasise once again that, the Indian Delegation deserves to be congratulated. This has made all of us proud of the performance of the Indian team. I fully endorse the view that India's core interests have been taken care of and evidently made certain gains. I have deliberately used the word, 'certain gains' because I would not say, rather venture to say, that it could gain totally for everything. So, I am particularly happy that there is a very firm commitment in the Doha Ministerial Declaration to phase out export subsidies and effect substantial reductions in other trade distorting subsidies, while fully taking into account the food security concerns of developing countries. We have also been able to mainstream the special and differential treatment in favour of developing countries including the principle of non-reciprocity from the developing countries for the concessions given by the developed countries into all negotiations. It is also satisfying that while some implementation issues have been resolved, there is a firm commitment to resolve the rest of issues as an integral part of the Work Programme of WTO and as a part of the single undertaking.

Sir, nothing could be more appropriate than Shri Murasoli Maran's description of WTO as a necessary inevitable evil. As the Founder Member of GATT and subsequently as the Founder Member of the WTO, we have to put up with that and we have to convert all the challenges into opportunities. There is no other go. In the given circumstances, the Indian Delegation has emerged as a successful winner in the battle that was fought.

17.00 hrs.

While GATT is a multilateral trade agreement, WTO provides an institutional mechanism to carry out the mandate given by GATT. As an institutional mechanism, WTO is a multilateral trade arrangement, which is supposed to operate on the principle of maximising the gains for all its 142 members. It is not supposed to be a zero-sum game and it is intended to be a win-win situation for all the member countries.

However, what had happened at Doha in reality is that a zero-sum game was sought to be played by the powerful developed countries like the European Union, the USA, Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, etc. So, it will continue to be a necessary evil till our country too, is able to acquire a dominant share in the global trade. Right now, our share in the global trade is 0.6 per cent which does not give us adequate leverage to assert ourselves and to be heard in a global trade situation in the WTO system. But the vehement posture put up by the Indian Delegation led by the Minister of Commerce, Shri Murasoli Maran to protect the long-term interests of developing and least developed countries is commendable and this team needs to be congratulated.

Doha Conference cannot be seen in isolation. It is to be seen as yet another step in the evolving mechanism of WTO orchestrated international trade. When India signed the Marrakech Declaration in 1994, we became party to certain core agreements. There is a kind of inherent asymmetry in the whole arrangement as is contained in various agreements both in terms of conceptual and practical implications. To state an example, adequate study has not been done before signing the TRIPS Agreement, as a result, we have come to face serious anomalies in the implementation of TRIPS Agreement, which is being seen as a monster by the developing countries. But, having agreed to be a party to it, we, now, can only try to undo the damage that flows out of the TRIPS Agreement. As on now, we are not a position to defend and exercise our rights based on traditional knowledge and geographical indicators as in the case of Basmati rice, Darjeeling tea, etc. The success and the credibility of WTO system will to a great extent depend on the flexibilities that could be built into the system and the respect for claims of developing countries that could be made possible.

Sir, if we look at the Doha Ministerial Conference as another step in the evolution of multilateral trade arrangement, it will be useful and helpful to analyse the Doha meeting from that perspective.

Doha need to be analysed from the point of view of our concerns. We have been opposing a new round of trade negotiations till the implementation issues are addressed to. There are a wide-ranging issues under the implementation concerns including the high level of subsidies in the developed countries, anti-dumping duties, countervailing measures, inadequacies in the TRIPS Agreement, minimum access to the products of developing and least developing countries etc.

Sir, it is a different matter that trade has come to be seen and described as 'development' at Doha at which the developed countries made a determined bid to launch a new round of negotiations in the form of Doha Development Declaration. Though we agree that the benefits of trade will contribute to the overall economic development and benefit various sections of the society, trade cannot be an adequate replacement for

development.

The Doha Declaration has three components, namely, negotiating agenda for the new WTO round, about forty implementation concerns of the developing countries and the political statement dealing with patents and public health.

The whole exercise of negotiations at the Doha Conference was marked by the efforts of the developed nations to push their own agenda and the determined bid of developing block led by India to have their own concerns addressed to. In the end, the Doha Declaration, in my view, was a compromise between these two positions. From India's point of view, our Delegation led by Shri Murasoli Maran could prevent the launching of a new round of negotiations straightway. Our Delegation also sought an assurance that negotiations on the Singapore issues namely, investment, competition policies, transparency in Government procurement and trade facilitation will only be taken up after an explicit consensus on the modalities and negotiations at the next Ministerial Conference. I am aware that it was not an easy task to have made it possible for our delegation. To the extent possible, Indian Delegation has asserted itself at the Doha Conference to the extent of being seen as an obstructionist which even stood the risk of isolation. On this account, I would like to wholeheartedly compliment our Delegation and particularly Shri Murasoli Maran for having done a tremendous job which in my view is the best possible in the given circumstances.

The Doha Declaration also sought to address about forty implementation concerns. Though, most of them relate to the best endeavour clause, it is no mean achievement because implementation concerns have been mainstreamed at the WTO, which was our main concern and objective. The other major implementation concerns will be addressed to in the next round of negotiations.

The political statement of TRIPS and public health empowering the developing countries to enable licensed production of patented drugs in case of a health emergency is also significant in the sense that this enables the suspension of patent rights to meet the demands of public health. I am of the opinion that this is also a demonstration of the possible flexibilities under WTO system which is being seen as rigid and non-transparent.

With regard to anti-dumping duties also, it was agreed that such duties will not be resorted to by an importing country against an exporting country and on the same commodity at least for 365 days of having last sorted out that matter under Dispute Settlement Understanding.

But, on the important issue of textile quotas, we could not get any concession from the developed countries and particularly the USA at the Doha Conference. But, I understand that right now, we are not in a position to fully avail the permitted quotas and some reform measures are required to be initiated, so as to be in a position to avail the increased quotas. In any case, these issues are included in the Work Programme to be taken up in the next Ministerial Conference.

Sir, more than our achievements or failures at the Doha Conference, what is more important is with reference to what we are going to do during the next two years and further till 2005 by when the negotiations on the next round of trade negotiations are to be concluded. Economists have been expressing a view that a new round of trade negotiations in itself may not be at variance with our national interests. The Singapore issues basically talk about linking the trade with investment, procurement practices of the Government and trade facilitation.

With regard to investment, multilateral negotiations for an agreement on investment are already under way. The Central Government has already proposed to introduce a competition Bill in the Lok Sabha. Scaling down of import duties is already on our agenda.

What is required to be done by the Government from now onwards is to undertake a detailed study of the implications of all these proposals and to identify our position with a view to protect the interests of farmers and industrialists including small scale entrepreneurs etc. Most of the problems being faced by our agriculturists and other sectors of the economy under the WTO regime are because of the inadequate appreciation of the implications by our delegations during the Uruguay Round and before signing the Marrakesh Declaration. We cannot afford to be caught on the wrong foot once again. Whatever euphemisms were used at the Doha Conference, the new round of trade negotiations is knocking at our door and the time clock has already started ticking. We have to make a comprehensive review of our experience with the WTO regime all these years and accordingly define our position while addressing the next round of trade negotiations. Our main concern and objective shall be to ensure a level playing field for our farmers and industrialists.

We can safely expect the developed countries to try to browbeat and force us into accepting a new agenda of their terms. But, Sir, our country is placed in a very peculiar situation. As a leading member of the developing countries, we are expected to provide leadership to the developing block, create confidence in them and assert in such a manner that everybody stands to gain under the WTO regime. But the experience so far, as highlighted at Doha,

has been that the developed countries would try their best to prevent formation of an alliance among developing and Least Developed Countries. Guided by the Doha experience, we have to see that a formidable alliance of developing and LDCs is built up in preparation to the next Ministerial Conference. I am glad that Shri Maran has already talked about such an alliance notwithstanding the inherent problems.

In essence, the next 4-5 years are going to be very crucial for our country, in so far as protecting the interests of our farmers, industrialists, technical personnel, geographical indications etc., is concerned.

Sir, another issue that I would like to highlight is the growing concern over marginalisation of national Parliaments with regard to international trade agreement. Though our Executive is supposed to conduct the negotiations as per the briefs provided by the Parliament, the reality is proving to be somewhat different. Given the way the representatives of developed countries seek to cajole and bamboozle their counterparts from developing countries at the negotiating table under various committees of WTO, there is a possibility of the sovereignty of Parliament being undermined. I feel that there is a strong case for more active parliamentary oversight in such negotiations. Under these circumstances, I would hence like to suggest that a Joint Parliamentary Committee be constituted on a permanent basis with representatives of all the parties on WTO issues to enable continued and more active involvement of Parliamentarians.

I would like to bring to the notice of the House that though the trade representative of USA becomes party to various agreements at the WTO, the American Congress has the ultimate right to oppose and reject them, if the agreements were not to their liking. I am not sure if the position is similar in our context. I would, hence, feel that there is a need for a Parliamentary Committee to be set up to oversee and provide necessary guidance to the whole exercise of negotiations on behalf of our country.

Coming back to Doha, Shri Murasoli Maran has described as 'nuclear bomb' the assurance of 'explicit consensus' before the commencement of next round of negotiations as given by the Chairman of the Doha Conference.

The nuclear bomb is something, which we cannot use, but can only flaunt for its potential use. At Doha, we almost came close to toppling the Conference by preventing a Declaration. But we stopped short of doing it because we could not have really done so. So, in my view, Doha Conference marks a new round of challenges to be effectively addressed to by our country, if we want to protect our farmers, industrialists, the technical man-power, our traditional knowledge base and the related issues. The need of the hour is to launch a comprehensive and transparent preparatory exercise. There is a need for forming a domestic coalition, cutting across party lines, before we endeavour to form an alliance to defend our rights in WTO regime. Let this day mark the beginning of this new exercise.

श्री रामजी लाल सुमन (फिरोजाबाद) : सभापति जी, विश्व व्यापार संगठन की ओर से 1999 में अमेरिका के सिएटल शहर में मंत्री स्तरीय सम्मेलन हुआ था। यह सम्मेलन बिना किसी परिणाम के समाप्त हो गया। यह सम्मेलन विफल रहा था। उसके बाद अरब देश कतार की राजधानी दोहा में नौ नवम्बर, 2001 से 14 नवम्बर, 2001 विश्व व्यापार संगठन का मंत्री स्तरीय सम्मेलन हुआ।

भारत को इस सम्मेलन में क्या मिला, भारत की भूमिका इस सम्मेलन में क्या रही, यह एक अलग सवाल है। लेकिन सत्तारूढ़ पक्ष ने इसका प्रचार बहुत बढ़ा-चढ़ाकर किया। अभी हमारे एक मित्र बोल रहे थे कि भारत की स्थिति दोहा में एक विजेता के रूप में उभरी है। हमारे पास मंत्री जी का वक्तव्य है। उसमें भी यह लिखा हुआ है कि हमने अपने लक्ष्यों की प्राप्ति हेतु काफी सफलता हासिल की है।

सभापति जी, विश्व व्यापार संगठन के मूल रूप से तीन स्तम्भ हैं। एक तो व्यापार सम्बन्धी बौद्धिक सम्पदा अधिकार 'ट्रिप', दूसरा सामानों के कारोबार के बारे में बहुउद्देशीय समझौता 'गैट' और तीसरा सेवा क्षेत्र के बारे में व्यापार समझौता 'गैट'। सब लोग इस बात को जानते हैं कि भारत विश्व व्यापार संगठन का संस्थापक सदस्य है। विश्व व्यापार संगठन में भारत की भूमिका एक नेतृत्वकर्ता की होनी चाहिए। हम कुछ भी कहें, लेकिन विश्व व्यापार संगठन में भारत की जो हैसियत है, वह पिछलग्गू होने के अलावा और कुछ नहीं है। जिस दोहा सम्मेलन में सफलताओं की बात कही जा रही है, उसमें भरोसे और कथनियों के बंडल के अलावा और कुछ नहीं है। करनी और निश्चितता कहीं दिखाई नहीं देती। सम्मेलन में भारत अपनी सफलता यह मान रहा है कि हमने विकसित देशों को अपने मंसूबे पूरे नहीं होने दिए। लेकिन सच्चाई यह है कि अगले दो वर्षों के बाद विकसित देशों के मंसूबे पूरे होने का रास्ता जरूर साफ हुआ है। दो वर्षों के बाद विश्व व्यापार संगठन पर मंत्री स्तर का जो सम्मेलन होगा, उसमें जो निर्णय होंगे, भारत उन निर्णयों को मानने के लिए बाध्य होगा।

आप इस खुशफहमी में न रहें, दो वर्षों के बाद मंत्रीस्तरीय जो सम्मेलन होगा, उसमें भारत उन निर्णयों को मानने को तैयार होगा।

सभापति जी, दोहा में जो विचारार्थ मुद्दे थे, उसमें यह भी था कि पिछले निर्णयों को क्रियान्वयन होना चाहिए। इस संबंध में न कोई चर्चा हुई और न निर्णय लिए गए। विशेष रूप से जो यूरोपीय देश थे, उन्होंने विश्व व्यापार संगठन से संबंधित जो निर्णय थे, उनको नहीं माना। बड़े मंत्री यहां नहीं हैं। (व्यवधान) रूडी जी हैं, वे तो पुराने परिचित हैं। (व्यवधान) आप से ज्यादा मैं उनकी क्षमता को जानता हूँ। इसलिए मुझे बताने की जरूरत नहीं है। महोदय, मैं एक बात जरूर कहना चाहूंगा, दोहा सम्मेलन में चर्चा के जो मुद्दे थे, वे सीमित थे। मैं विनम्रता के साथ निवेदन करना चाहूंगा, भारत दोहा में जाने के बाद जब तक लाभ-हानि का विश्लेषण नहीं करेगा, तब तक कोई अच्छे परिणाम आने वाले नहीं हैं। हमने WTO में जाने के बाद क्या पाया, इस पर जब तक सार्थक विचार नहीं करेंगे (व्यवधान)

डॉ. लक्ष्मीनारायण पाण्डेय (मंदसौर) : पाया ज्यादा है।

श्री रामजीलाल सुमन : जो पाया है, वह सामने आ जाएगा।

मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य में यह भी था - कृषि के मामले में भारत की मुख्य चिन्ता घोणा पत्र में सुरक्षा प्रदान करने की थी, लेकिन किसानों का बहुत बुरा हाल है। अगर

किसानों की दशा सुधारने के लिए जो सार्थक और प्रभावी प्रयास हमारे देश में होने चाहिए थे, वे नहीं हुए हैं। आज हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों के द्वारा उत्पादन बढ़ाने से संकट खड़ा हो गया है। देश में कृषि के क्षेत्र में उत्पादन लागत बराबर बढ़ रही हैं। हालत यह है कि 1971 से लेकर आज तक गेहू का समर्थन मूल्य 15 गुना बढ़ा है और उत्पादन लागत 15 गुना बढ़ी है। यह व्यावहारिक सत्य है। इसके इन्कार करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। अन्तरराष्ट्रीय बाजार में रासायनिक खाद के दाम सस्ते हैं और हिन्दुस्तान में मंहगे हैं। दुनिया के दमाम देश अपने किसानों के कृषि उत्पादन लागत का बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा सब्सिडी के रूप में दे रहे हैं। यूरोपीय देशों में सब्सिडी 56 प्रतिशत, जापान में 40 प्रतिशत, अमरीका में 29 प्रतिशत और हमारे यहां जो सब्सिडी दी जाती है, वह सब्सिडी किसानों को सीधे नहीं मिलती है, बल्कि बिचौलिया खा जाते हैं। सिर्फ यह कह देना कि हम किसानों के हितों का संरक्षण करेंगे, यह पर्याप्त नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों को दिखाई देना चाहिए कि सरकार उनकी दशा को सुधारने का क्या व्यवस्थित प्रयास कर रही है।

महोदय, जब हम दोहा सम्मेलन पर विचार कर रहे हैं, तो हमको यह जरूर सोचना चाहिए कि अन्तरराष्ट्रीय व्यापार संगठन से भारत का जो व्यापार का करार हुआ था, उसकी स्थिति क्या है 1990 में भारत का व्यापार अन्तरराष्ट्रीय व्यापार में 0.5 प्रतिशत था और आज दस वॉ के बाद 0.67 प्रतिशत है।

पिछले दस वॉ में अंतरराष्ट्रीय व्यापार में हमारी उपलब्धि सिर्फ 0.17 प्रतिशत बढ़ी है। इसे एक प्रतिशत करने के लिए, आगे आने वाले 20 वॉ तक हमें इंतजार करना पड़ेगा। आज हम उदारीकरण की चकाचौंध में फंस गए हैं। विदेशी पूंजी निवेश का बड़ा हल्ला हो रहा है। हमारे देश में भी पूंजी निवेश बढ़ा है, लेकिन वह किन क्षेत्रों में बढ़ा है - टेली-कम्युनिकेशन, कम्प्यूटर, ट्रांसपोर्ट, ईंधन, केमिकल, कपड़ा आदि में ज्यादा बढ़ा है। भारत जब तक अपनी प्राथमिकताओं को सुनिश्चित नहीं करेगा, तब तक उसे कुछ नहीं मिलने वाला है।

महोदय, सदन में विदेशी पूंजी निवेश के संबंध में जब पूछा गया कि सिंचाई व्यवस्था पर कितना विदेशी पूंजी निवेश हुआ है तो इनका जवाब था कि हमारे पास विवरण उपलब्ध नहीं है। सिंचाई (व्यवधान) सिंचाई खेती का प्राण है और हिन्दुस्तान जैसे देश में लगभग 80 फीसदी लोग कृषि पर निर्भर करते हैं। जब तक यहां सिंचाई की समुचित व्यवस्था नहीं होगी, तब तक हिन्दुस्तान कैसे आत्मनिर्भर रह सकता है। उसकी हालत को कैसे सुधारा जा सकता है?

महोदय, कृषि के बाद रोजगार देने का सबसे बड़ा साधन कपड़ा क्षेत्र है। पिछले तीन वॉ में इसमें लगभग साढ़े तीन करोड़ लोग काम करते हैं। इतने लोगों को रोजगार मिला हुआ है लेकिन पिछले तीन वॉ में कपड़ा व्यवसाय की स्थिति खराब हुई है। 1998 में कपड़ा उद्योग का निर्यात, देश के कुल निर्यात का 38 फीसदी था, जो अब घट कर 35 प्रतिशत रह गया है। कपड़ा मिलें बंद पड़ी हैं, मजदूरों को हटाया जा रहा है और देश के सबसे बड़े क्षेत्र, जहां लोगों को रोजगार मिलता था, उस तरफ सरकार का कोई ध्यान नहीं है। मार्च, 2001 तक भारत में सभी वस्तुओं के आयात पर प्रतिबंध हटा लिया गया था। ऐसा WTO के करार के मुताबिक किया था, लेकिन मारन साहब, अमेरिका और यूरोपियन देशों में आज भी कपड़ा कोटा प्रणाली से आयात किया जा रहा है। ये देश कोटा प्रणाली लगा कर प्रतिबंध लगाने का काम कर रहे हैं, फिर भारत की ऐसी कौन सी मजबूरी थी? मैं समझता हूँ कि दोहा सम्मेलन में इस पर भी चर्चा होनी चाहिए थी।

महोदय, भारत की आबादी पिछले दिनों बहुत बढ़ी है। यहां काम करने वाले हाथ ज्यादा हैं और पूंजी कम है। अंतरराष्ट्रीय स्तर पर या कभी किसी भी स्तर पर चर्चा हो - जब तक इन तकनीकों के प्रचलन पर प्रतिबंध लगाने या उन्हें निरुत्साहित करने के निर्णय नहीं होंगे और तकनीकी श्रम प्रधान नहीं होगा तब तक देश का कोई भला नहीं हो सकता। WTO में फंसने के बाद हमें क्या हासिल हुआ है और क्या हासिल होने की संभावना है, कहीं यह हमारे लिए घाटे का सौदा तो नहीं। ... (घंटी)

हमारे देश की जलवायु, वातावरण, परिस्थितियां, बेरोजगारी की समस्या, स्वास्थ्य समस्या, कृषि आदि सब सवालों पर अगर हम व्यावहारिक दृष्टि से नहीं सोचेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे बड़ी गलतफहमी दूसरी कोई नहीं हो सकती, मुझे यही निवेदन करना था। ... (व्यवधान).*

*Not Recorded.

सभापति महोदय : यहां निपक्ष, वहां विपक्ष।

श्री थावरचन्द गेहलोत (शाजापुर) : यह जो आसन के प्रति कमेंट्स दिए गए हैं, इसे कार्यवाही से निकाला जाए।

सभापति महोदय : यह प्रोसिडिंग में नहीं जाएगा।

DR. BIKRAM SARKAR (PANSKURA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank the hon. Minister, Shri Murasoli Maran, for having taken the trouble of initiating discussions much before the Doha Ministerial Conference started. My party also got a letter of invitation requesting us to join the discussions. We could not come because of other compulsions. But we made our views known to him. I must compliment Shri Maran and his team of Ministers and officials for having done the best out of the worst situation so far as Doha Ministerial Conference is concerned.

With the kind of atmosphere that was there before the WTO Doha Conference, it has been given very succinctly in one of the articles written by Shri Chandra Kant Patel in the *Economic Times* of 1st November, 2001. The timing soon after the 11th September, 2001 made the things far more difficult. As a matter of fact, it was very clear that the developed countries had been trying their best to make use of this opportunity for a new trade round in the backdrop of terrorism. It has been said in that article:

"..as a result of the growing awareness that the Uruguay Round has been a singular disaster for their economies.

Many developing countries fear that inclusion of new issues - such as government procurement, competition policy, investment, trade and environment, trade facilitation and industrial tariffs - would further curtail their options to design economic and social policies. It is also becoming evident that the provision of WTO sanctioned cover to the multinational corporate sector to expand its economic space is a zero-sum game."

This is the backdrop against which the performance of India has to be judged in the Doha Conference.

I would draw your kind attention to para 12 of the Ministerial Declaration on the high priority given to the Resolution on 'implementation-related issues and concerns'. I must say that this is a major gain because the world attention has been drawn to the fact that the whole world has to pay attention to the developing nations. They cannot be neglected.

The Commonwealth Secretary-General, Don McKinnon, has called for greater attention to the needs and concerns of developing countries in trade negotiations, as Ministers gathered in Doha for the World Trade Organisation meeting that commenced on 8/9 November.

Now, I would like to quote briefly a portion of para 12. This is about the 'Work Programme':

"Decision on Implementation-Related Issues and Concerns to address a number of implementation problems faced by Members.

We agree that negotiations on outstanding implementation issues shall be an integral part of the Work Programme we are establishing, and that agreements reached at an early stage in these negotiations shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 47."

According to me, this is a major gain.

The next point is about the linkage of core labour standards with trade. This has been very ably opposed.

It has also been said that the Declaration reaffirms that "ILO is the appropriate forum to address the core labour standards". This refers to para 8 of the Ministerial Declaration. It says:

"We reaffirm our declaration made at the Singapore Ministerial Conference regarding internationally recognised core labour standards. We take note of work underway in the International Labour Organisation on the social dimension of globalisation. "

Sir, moving from there, let us come to the agricultural negotiations, which is linked up with the issue of food security and rural development. These are para 13 and para 2.1 --I am just referring to it and not quoting it -- and they manifest that there is a concern and it has been accepted and recognised by the WTO. In the Services, the movement of natural persons has also been recognised.

One of the important issues was about the public health and I refer to para 4 and para 7 where it has been stated:

"4. TRIPS Agreement does not and should not prevent Members from taking measures to protect public health. Accordingly, while reiterating our commitment to the TRIPS Agreement, we affirm that the Agreement can and should be interpreted and implemented in a manner supportive of WTO Members' right to protect public health and in particular, to promote access to medicines for all.

7. We also agree that the least-developed country Members will not be obliged with respect to pharmaceutical products, to implement or apply Sections 5 and 7 of Part II."

These are ample illustrations where our Ministerial team in the Doha Conference made their best. I would just take one or two minutes saying that in para 2, page 2 of the hon. Minister's Statement, there is a reference about Uruguay Round, which says:

"WTO rules and Multilateral Environment Agreements, process for regular information. As is known, India is already a signatory to most of these MEAs and I would like to assure the Members that these negotiations would not widen the environmental window in trade."

We would like to have more elaboration on this.

Sir, I have got two suggestions. One is, as I said in the beginning, we feel that the hon. Minister, as the leader of the team, has done his best. It is a question of continuing things and the kind of world scenario that was available at that time, he did the best. So, for these matters, we should have a joint committee of Members to go into. This would be of great importance. Second is that such meetings can be held from time to time to take the suggestions into consideration.

SHRI P.H. PANDIAN (TIRUNELVELI): Hon. Chairman Sir, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to participate in the discussion on the Statement made by the hon. Minister for Commerce on the Doha Conference.

In the first instance, I would like to say that there was clarity of thought, there was no clarity of expression, there was no clarity of response at Doha. The hon. Minister himself, while participating at Doha Conference, has said that WTO has ignored poor. One of the Union Ministers of Agriculture has said that it is anti-farmer.

Sir, when WTO is criticised for ignoring poor, then the poor agriculturists, labourers, and common man will not be benefited by this WTO Agreement at all. I would like to stress on one more point that the rich nations, according to the hon. Minister, are pressurising the developing nations under the WTO umbrella.

Sir, the major economic powers like the US, the European Union and Japan were dictating the agenda to WTO. When the big countries are dictating terms and their agenda on the developing countries like India, will an ordinary farmer or an ordinary citizen be benefited by this WTO? The Minister may know because he comes from Tamil Nadu that we are not able to remedy the situation which has arisen in relation to the small tea growers in Nilgiris because of this WTO Agreement. We are not able to alleviate the problems faced by the agriculturists. We are also constrained and forced to even think about lifting the subsidies. We are also constrained and forced to move against the farmers. Though WTO was established in 1994, it has not done anything to the common man and to the ordinary farmer. Especially the developing nations like our country are not able to compete with the developed countries and the rich countries. I do not know whether it will be advantageous for India to get a response at WTO in future. At Seattle, there was a setback. After that, at Doha, the hon. Minister has said that it is successful. He is not able to place before the Parliament to what extent he has succeeded, and how we are going to gain in the future generations if we pursue this WTO.

Sir, the consistent attitude of our Party is to pull out of WTO in respect of farmers because on all occasions when this matter came up for discussion, we reiterated our stand that WTO would not be helpful to the farmers and to the small agriculturists.

Then, Sir, I take up the implementation issues – TRIPS. I would like to know whether it is in consonance with the demand of our country. Everything is on paper. When we read, we think that India may grow to a strong country in the world. If I imagine like that, there should be a substance in this paper. I read the Statement made by the hon. Minister on that day itself and it has stated that the Declaration reaffirms that ILO is an appropriate forum. We have to recognise ILO, which is the United Nation's forum. We recognised the United Nations. We recognised WTO from 1994. To what extent have we gained benefit on the economic front?

Then, Sir, I do not want to repeat because my friend, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar has said in his own way, but there have been so many references about the Minister and I do not want to repeat them. I would like to know whether the Minister has moved in the right direction on the economic front. While participating in the Conference, was he able to protect our country's interest, protect the interest of our intellectuals, and protect our nation's future? That is in doubt.

Then, it says that the key concerns of India in regard to agriculture have been adequately safeguarded in the Declaration. Had they been safeguarded, I would not have come here to speak on this subject because our Party's grievance and the grievance of the agriculturists are that the interests of the agriculturists have not been safeguarded. There is a separate landmark declaration on TRIPS ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI THAWAR CHAND GEHLOT : Please obey the Chair because you are a Member of the Panel of Chairmen.

SHRI P.H. PANDIAN : All right, I will obey. I have to obey. In one sentence, I will conclude. This statement is not in the interest of the country; this is not in the interest of the common man; and this is not in the interest of the future generation.

डॉ.रामकृष्ण कुसमरिया (दमोह) : माननीय सभापति महोदय, आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ।

सियाटल की असफलता को सफलता में बदलने वाले शिटमंडल और उसका नेतृत्व करने वाले वाणिज्य मंत्री, माननीय मुरासोली मारन साहब को मैं बधाई देता हूँ जिन्होंने लगभग 142 विकासशील देशों का नेतृत्व कर, उन्हें एक आधार देकर, यूरोपीय संघ के विकसित देशों के ङ्चत्र को विफल करके, अद्वितीय सफलता प्राप्त की और भारत को एक सम्मानजनक स्थिति में उन्होंने डब्लू.टी.ओ. में प्रतिष्ठित किया।

मान्यवर, नये दौर की वार्ता को विफल करने में उन्होंने जो सफलता पाई है और इसके कारण उन विकासशील देशों के लिए विकास के नए आयाम खुलेंगे जिसमें गरीबों को सस्ती दवाएं उपलब्ध हो सकेंगी। ट्रिप्स को उन्होंने अपने एजेन्डा में सम्मिलित किया है। इसी तरह उन्होंने अपने एजेन्डा में जो हमारे देश की कृषि है, किसानों की हालत है, उसके सुधार के लिए काफी संभावनाएं रखी हैं। सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि आज हमारे देश में सबसे बड़ी समस्या बेरोजगारी है। इन समस्याओं से जूझते हुए लोगों को, इस समझौते के बाद, आने वाले समय में रोजगार के अवसर प्राप्त होंगे।

मान्यवर, इस वार्ता में विकास के पहलुओं पर पर्याप्त बल दिया गया है। घरेलू संवर्द्धन, खाद्यान्न सुरक्षा के आधार पर भी आयात से बचाव और ग्रामीण विकास को जो इसमें सम्मिलित किया गया है, जो निश्चित रूप से हमारे देश के विकास में एक बहुत बड़ा अध्याय जोड़ेगा। इसी के साथ जो हमारे देश के भीतर सस्ती औधियाँ निर्माण करने वाले लोग हैं, उनको भी विकास का अवसर मिलेगा और हमारे गरीब लोगों को सस्ती दवाएं उपलब्ध हो सकेंगी।

मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब हमारे देश में इसका शुरुआती दौर चला था और डंकल ड्राफ्ट के रूप में वह सामने आया था, उस समय भी पूरे सदन के भीतर डंकल ड्राफ्ट का काफी विरोध हुआ था। उस समय डंकल ड्राफ्ट को बिना डिसकशन के स्वीकार कर लिया गया था, जिसके कारण लोगों को काफी अड़चन आई।

सभापति महोदय, तत्कालीन कृषि मंत्री श्री बल राम जाखड़ ने कहा था कि केन्द्र सरकार डंकल प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार नहीं करेगी क्योंकि यह देश के हित के खिलाफ है। जाखड़ साहब ने बड़े स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहा था कि हम किसी विदेश दबाव के आगे नहीं झुकेंगे, लेकिन उस समय वह सरकार विदेशियों के दबाव के आगे झुकी और लगातार तीन वार्ताएं हुईं जो विफल हुईं, परन्तु इस चौथी वार्ता में जिस दबंगता के साथ हमारे मंत्री श्री मुरासोली मारन साहब ने भारत और विकासशील देशों का पक्ष रखा उसके कारण पूरे विश्व में एक नई फिज़ा बनकर तैयार हुई।

मैं मारन साहब को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने बहुत सराहनीय कार्य किया है और देश का सम्मान बढ़ाया है। मैं उन्हें पुनः बधाई देते हुए अपनी वाणी को विराम देता हूँ।

SHRI PRABODH PANDA (MIDNAPORE): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Sir. I am very much constrained for time yet I would request you to give me sufficient time so that I could express my views.

Just on the eve of the Doha Conference, a good number of delegations from different political parties and NGOs had a meeting with the hon. Prime Minister in Delhi. The hon. Prime Minister said in the meeting that we would not succumb but as it appears in the print media, the proceedings of the Doha Conference tell a different story altogether.

The hon. Minister Shri Murasoli Maran, in his Statement in this august House, claimed that we made major strides towards realising our goals and the Ministerial Declaration contained significant achievements for India. He also proclaimed the achievements in some areas like agriculture, recognition of asymmetries, Singapore issue, TRIPS, public health and so on and so forth. I would not like to go into all those issues here.

Many things have been said here, mostly by the hon. initiator of this debate Shri Rupchand Pal and by another hon. Member of this House Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar. I would not go into all those aspects but I would like to confine to some areas like agriculture.

In this august House, an hon. Member from the Treasury Benches told that our country India did not succumb but what has happened is the reverse. It is not believable. Who will believe it? He claims that the USA and other developed countries have succumbed to India. Do we believe it?

So far as agriculture is concerned, India lifted the quantitative restrictions ahead of the prescribed time and that has caused havoc to our agriculture. It is known to all. The hon. Minister failed to register our right to insist on imposition of quantitative restrictions during negotiations on agriculture. This is, I think, the most miserable setback for the developing countries in respect of the question of agriculture subsidies.

It is known to everyone that developed nations spend \$300 billion, that is, five times the total official aid that agriculture in developing countries receives. India could not harp on differential treatment clauses and could do nothing to safeguard the interests of its farmers. On the contrary, the objective of the negotiations has been limited to substantial improvement in market access for countries exporting agricultural products. Is it not succumbing to the pressure of the developed countries?

The Doha Declaration has not set any time frame for phasing out subsidies on exports. Not only that, it is seen that during our negotiations, we did not even stress on the non-implementation of the programme of the developed countries. We have implemented quantitative restrictions ahead of them, but we did not stress on the implementation of quantitative restrictions by developed countries. Is it not succumbing to the pressure of the developed countries? Not only that, during the negotiations, we have not been successful to register the strength and aspirations of the Indian people, mainly the farmers of India.

Sir, as there is time constraint, I would like to say that in the end of his Statement, the hon. Minister has told that this is only the beginning. But his proclamation is so high that it does not mean the beginning. I say, yes, it is the beginning, but beginning from zero. What we achieved is nothing but merely a zero. To start a good race, zero is not a bad thing. So, I think he should realise the aspirations of the peasants of our country and he should think that India is having a very large market. It is said that India is a country of poor people. But India is not a poor country.

We are, of course, having great potentialities and if we fight to protect the interests of our nation, then so many developing countries can come together. There should have been a United Front in the WTO itself. Our country has failed to do this.

I would conclude by saying that in the Doha Declaration, the Indian Delegation, headed by our hon. Minister, Shri Murasoli Maran, has, in fact, surrendered to the pressure of the developed nations and did not protect the interests of our country and of our farmers in general. Thank you, Sir.

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव (झंझारपुर) : सभापति महोदय, डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. का दोहा में जो सम्मेलन हुआ, उस पर आज यहां चर्चा हो रही है। यह न केवल राष्ट्रीय महत्व का मुद्दा है बल्कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर हम अपने भारत की भूमिका देना (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : छः बज गए हैं, यदि सदस्यों की सहमति हो तो इस विषय के पूरा होने तक समय बढ़ाया जाए।

डॉ. लक्ष्मीनारायण पाण्डेय : इसके लिए समय बढ़ा दिया जाए लेकिन चर्चा कल हो।

18.00 hrs.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir, we would request that you give as much time as is necessary to deal with this extremely complicated and technical subject. It is not easy to be able to explain one's argument. Sir, may we request that you please extend the time of the House and give whatever time it takes to end the debate today?

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (AKOLA): Sir, I would request that the time of the House be extended till the debate is completed.

सभापति महोदय : बी.ए.सी. ने इस विषय के लिए तीन घंटे तय किए थे, वे समाप्त हो चुके हैं।

डॉ. लक्ष्मी नारायण पाण्डेय : समय बढ़ाया जाए, लेकिन कल के लिए रखा जाए, जिससे पूरी चर्चा हो सके।

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): Sir, I submit that we can conclude the debate today itself.

SHRI S.S. PALANIMANICKAM (THANJAVUR): Sir, you extend the time of the House but let us conclude the debate today.

सभापति महोदय : सात-आठ सदस्यों को अभी बोलना है। सदन की अनुमति हो तो सदन का समय चर्चा समाप्त होने तक के लिए बढ़ाया जाता है।

कई माननीय सदस्य : ठीक है।

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : मैं कह रहा था कि दोहा में अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर भारत की भूमिका को माननीय मंत्री मुरासोली मारन जी ने निठा से और ईमानदारी से अपने देश के व्यापक हितों को ध्यान में रखने का प्रयास किया, जो सराहनीय है। मैं मंत्री जी को व्यक्तिगत रूप से जानता हूँ। सभापति जी, आप मैं और यह 1996 में एक साथ रहे हैं। दोहा में शुरू में ऐसा लग रहा था कि भारत अड़ा हुआ है। अपने देश के किसानों के हित में और अपने आर्थिक हित में पूरी तरह अड़ा हुआ है। मंत्री जी ने विकासशील देशों की वकालत पूरी दृढ़ता से काबलियत से और बुद्धि से करने का काम किया। उनकी निठा पर मैं कोई प्रश्न चिन्ह नहीं लगाना चाहता। मणि शंकर अय्यर जी बड़े जोरशोर से पूरी लाठी मार रहे थे। मैं उनको कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब सांप बिल में चला गया, 1991 से 1994 के बीच मैं ही चला गया था, अब आप लाठी क्यों भांज रहे हैं। गैट समझौता उस समय हुआ था इसलिए सांप तो उसी समय बिल में चला गया था, अब लाठी चलाने से कोई फायदा नहीं है।

मंत्री जी ने अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर भारत का प्रतिनिधित्व करने का काम किया है। लेकिन जब बरसा नहीं, कृषि सुखान, यानी बिना बारिश के कृषि सूख जाती है, 1991 से अब तक नौ साल से उमर हो गए हैं, जब गैट का एग्रीमेंट हुआ था और विश्व व्यापार संगठन अस्तित्व में आया था। उस समय डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के अंतर्गत प्रथम चरण में ग्लोबलाइजेशन और लिब्रलाइजेशन की शुरुआत हुई थी, उस वक्त भारत के किसानों की, विकासशील देशों के गरीब लोगों के हितों की समीक्षा होनी चाहिए थी। विश्व व्यापार संगठन के डिक्लैरेशन में जो आया है, वह सदन के सामने है। मणि शंकर जी, मुझे माफ करना, यह एक ऐतिहासिक भूल थी और यह आपकी सरकार के समय 1991 से लेकर 1994 तक जो कुछ हुआ, उसका परिणाम है। भारत को उस समय अपने हित के लिए अड़ना चाहिए था, लेकिन वैसा नहीं और ऐतिहासिक भूल हमसे हुई। आज गलत दिशा में एक गलत रास्ता अख्तियार हो गया है। अब यह कहें कि हम अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच को डिगा देंगे, तीसरी दुनिया के देश एक हो जाएंगे। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज विश्व व्यापार संगठन में तीसरी दुनिया के देशों का क्या वजूद है, यह डिक्लैरेशन में साफ है कि उनकी क्या हैसियत है। मंत्री जी ने अपने कर्तव्य का निर्वहन किया है। 14 नवम्बर को मंत्री स्तर की ड्राफ्टिंग कमेटी में भारत के भी सदस्य होने के नाते उन्होंने कहा :-

"The Doha Ministerial Conference will not, in any way, harm us. On the contrary, we have substantial gain."

सदन में अपने स्टेटमेंट में आगे कहा गया :-

"And the Ministerial Declaration contained significant achievements for India."

आगे चलकर बहुत जबरदस्त ढंग से यह भी कहा गया है :-

"The key concern of India is in agriculture having been adequately safeguarded in the Declaration. "

दोहा में 14 तारीख को जो डिक्लरेशन हुआ है, उसमें कहा गया है कि एग्रीकल्चर को पूरा सेफगार्ड किया गया है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, कैसे सेफगार्ड हुआ है? डिक्लरेशन के पैरा-13 में एग्रीकल्चर के बारे में कहा गया है। इस संबंध में विद्वान सदस्यों ने अपनी बात कही है। जैसा मैंने पढ़कर सुनाया है -

"The key concerns of India in agriculture have been adequately safeguarded in the Declaration."

डिक्लरेशन के मसौदे में आगे लिखा है -

"...we commit ourselves to comprehensive negotiations aimed at; substantial improvements in market access; reductions of, with a view to phase out, all forms of export subsidies; and substantial reductions in trade-distorting domestic support."

जैसा इसमें लिखा है - ट्रेड डिस्टार्टिंग डोमैस्टिक सपोर्ट - इसका अर्थ हमारे जैसा कम बुद्धि वाला व्यक्ति, जो किसान वर्ग से आता है, समझ नहीं पा रहा है। माननीय मंत्री जी को इसको स्पष्ट करना चाहिए कि क्या यह मिनिमम सपोर्ट प्राइस(MSP) है। कहा गया है, दोहा में किसानों का बड़ा भारी सेफगार्ड हुआ है, इसलिए मंत्री जी को इसको क्लीयर करना चाहिए। यह बात स्पष्ट होनी चाहिए कि भारत को मार्केट मिलेगा या भारत दुनिया भर के देशों का मार्केट बनेगा - क्या होगा? इसका नतीजा क्या होने वाला है? क्या यूरोपीय देश तथा युनाइटेड स्टेट्स फार्म सब्सिडी या एक्सपोर्ट सब्सिडी को हटाने को तैयार हैं - यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ? अगर यह बात सही है, तो यूरोपीय यूनियन तथा यूएसए में क्या मतभेद हैं? भारत को कहा जा रहा है कि ट्रेड डिस्टार्टिंग डोमैस्टिक सपोर्ट घटाइए। जो विकसित देश हैं, वे तीसरी दुनिया के देशों को, जो गरीब हैं या विकासशील देश हैं, कह रहे हैं कि आप ट्रेड डिस्टार्टिंग डोमैस्टिक सपोर्ट को घटाएँ, रिडक्शन करें, खत्म करें। मान लीजिए - पिछली खरीफ फसल में गेहू की कीमत 610 रुपए प्रति क्विंटल MSP तय हुई। अब क्या आप इसको घटा कर 300 रुपए प्रति क्विंटल लायेंगे? मतलब यह कि मार्केट में 610 रुपए प्रति क्विंटल और MSP के तहत 300 रुपए प्रति क्विंटल - मैं ऐसा समझता हूँ। इसी प्रकार पैडी का प्रोक्योरमेंट पिछले सीज़न में 530 रुपए प्रति क्विंटल और स्पेशल ग्रेड का 560 रुपए प्रति क्विंटल - क्या आप इसको घटा कर 400 रुपए प्रति क्विंटल लायेंगे? इस बारे में क्या करना है, क्या परिणाम होगा, मंत्री जी बतायें। यह कहा गया है कि पाचवें मिनिस्टीरियल सम्मेलन सन् 2005 में इसको ठीक कर लेंगे। जनवरी सन् 2002 के लिए एजेंडा फिक्स हो जाएगा और मार्च, 2003 तक सारा काम कर लेंगे। फिर पटरी इस लाइन पर चलेगी। हम चाहते हैं, कामना करते हैं कि माननीय मंत्री जी को अधिक से अधिक ताकत मिले, संसद से मिले, देश से मिले और वे मजबूती से हितों को ध्यान में रखते हुए, कदम उठावें। डिक्लरेशन में पूरी तैयारी की गई है। इधर लिखा है - ट्रेड डिस्टार्टिंग डोमैस्टिक सपोर्ट और उधर लिखा है - एक्सपोर्ट सब्सिडी। क्या 250 से 300 प्रतिशत सब्सिडी आन-स्कीम्स पर घटायेंगे? बहुत ही बुद्धिमत्ता से यह डिक्लरेशन तैयार किया गया है। इसलिए हम चाहते हैं कि मंत्री जी को ताकत मिले। यह पार्टी लैवल पर बहस का मुद्दा नहीं है, देश के हितों का सवाल है। विकासशील देशों को इंडिया ने लीड करना है और अपनी भूमिका तय करनी है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत ट्रेड डिस्टार्टिंग डोमैस्टिक सपोर्ट को कितना डिस्टार्ट कर रहा है। इस बारे में भी भारत को बताना चाहिए।

किसानों को जो हम सब्सिडी दे रहे हैं, उसमें उनको क्या नुकसान हो रहा है? भारत ट्रेड को डोमैस्टिक सपोर्ट देकर कितना डिस्टार्ट कर रहा है। यह सब करने के बाद भारत को क्या लाभ होगा, क्योंकि मल्टी नेशनल ग्रेन कम्पनी बड़ी ताकत लगाए है, जो स्टोरेज प्रोक्योरमेंट आदि सारा इंतजाम कर लेगा। इस देश में जो नया हिसाब बँध रहा है उसका नाम मॉनसाटो और कारगिल है, इसमें क्या इंटरस्ट है, ये बड़ा भारी इंटरस्ट लेने चले हैं। अब मल्टीनेशनल कम्पनी ग्रेन का मालिक बनने जा रहा है। इन सब का कहीं दबाव न हो। भारत के हित में कहां फँसला लिया जा सकता है, यह देखना होगा। कितना स्पेशल और डिफरेंशियल ट्रीटमेंट मिल पाएगा, यह देखना पड़ेगा। इंडिया में सबसे जरूरी हमारी फूड सिक्योरिटी है। दोहा के डिक्लरेशन से खाद सुरक्षा की आवश्यकता बढ़ी है। आज फूड सिक्योरिटी खतरे में है। इसे इफैक्टिवली नेगोशिएट करने के लिए क्या भारत अपनी पूरी ताकत इकट्ठी कर चुका है? इसके मैंडेट के लिए भारत क्या कर रहा है? क्या आप दूसरे देशों से सम्पर्क कर रहे हैं, जिससे हमारी इकॉनमी की क्षति न हो। क्या इसके लिए कोई प्रयास हो रहा है? दोहा में जो अभी हुआ, इसका क्या परिणाम निकल रहा है? मुझे मंत्री जी की नीयत पर कोई आशंका नहीं है। इस बार भी उन्होंने वहां बहुत ईमानदारी से काम किया है लेकिन इसका क्या रिजल्ट निकला है? जब काफी दबाव आया तो मंत्री जी को भी इसे स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिए क्योंकि सारा पाप ये लोग कर चुके हैं। मंत्री जी को चाहिए कि वह इसे ठीक कर दें क्योंकि सारा खेल उधर से 1991 से 1994 तक खराब किया गया। आप इस समय जितना चाहेंगे, परिस्थिति जहां है उसमें आप जितना कर रहे हैं उसमें और थोड़ा सौफ्ट हों, आपको इसे मान लेना चाहिए। पहले से एक लाइन चल चुकी थी। मारन साहब, आपने कहा था, The second draft is worst than the first. सैंकिड राउंड जो हुआ तो आपने कहा था, We have no say in the setting of the agenda.

इसका विरोध करने के बावजूद क्या-क्या हो गया। सिंगापुर इश्यू, ट्रेड ऐंड इनवैस्टमेंट, ट्रेड ऐंड कम्पीटिशन, Transparency in Government procurement and its trade facilitation को ड्राफ्ट डिक्लरेशन में स्थान मिल ही गया, जिस पर अभी रूपचन्द पाल जी चर्चा कर चुके हैं, मैं उस पर चर्चा नहीं करना चाहता। मैं टैक्निकल निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि मंत्री जी काफी राहत महसूस कर रहे हैं। 2005 तक काफी समय है, इस दौरान काफी नेगोशिएशन कर लेंगे। इस कमेटी में 2003 तक काफी चीजें आगे बढ़ जाएंगी। एजेंडा काफी क्लीयर हो जाएगा। इसमें थोड़ा सावधान रहने की जरूरत है। हम 6 साल में कुछ नहीं कर पाए तो अब हमें थोड़ा सावधान होने की जरूरत है।

सभापति महोदय, अगले जो भी राउंड हों, उसके लिए जनवरी से सावधान हो जइए। जो सीड्स का मामला है, इस पर जो मनोपत्नी होगी, जो महंगी सीड विदेशी होगी, उस पर भी आवाज उठनी चाहिए। दोहा मंत्रिमंडलीय सम्मेलन के बाद जो भी आगे डिसकशन हो, उसे प्रायर्टी दी जाए, क्योंकि जो ट्रेड नेगोशिएशन कमेटी बैठेगी वह जनवरी, 2002 में कार्य प्रारम्भ कर देगी और 2003 में कार्य समाप्त हो जाएगा। फिर 2005 के बाद अगर कुछ करना चाहेंगे तो भी नहीं कर पाएंगे।

इसमें थोड़ी सावधानी बरतने की जरूरत है। हमारे देश में फूड सिक्योरिटी होनी चाहिए। विकसित देशों की सब्सिडी हमारे देश के किसानों के रोजगार को खत्म करेगी, खेती को चौपट करेगी। डब्ल्यूटीओ के चलते जब मात्रात्मक प्रतिबंध उठा तो उसका परिणाम क्या हुआ? हमारे देश में 610 रुपये क्विंटल एमएसपी सरकार निर्धारित करती है तो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मार्केट में 400 रुपये से 450 रुपये प्रति मीट्रिक टन दाम हो जाता है। हमारा किसान उनसे कहां मुकाबला कर पायेगा? इसलिए यह सवाल भी हमारे लिए बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। मात्रात्मक प्रतिबंध जल्दबाजी में 1 अप्रैल 2001 को उठाया गया। इस मात्रात्मक प्रतिबंध में बहुत सारे स्पेशल प्रोविजन्स हैं। हमें इसके लिए तैयार होना चाहिए। अगर देश को बचाना है तो इसको फिर से लागू करने पर हम तैयार हैं। इसलिए इस सवाल पर भी माननीय मंत्री जी ध्यान दें।

दवाइयाँ, पब्लिक हेल्थ के बारे में जो जीत की बात कही गयी है तो मलेरिया या एड्स गरीब किसानों में कहां होता है? एड्स हो रहा है उन लोगों को जो काम नहीं करते हैं, निठले हैं, कमरे वर्ग से नहीं हैं, जो मॉडर्न संस्कृति में डूबे लोग हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कितने प्रतिशत गरीब किसान और गरीब लोग हैं जिनको एड्स जैसी बीमारी की दवा की जरूरत पड़ेगी। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अधिकतर मेहनतकश लोगों को इसमें कोई खास विश्वास नहीं है और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हिंदुस्तान में यह बीमारी दवा के नाम पर न आये।

में अपनी बात समाप्त करते हुए माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करता हूँ कि आने वाले डिस्कशन में वे आगे बढ़कर भाग लें।

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (AKOLA) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Being in Parliament for the last ten years, I find that this is the first time that GATT and related matters are being discussed. I have witnessed in this House that whenever this issue was referred to, there was almost always a subcommittee of Parliament appointed to study and refer the matter back to Parliament. Today, we are quarrelling over what is going to be the effect. But, let us first admit that when the discussions started in 1991, we had parallel issues running in this country which were related to Ayodhya. Whenever any important issue related to discussion on GATT came up at international level, this House was drawn into a situation where it could not function due to Ayodhya issue. I do not need to refer to the names of the organisations which raised that issue and the members of the international delegation that went on the task during that period.

What we are doing now is, we are speaking in terms of what is going to be the consequences. I have been listening to the debate and I have been witnessing some of the aspects of international diplomacy that has taken place. Some of the things have been analysed. The Minister made a pious declaration during his initial speeches that he has not been able to carry out till the end.

I was in the Durban Conference for more than 20 days. It was in connection with an international event where an issue related to caste, whether it should be included in the declaration or not, was being discussed. I had an opportunity of meeting nearly 79 representatives from 163 countries. Out of 69 countries, initially 59 countries were in favour of inclusion of caste. Some of the Brazilian countries and EU countries were concerned over a different aspect of caste. Therefore, they had said that they had some areas on which we could work. What I found in those deliberations was that those countries which were ready to support us on this issue turned around the next day.

When we asked as to what happened, they said, "Look, this is an international diplomacy; we have got some concessions from the Indian Government; and we have got some commitments from the Indian Government."

So, I would like to ask the hon. Minister that to keep the issue of caste out of the Durban Conference, are we being blackmailed and are we giving the commitments to such an extent that it is affecting the Indian economy as such?

The second issue which I would like to raise is this. My colleagues have already gone into greater details of it. If the Fifth Round of the Ministerial Conference takes place and the issues like investments, environment and procurement by the States are taken up there, and if there is some form of an agreement on these issues, whether this Parliament loses its economic sovereignty over the country.

Sir, procurement by the States is one of the major issues where we control the agricultural prices in this country. If this mechanism is taken away, it will mean that we will be throwing our farmers into the lots of those buyers who have no morality and who do not follow any morality. I would like to have a specific answer from the Government on these issues.

The third issue which I would like to raise is this. We are saying that we are fighting a losing battle. I do agree with him that we are fighting a losing battle because we have lost whatever we could gain in the initial rounds between 1991 and 1995. It is because there were countries which, in those periods, went into for referendums. Through these referendums, they got whatever concessions they wanted.

18.22 hrs (Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav in the Chair)

But I do know that we have one aspect in our hand. It is the 'growing market' in this country. The world, as we see it, is in recession. In the international arena, there is a period of boom when a new generation starts functioning in the Western countries. Today, there is recession because the population has not grown. The new generation has not started its life which, as some of the economists predict, is to start after seven years. So, we have a period of seven years where we, as a country, can project that there is going to be a new buyer class.

Today, we have 22 million middle-class people which in an economic terms is the saturated class. We have nearly about 37 per cent of the total population living below poverty line. If we take a conscience decision in this country to bring, at least, five per cent of that 37 per cent below poverty line people into the middle-class side, we will be having a new growing consumer class of nearly 10 crore. This class can be a trading class. This class can be a meeting class for their next Ministerial Conference.

So, this is not going to be an isolated issue. It has to be a correlated issue towards the Foreign Policy and economic development of our country. So, unless we project that we are bringing in a new buyer class in this country, I am sure, whatever concessions they are asking for in Agriculture and Textiles will be granted because the

Western world, other European countries and American continent need the buyer-class for their production and survival.

Lastly, I want to know this. As I have said, I had been in this diplomacy for quite a long time. There is one feeling that has gone across the world and amongst the diplomats also. It is that we are using systems to destroy our own society. We have gone on a path of liberalisation and we have gone on a path of globalisation. When we have taken the path of liberalisation, we have given a word that we will open up our economy. When we said that we would open up our economy, it does not mean that we finish off the Government sector, which is already there, or the public sector, which is already there. We are now finishing off the public sector, which has conveyed to the other parts of the world that we are going against a section of our society. Privatisation and public sector being privatised means that you are on the verge of destroying the reservation system, which is there in the country.

All these are co-related issues. If you do not come out of this phase, then, I firmly believe that you cannot do anything. It is because Switzerland was the Government, which was ready to sponsor the Resolution on Castes. But there was one call from the Americans and then, they withdrew. When we found out as to why did the Americans call them up, we were given explanations, which I would not like to state in this House because they are matters of confidentiality. But I would hope that the Government would protect the economic sovereignty and we should not give a feeling that we are destroying a society and that we are taking away the rights of some of the people.

I do hope that the Minister will address these issues when he replies.

डॉ. जसवंत सिंह यादव (अलवर) : सभापति महोदय, दोहा की चर्चा काफी देर से चल रही है। मैं मंत्री जी को और भारत सरकार को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि अब तक जितने भी वक्ता बोले हैं, उन्होंने अपने भागण में इतना तो कहा कि हमने क्या प्राप्त किया या इस सम्मेलन से भारत को क्या मिला। यह बहुत अच्छी बात है कि उनका रुख सकारात्मक रहा, परंतु किसी ने भी यह नहीं कहा कि मंत्री जी के वहां जाने से भारत ने कुछ खोया हो। किसी ने कम प्राप्त करने की बात कही और किसी ने ज्यादा प्राप्त करने की बात कही, परंतु सभी ने मंत्री जी के लिए यही कहा कि भारत सरकार का रुख अच्छा रहा। यह हकीकत है कि दोहा के सम्मेलन के पहले सिएटल में जो सम्मेलन हुआ था, वह कौंसिल हो गया था। उसमें एक राय नहीं बनी। उससे पहले उरुग्वे में कांग्रेस शासन के मंत्री श्री प्रणव मुखर्जी गये थे। मैंने डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में स्वयं जाकर नहीं देखा और न ही मैं वाणिज्य का बहुत बड़ा ज्ञाता हूँ, लेकिन मैंने टेलीविजन पर चर्चा सुनी थी और विशेषज्ञों की राय देखी कि भारत सरकार का प्रतिनिधिमंडल और मंत्री जी दोहा जाने की तैयारी में थे तभी टेलीविजन पर विशेषज्ञों की राय आनी शुरू हो गई थी और सभी यह कहने लगे थे कि श्री प्रणव मुखर्जी के समय, जिस तरह से भारत ने उरुग्वे में घुटने टेके थे, शायद इस बार भी भारत को अपने घुटने टेकने पड़ सकते हैं। विकसित देश उस समय अपनी मनमानी चला चुके थे, अपने मन के फैसेले ले चुके थे। शायद उनके मन में था कि इस बार भी ऐसा ही होगा, भारत का मंत्री आयेगा और चुपचाप बैठकर जो हम कहेंगे वह साइन करके चला जायेगा। चाहे हम पक्ष में बैठे हों या विपक्ष में बैठे हों, जहां भारत की प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ती हो वहां हम पार्टियों के मैम्बर बाद में हैं सबसे पहले हम भारत के नागरिक हैं। हो सकता था कि मारन साहब भारत के किसी एक पत्रकार को पटा सकते थे, परंतु कोई भी मंत्री पूरी दुनिया के पत्रकारों को नहीं पटा सकता। पूरी दुनिया की प्रेस ने इस बार पहली दफा लिखा कि भारत के मंत्री ने अपना दृढ़ रवैया रखा और दृढ़तापूर्वक अपनी बात कही।

दुनिया के जो विकासशील देश थे जिनको विकसित देश दबाना चाहते थे, जिनके घुटने टिकवाना चाहते थे, उन विकासशील देशों की उच्चस्तरीय बात रखकर, जिस तरह से उनका बचाव किया और जो विकसित देश चाहते थे कि यह सम्मेलन भी रद्द हो जाए, हर अखबार और टीवी चैनल में था कि मारन साहब ने अपनी चतुराई, अक्ल और दृढ़ता तथा बौद्धिक ज्ञान से उस सम्मेलन को सफल कराया। इस बार उल्टा हुआ कि विकासशील देशों ने विकसित देशों को घुटने टेकने पर मजबूर किया। ये जो चाहते थे, उसमें से कुछ खोया नहीं। पहले जो समझौते हुए थे, इन्होंने जो भी प्राप्त किया, वह कम से कम एक सफलता है।

अभी मेरे एक साथी बोल रहे थे कि ओलंपिक गेम्स में क्या होता है। विभिन्न देशों के खिलाड़ी खेलते हैं और जो प्रथम आता है वह स्वर्ण पदक ले जाता है। सब लोग उस पर खुशी जाहिर करते हैं। आज विकासशील देशों का नेतृत्व करने को हमें मिला और हर विकासशील देश ने भारत को अपना नेता माना। विकसित देश भी इसे मानने पर मजबूर हुए कि भारत का मंत्री पहले वाला मंत्री नहीं है, पहली सरकार का मंत्री नहीं है। अब सरकार भी बदली हुई है और मंत्री भी बदला हुआ है। जो उनकी गलतफहमी थी, वह दूर कर दी कि यह मंत्री औरों के घुटने टिका सकता है, पर खुद के घुटने नहीं टेक सकता।

महोदय, मेरे पूर्व वक्ताओं ने कहा कि भारत को क्या मिला। मैंने भी पढ़ा और चर्चाएं सुनी हैं। जो लिखा हुआ है मैं थोड़ा सा पढ़कर सुना दूँ। 'दोहा मंत्रिस्तरीय सम्मेलन की सफलता को विश्व व्यापार के लिए एक महत्वपूर्ण उपलब्धि के तौर पर देखा जा रहा है।' यह मंत्री जी ने नहीं कहा, प्रेस लिख रही है, प्रेस के संवाददाता लिख रहे हैं, एजेन्सियां लिख रही हैं। 'दो साल पहले सियाटल और विश्व व्यापार संगठन का सम्मेलन वार्ता का नया दौर शुरू करने में असफल रहा था। अंतिम दिन तक अपने और विकासशील देशों के हितों की पुरजोर वकालत करते हुए भारत ने इस बैठक में काफी कुछ पाया है। भारत और विकासशील देश कड़े पेटेन्ट कानूनों के तहत भी सार्वजनिक स्वास्थ्य, कृषि, आपात जरूरत से निपटने के लिए सस्ती दवाइयां हासिल करते रहेंगे। दूसरे शब्दों में भारतीय दवा निर्माता कंपनियां ऐसी सूत में कानूनी तौर पर दवाओं की नकल बना सकेंगी, हालांकि इसके लिए उन्हें निर्माण की कोई प्रक्रिया अपनानी होगी। पश्चिमी दवा कंपनियां अंत तक इसका विरोध करती रहीं।' भारत कुछ पा ही रहा था, तभी वे कंपनियां विरोध कर रही थीं।

इसी तरह जो हमारी सबसिडी घटाने की बात कर रहे थे, वे विकसित देश अपने बारे में सोचने पर मजबूर हुए। उन्होंने आश्वासन दिया कि हम इस पर विचार करेंगे। जिस तरह वहां अमेरिका के टीवी चैनल्स ने हमारे देश के मंत्री मारन जी के लिए शब्द इस्तेमाल किये, वह हमारे लिए गौरव की बात है। हर चैनल ने इस बात को कहा कि निर्यात कानून के बारे में भी ऐसा कोई पॉइंट नहीं रखा गया, जहां पर मंत्री जी को दबना पड़ा हो। फिर भी हमारे दोस्त एक ही बात कहते रहे।

सभापति महोदय, अभी आप बोल रहे थे कि कुछ काम इन्होंने गलत किये, देश इनकी सज़ा भुगत रहा है और मारन जी ने उसको पटरी पर लाने की कोशिश की है, सरकार ने पटरी पर लाने की कोशिश की है। दूसरों की गलतियों को सुधारने में बहुत समय लगता है। हम निश्चित रूप से कह सकते हैं कि आज जिस तरह से इस देश का मान और सम्मान मंत्री जी ने बढ़ाया है, हमें इसके लिए उनकी प्रशंसा करनी चाहिए। यह हकीकत है कि हमें इस तरफ और ध्यान देना पड़ेगा, माननीय मंत्री जी को और कड़ा रुख अपनाना पड़ेगा कि यहाँ के किसानों की खेती हकीकत में व्यापार नहीं है, यह आजीविका है।

सभापति मोहदय, अमरीका और दूसरे विकसित देशों के किसानों की खेती व्यापार है क्योंकि उनके पास एक हजार, दो हजार और चार हजार बीघे जमीन है।

सभापति महोदय : अब आप समाप्त करिए।

डॉ.जसवन्त सिंह यादव : सभापति महोदय, हमारी पार्टी का आधा घंटा है।

सभापति महोदय : आपकी पार्टी के और भी सदस्य बोलने वाले हैं।

डॉ.जसवन्त सिंह यादव : सभापति जी, मंत्री जी से हम उम्मीद भी कर सकते हैं क्योंकि इन्होंने अपने पक्ष को वहां बहुत दृढ़ता से रखा है। हमारे देश के किसानों को संरक्षण की जरूरत है। वहां के किसान की खेती व्यापार है, लेकिन हमारे किसान की खेती व्यापार नहीं बल्कि आजीविका है। जो कुछ किसान खेती में पैदा करता है उसे बेचकर वह अपने बच्चों की शादी करता है, उन्हें पढ़ाता-लिखाता है। ऐसे किसानों को बचाने के लिए जहां-कहीं भी लड़ाई लड़नी पड़े, वह निश्चित रूप से लड़नी चाहिए।

सभापति महोदय, मणिशंकर जी यहां नहीं बैठे हैं। मैं उन्हें कई बातें पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूं। मैं एक जगह पढ़ रहा था कि इस सम्मेलन को कामयाब बनाने के लिए कैसे मंत्री जी को 36 घंटे तक चर्चा करनी पड़ी। विकसित देशों से दिन-रात वार्ता कर के जिस तरह इन्होंने अपनी बात को रखा और मनवाया, वह वाकई काबिले तारीफ है। यह अखबार में लिखा है। **â€œ**(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य, आप अपने भाषण के बीच में टोका-टोकी को क्यों इनवाइट कर रहे हैं ?

डॉ.जसवन्त सिंह यादव : सभापति जी, मैं और मेरी आत्मा बार-बार प्रधान मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद दे रही है। जिस प्रकार से आपके कारनामे थे, उनसे इस देश को बचाने के लिए मुरासोली मारन साहब और प्रधान मंत्री जी को मैं बार-बार धन्यवाद देता हूं। आपके समय में डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. एक हौबे के रूप में किसानों व्याप्त था। इसके डर के मारे कुछ किसानों ने आत्महत्याएं कीं क्योंकि आप लोगों ने किसानों को मारने के

लिए व्यूह रचना की थी। मंत्री जी ने उससे उन्हें मुक्त कर दिया और एन.डी.ए. की सरकार तथा मंत्री जी ने कहा कि इस सरकार के होते हुए किसानों का कोई कुछ बिगड़ नहीं सकता है। भारत का किसान सुरक्षित है।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : सभापति महोदय, दोहा सम्मेलन की बड़ी चर्चा है और बड़ा बोलबाला है। हम लोगों ने भी मारन साहब को पीठ ठोक कर भेजा था कि जाइए, दोहा में लोहा लीजिए, लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हुआ। यहां बहुत हंगामा हुआ और सरकार के लोग अपनी तरफ से खूब पीठ ठोक रहे हैं कि बाजी मार ली।

महोदय, मंत्री स्तरीय अंतिम घोणा के क्लॉज 52 को देखिए, जिसे हमने देखा है।

प्रथम क्लॉज में ही सबसे गलत बात लिखी हुई है। उसमें कहा गया है कि डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. होने से सबकी इकोनॉमिक ग्रोथ हो रही है, व्यापार बढ़ रहा है और इम्प्लायमेंट हो रही है। इतने भारी असत्य से शुरुआत हुई। उसी में हो रहा है कि बड़ा भारी कांड हो गया। कपड़े के मामले में मंत्री जी का स्टैंड जरूर हुआ कि काले बादल गरजे लेकिन बरसात नहीं हुई, ऐसा हमको लगता है। लाभ कुछ नहीं हुआ, कहने के लिए कुछ हुआ। उसमें क्या गड़बड़ हुई? कपड़े के मामले में टोटल फेल हो गए। यह हुआ कि मात्रात्मक कोटा खत्म हो। अमरीका अड़ गया और हिन्दुस्तान, पाकिस्तान और पता नहीं कौन-कौन से देश बोलते रहे, सब लोग कुछ नहीं कर सके और अमरीका अड़ गया। अमरीका, यूरोपियन कंट्रीज़ और विकसित देशों की दादागिरी है, यह साबित हो गया। यहां सरकार अपनी पीठ ठोक रही है। ब्रिटेन, अमरीका और विकसित देशों में भी यह हो रहा है कि हम जीत गए, जो चाहा सो करवा लिया। दोनों में से किसकी बात में सच्चाई है। वे लोग भी अपनी पीठ ठोक रहे हैं। अमरीका का प्रतिनिधि यहां आया था। उन्होंने कहा, खबरदार, अगर उसमें हेराफेरी की तो भुगतना पड़ेगा। अमरीका वाला ऐसी धमकी देकर गया है। इस तरह अमरीका की दादागिरी चल रही है।

यह बात हुई कि सबसिडी कम कीजिए। वे सबसिडी कम नहीं कर रहे हैं, नहीं मान रहे हैं। वे 35,000 करोड़ डालर की सबसिडी दे रहे हैं। विकासशील मुल्क केवल 17,000 करोड़ डालर का ही व्यापार करते हैं। यदि वे अपनी सबसिडी घटा दें, जो ऐग्रीमेंट में है, इन्हें कहा कि हम इस पर फेज़वाइज़ विचार करेंगे। लेकिन अभी तक कुछ नहीं किया, अपनी सबसिडी नहीं रोकी। हमारे ऊपर सब प्रतिबंध लगते हैं। कपड़े वाले मामले में फेल हुए, इनकी कोई सुनवाई नहीं हुई, अमरीका अड़ गया कि 1995 से पहले कोटे को खत्म करने वाले नहीं हैं।

ट्रिप्स के मामले में इन्होंने दावा किया है कि महामारी की दवाई के दामों के पेटेंट में जो मोनोपोली चलती है, वह नहीं होगी। हमारे देश में हैपाटाइटिस बहुत हो गया। एक सुई का दाम 1200 रुपये है क्योंकि हमारे देश के पेटेंट कानून में प्रोडक्ट पर पेटेंट होता है, वहां वाले कानून में प्रोसीजर पर पेटेंट होता है। हमारे यहां दवाई का पेटेंट पांच से सात साल में खत्म हो जाता है लेकिन वहां का कानून कहता है कि बीस साल तक पेटेंट रहेगा, मतलब हैपाटाइटिस बी की सुई, जो क्यूबा वाला मुल्क बनाए, 1200 रुपये प्रति सुई गरीब आदमी कहां से लाएगा। ये कहते हैं कि हमें महामारी की दवाई में छूट मिली है लेकिन हम देख रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान, बंगलादेश, अमरीका और ब्रिटेन में दवाइयों का दाम हमारे यहां से पचास गुना ज्यादा है। जो गोली हमारे यहां एक रुपये में मिलती है वह वहां बीस रुपये की है। इसके चलते हिन्दुस्तान में गरीब आदमी के लिए बहुत संकट होगा।

किसानों के मामले में सुनते हैं कि बासमती का पेटेंट वहां करवा लिया है और लोग केस चला रहे हैं। हमारे यहां की जड़ी-बूटियां जैसे हल्दी, तुलसी, नीम, चिरौता, हरड़-बहेड़ा, इन सबको पेटेंट के लिए करवा रहे हैं। यह भी सुनते हैं कि कड़ी, जो हम गांव में खाते हैं, जापान ने उसे पेटेंट करवा लिया है।

इस तरह से पेटेंट के नाम पर बौद्धिक सम्पदा अधिकार के तहत हमारे देश के गरीबों पर खतरा मंडरा रहा है। बीज के बारे में भी कहा गया है कि बाहर से बीज आएगा, तो यह टर्मिनेटर वाली बात हो रही है। पुराने जमाने में किसान अगल-बगल से बीज ले लेते थे और बो देते थे। लेकिन अब हर साल नया बीज खरीदना पड़ेगा। इसलिए मैं मंत्री जी को कहना चाहता हूं कि इससे किसानों की सुरक्षा नहीं हो सकेगी।

पिछली बैठक में कहा गया था कि पर्यावरण को इसमें शामिल नहीं किया जाएगा। इस पर 2003 में चर्चा होगी। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि विश्व व्यापार संगठन से पर्यावरण को भी भय है। कहते हैं कि यह आवश्यक, एवील है। पुराने जमाने की कहावत है कि एवील मेक्स मैन डेवील। इसमें कोई सुरक्षा नहीं मिल रही है। हम दुनिया का छठा हिस्सा हैं, हमें वहां दृढ़ता से अपनी बात कहनी चाहिए थी। यह कहना चाहिए था कि अगर ऐसा नहीं हुआ, तो हम इस संगठन में नहीं रहेंगे। सब जानते हैं कि हमारे बिना दुनिया का कोई संगठन नहीं चल सकता। जो विकसित देश हैं, हमारे यहां जितना अनाज में भूसा होता है, उतना वहां एक साल का उनका भोजन होता है, फिर कैसे वे हमारी बात टाल सकते हैं। ये लोग मानसिकता से विश्व व्यापार संगठन के साथ हैं इसीलिए कहते हैं कि अगर हट जाएंगे तो हमारा भला नहीं होगा। आपको पता होगा कि पहले चीन इसमें नहीं था, अब शामिल हुआ है, जबकि उसका व्यापार बहुत विस्तृत है। दिल्ली के चांदनी चौक इलाके में आप देखें,

चाइनीज सामान की भरमार है। चीन में बनी हुई गणेश जी की मूर्ति 50 रुपए में यहां मिलती है, जबकि महाराष्ट्र में वही मूर्ति 500 रुपए में मिलती है, क्योंकि वह वहां बनी है। इसी तरह से हमारे यहां बने हुए फानूस की कीमत 1000 रुपए है, जबकि चीन से वही फानूस यहां आकर 200 रुपए में बिक रहा है। इसलिए हिन्दुस्तान को खुद अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होना पड़ेगा, खुद को शक्तिशाली बनाना चाहिए और कहना चाहिए कि हम दुनिया का छठा हिस्सा हैं इसलिए हमारी बात माननी चाहिए। हमारे बिना कोई संस्था नहीं चल सकती इस मनोबल से हमें अपनी बात कहनी चाहिए।

मणि शंकर जी कह रहे थे कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जिद ही नहीं किया। लेकिन हमें सूचना आई है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने मारन जी को कहा कि थोड़ा नरमी से चलें, नहीं तो गड़बड़ हो जाएगी। उनको पता नहीं है कि खूंटे के बल पर ही बछड़ा कूदता है, अगर खूंट कमजोर होगा तो हमारा भेजा गया प्रतिनिधि वहां क्या कर सकता है। हमने यह भी सुना कि आपने वहां भाण दिया और उन लोगों को लगा कि हिन्दुस्तान इस वक्त कठोर है। जब प्रधान मंत्री जी के बारे में पता लगा कि उन्होंने आपको नरमी से चलने की कही है, तो कैबिनेट का एक मंत्री अकेला वहां क्या कर सकता है। यह देश के हित का प्रश्न है, इसका जवाब देना चाहिए।

एंटी डम्पिंग के बारे में कहा गया कि कानून बना रहे हैं। ये कह रहे हैं कि इससे बड़ा भारी फायदा हुआ है। लेकिन कृषि में, कपड़ा में जो प्रतिस्पर्धा है, उसको एंटी डम्पिंग से कैसे पाटोगे। ट्रेड रिलेटिविटी की बात कही गई, जिसे ट्रिप कहते हैं, उसमें भी यह है कि प्रतिस्पर्धा होगी। हिन्दुस्तान का किसान कैसे प्रतिस्पर्धा में टिक पाएगा। उससे निपटने के लिए आप कौन सा कानून बना रहे हैं, इसके बारे में भी बताएं। इवैस्टमेंट मैजर्ज़ की बात कही गई। पूंजी की हमारे यहां कमी है, तो यह कैसे होगा, यह भी साफ करें। कहते हैं कि गैट में आधुनिक सेवाओं का आदान-प्रदान होगा। लेकिन अपने यहां तो परम्परागत सेवा वाले लोग हैं, जैसे डाक्टर हैं, वकील हैं, मेहनतकश मजदूर हैं, उनका क्या होगा, इसका भी स्पटीकरण दें। थोड़ा सा रिलीफ अगर मिला है तो वह दवाओं के मामले में और सब्सिडी के मामले में है। इनको कहा गया कि सब्सिडी फेजवाइज घटा रहे हैं। जब डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के एग्रीमेंट में सब्सिडी कम करने की बात है तो यूरोपियन देश क्यों नहीं अपने यहां सब्सिडी कम कर रहे हैं। इसलिए सभी विकासशील मुल्कों को एकजुट होना चाहिए, ये मुल्क कुल संगठन का एक तिहाई हैं।

सबको संगठित करने के मामले में, मंत्री जी बतायें कि क्या प्रगति हुई। व्यापार के मामले में जो विदेश विभाग के दूतावास बने हुए हैं, उनसे क्या मदद मिली है? हम वहां जाकर देखते हैं, तो वे लोग सब आराम से रहते हैं, उनको भारत के हितों की कोई चिन्ता नहीं है, जबकि उनका काम बात करके एकजुट होने का प्रयास करना चाहिए। हिन्दुस्तान का सपना था कि वह तीसरे खेमे का नेतृत्व करे। एक खेमा तो खत्म हो गया है और दूसरा खेमा बचा हुआ है और अमरीका तथा यूरोपीय देश सब दादागिरी चला रहे हैं और विकासशील देशों का शोण कर रहे हैं। इन देशों को डराने, फंसाने का काम कर रहे हैं। इसलिए इन चार-पांच मामलों में विश्लेषण करके देखना चाहिए। अब सन् 2003 में होने वाले सम्मलेन के लिए तैयारी करें। अब कम से कम विकासशील देश एकजुट हो जायें। सन् 2003 के सम्मलेन के लिए मामले तैयार करने हैं। अगर काम कमजोरी, ढिलाई से किए गए, तो उसके परिणाम देश को भुगतने पड़ेंगे। **â€** (व्यवधान) इस भारतीय जनता पार्टी की सरकार में मल्टीनेशनल्स की पौबारा है, ब्लैक मार्केटियर्स की पाव-बारह है और प्रोफिटियर्स की पौबारा है और गरीब किसान त्राहि-त्राहि कर रहे हैं। जिस तरह से हम आतंकवाद के खिलाफ जनमत बनाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, उसी तरह से हमें इसके खिलाफ भी एकजुट हो जाना चाहिए। मेरे विचार से WTO को खत्म कर देना चाहिए। पूंजीवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने के लिए एकजुट होना चाहिए। जो देश दादागिरी कर रहे हैं, उनके खिलाफ एकजुट हो जाना चाहिए। कहा गया कि प्रैस में काफी प्रशंसा हो रही है। इंडिया टूडे में लिखा है - "पाया कम, खोया ज्यादा" इसी पत्रिका में आगे लिखा है - "हिन्दुस्तान का संघर्ष सपाट समर्पण" यानि सरन्डर। इन समाचारों को पढ़कर कौन कह सकता है कि भारत की प्रैस द्वारा प्रशंसा हुई है। यह क्या इनकी उपलब्धता है, इसको भी मंत्री जी को स्पट करना चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

श्रीमती रेनु कुमारी (खगड़िया) : महोदय, सदन में जो चर्चा चल रही है, वह दौरा में हुए WTO के सम्मलेन से संबंधित है। मैं सदन को बताना चाहती हूं कि श्री प्रणव मुखर्जी पहले नायक हैं, जिन्होंने WTO के एग्रीमेंट पर हस्ताक्षर किए थे। उनसे अधिक कोई इस बात को नहीं जानता कि हस्ताक्षर के समय उनको क्या-क्या सहना पड़ा था। आजाद भारत में संप्रभु सरकार के वे प्रतिनिधि थे, लेकिन उनको बहुत जिल्लत सहनी पड़ी थी। उन्होंने इस बात को अपने भाषणों में भी उद्धृत किया है। लेकिन मैं आज वाणिज्य मंत्री, श्री मुरासोली मारन जी का अभिनन्दन करती हूं, उन्होंने विकासशील देशों का प्रखर नेतृत्व किया। उन्होंने विकासशील देशों के ट्रेड मंत्रियों को एक पत्र लिखा। वह पत्र एक ऐतिहासिक पत्र है और एक मील का पत्थर है। उन्होंने दोहा में WTO की चौधराहट के खिलाफ प्रखरता दिखाई और संघर्ष किया। लेकिन हमारे विपक्ष के लोग उनकी शिकायत कर रहे हैं।

महोदय, जिस समय कांग्रेस पार्टी ने WTO का समर्थन किया और उस पर हस्ताक्षर किए, उसी समय से भारत की हालत खराब हो रही है। पेटेंट कानून की बात आई, यह सच्चाई है कि पेटेंट कम्पनियों ने हमारे देश में नीम, हल्दी तथा और कई चीजों का पेटेंट करा लिया है। इससे सिर्फ बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियों को लाभ मिला है। उनकी यह नीति है कि जो चीजें उनके अनुकूल नहीं होती हैं, उसे वे नहीं मानते। इससे हमारे भारत को बहुत लॉस हुआ है और यह पेटेंट कानून एक मीठे जहर की तरह है, जो भारत को अंदर ही अंदर खोखला कर रहा है।

महोदय, कृषि के क्षेत्र में हमें काफी घाटा हुआ है। अमेरिका किसानों को सबसिडी दे रहा है, जिसे इन्होंने प्रोटेक्टिव सबसिडी का नाम दिया है। कृषि पर उन्होंने 90,000 करोड़ रुपए सबसिडी दी। भारत में किसान को खाद, बीज, बिजली आदि किसी चीज पर भी सबसिडी नहीं मिल रही है। इस कारण भारत अगले 10-20 वर्षों में भी अमेरिका का मुकाबला नहीं कर पाएगा। इसलिए ऐसा होना चाहिए कि भारत भी ऐसा कोई नियम बना दे, जैसे अमेरिका ने बनाया हुआ है। वह प्रोटेक्टिव सबसिडी के नाम से चैक के द्वारा सबसिडी देता है, उसी तरह भारत में भी बनाया जाए ताकि किसानों को भी, हमारे कृषि प्रधान देश को भी सबसिडी मिल सके। हमने विश्व व्यापार संगठन को इसलिए बढ़ावा दिया कि हमारे देश में रोजगार के अवसर पैदा हो सकें, लेकिन यह सच्चाई है कि भारत में बेरोजगारी दूर नहीं हुई। WTO की जो नीयत है, विश्व व्यापार संगठन की जो शर्तें हैं उन पर चलते हुए हम अपने देश के व्यापार, उद्योग और कृषि को नुकसान ही पहुंचाते जा रहे हैं। आज हमारे देश के सारे उद्योग-धंधे बंद होने के कगार पर हैं, मंदी की चपेट में हैं। ऐसे में हमारा और हमारी सरकार का दायित्व बनता है कि WTO की शर्तों को निभाते हुए उद्योग को कैसे संरक्षण और बढ़ावा दें, उसे कैसे नई टेक्नोलॉजी प्रदान करें, जिससे हमारे उद्योग-धंधों को बढ़ावा मिल सके।

महोदय, बौद्धिक सम्पदा अधिकार समझौते में सुधार करने की बात पर क्या फैसला हुआ, जिसमें सार्वजनिक स्वास्थ्य संबंधी संकट और जरूरत के समय दवाओं के पेटेंट को किनारे करने का मुद्दा अहम् है। इसमें क्या हुआ? पेटेंट कानून के संबंध में क्या वार्ता हुई, यह भी मैं जानना चाहती हूं?

महोदय, अंत में मैं माननीय मॉरन साहब को धन्यवाद देती हूं, जिन्होंने दोहा में भारत की ओर से महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निभाई है। साथ ही यह भी कहना चाहती हूं कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय करारों के साथ-साथ हमारे देश का हित देखना भी उनका दायित्व है। मुझे विश्वास है कि हमारी सरकार इन दायित्वों को पूरा करने के लिए, WTO में अपनी भूमिका को जिस तरह उन्होंने प्रभावी ढंग से निभाया है उसी तरह आगे भी अपने देश के हित को देखते हुए प्रभावी ढंग से निभाएंगे।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, the hon. Minister to reply....(Interruptions)

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Sir, what is this? I could not follow.â€ (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just wait a minute. जितना समय इसके लिए तय हुआ था, उतना समय समाप्त हो गया है। छः बजे एक घंटे का समय बढ़ाया गया था, वह समाप्त हो गया है, अब सात बज गए हैं।

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA (MAVELIKARA): The time has been extended by one hour....(Interruptions) Only one or two hon. Members are there to speak from out side....(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH (AURANGABAD, BIHAR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I just want to find out how many minutes I have been allowed to speak.â€ (Interruptions)

सभापति महोदय : आप सब दो-दो मिनट बोल लीजिए

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, I make an appeal to you. It is a subject which is free from all political controversies. It is a subject pertaining to the nation. We agreed in the Business Advisory Committee that this discussion should continue as long as we can complete the speeches and the hon. Minister should reply tonight itself....(Interruptions) All right, it is to be concluded the same day. Therefore, I feel that if the hon. Members want to speak, let them continue with it. We are also learning many new points. What is wrong in it?

सभापति महोदय : माननीय दासमुंशी जी, आप विपक्ष के मुख्य सचेतक हैं और बीएसी के भी मेम्बर हैं। आपको मालूम है कि बिज़नेस एडवायज़री कमेटी में इसके लिए तीन घंटे का समय तय हुआ था। तीन घंटे के बाद सदन की सहमति लेकर एक घंटे का समय बढ़ा दिया गया और अब चार घंटे हो गए हैं। आपकी तरफ से मणिशंकर अय्यर जी ने काफी विस्तार से अपनी बातों को रखा है।

19.00 hrs.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : With all respects to you, I would correct your wisdom. The BAC had decided that it would be start at 3 o' clock and would conclude at 6 o' clock. Then, if we need time, we can extend. ... (Interruptions) That has been discussed in the BAC.

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : We are not very desperate to speak. These are subjects which need a lot of attention and a lot of time. ... (Interruptions)

सभापति महोदय : काफी पाइंट्स आ गये हैं उनको रिपीट करने की जरूरत नहीं है, अगर आप उनको रिपीट करेंगी तो चेयर से मैं आपको बोलने से रोक दूंगा। अगर आपको नये पाइंट्स बोलने हैं तो आप बोलिये।â€ (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is no need of repetition. If you have a new point, you can raise it....(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : Yes, Sir. The Doha Ministerial Conference is being hailed as a major success. Almost all major Delegations who had participated in it appeared to have got what they wanted. How is that possible when so many countries held very different views? The London based newspaper, *The Financial Times*, for example, has clearly stated that the only country which came away with nothing from the Doha Declaration was India. One can always be wiser in the future and the fact remains that the entire world is caught in this historic current on globalisation. As a nation, we have to see beyond our political divide. Therefore, we have to come together and get the better of this historic current. The WTO agreement itself was to a large extent one-sided. Since there is a constraint of time, I would come straight to the subject, which are four in number.

I would start with the environment. The Minister had stated that he gave a little into environment in order gain a little in the field of agriculture. Let us see as to how we fared in the field of environment. The European Union has in its post-Doha assessment claimed that the Declaration affirms the right of members to take measures that they consider appropriate in their national context in the interest of health, safety and environment. In other words, the members will play an important role in global control of environment-related issues. Is this what we were looking for at Doha? Regardless of what the hon. Minister may claim it is just what he was trying to avoid. It may be a gain for the European Union but I see it as a major loss for ourselves. We had hoped to avoid mainstreaming of environment but it is just what has happened. I fear this will raise market access barriers and we cannot be very satisfied with it.

Secondly, I come to agriculture. This is a topic and subject which nobody in this august House has dwelt upon except Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, my senior colleague, who was not able to complete the whole of it. We are told that we lost out on environment because we have gained on agriculture. Let us look at agriculture. Even prior to the Doha agreement it was in fact a part of the earlier Marrakech agreement to have negotiations on agriculture. In fact, the concept that the vulnerable developing countries like India should have special treatment relating to food security, and we permitted to have an incentive structure, was part of the agreement. It was also axiomatic that the developing countries whose levels of subsidy should constitute serious trade barriers for other countries needed to

phase out their subsidy structure is not a new achievement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need not read.

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : Please allow me to speak this, Sir. If you just ruffle a person with time, then, you cannot speak what you want to speak, and if you want to speak without conviction, I am sorry it does not convey the meaning . We are told that we lost out in environment, we made up in agriculture. And this was achieved by refusing to approve the draft presented at the Ministerial as it led to changes that are to our benefit. The Minister may kindly enlighten us on our gains for I feel that we have lost out instead. The proposed draft had a provision for phasing out farm export subsidies that were hurtful to us for we were unable to export out farm produce to Europe and the USA. Our core concerns were the flooding of our markets by agricultural commodities and the imposition of the standards of labour, investment and environment of the industrialised nations on our exports.

Regarding international markets, I do not know if these concerns have been taken care of in this Declaration. Would the hon. Minister kindly clarify?

We have some concerns. The first relates to discussions at the next meeting to be held in two years' time. The Declaration mentions negotiations but it does not indicate any timeframe for the reduction of agricultural subsidies by the European Union. What is the assurance that these negotiations will be taken up within two years and will lead to reduction in the subsidies even while our own subsidies remain intact?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Madam, you can quote only but you are reading it line by line...(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : Now, I am just speaking about textiles. On textiles, there is a major setback. Far from front-loading and increasing quotas for countries like India, there has not even been any movement on the peak tariffs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can lay it on the Table.

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : Sir, I am the last speaker. â€¡â€¡..*

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not fair.

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : The hon. Minister must listen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You do not understand what you are saying.(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You do not understand what you have said. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is very bad. You cannot question the Chair.

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : I am sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to establish a new precedent in the House?

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : No. Sir. You give us time. That is the point. ...(Interruptions)

On textiles, there is a major setback. Far from front-loading and increasing quotas for countries like India, there has not even been any movement on the peak tariffs. On anti-dumping, there is more expression of intent and the words are platitudes. How can we say that we have made progress on implementation issues? What is worse is that we have modified our earlier stand and allowed negotiations to go forward without a prior resolution of these issues connected with textiles, anti-dumping and subsidies.

*Expunged as ordered by the chair.

I will hurriedly come to the last point on software. Our next concern is about something that is our largest export item, namely, software worth Rs. 30,000 crore annually. It seems that the United States insist that the Indian firms using software personnel for short periods should be paid as much as theirs. It also proposes to restrict their number, perhaps, due to the slow-down of their economy post-11th September. How does the Minister ensure that this is taken care of?

Finally, there are four points on which I would like him to answer. First, we failed, in spite of declaration, that we will have a 'round' for the post-Doha process to become a reality. Semantics will not alter the truth.

Second, we have earlier decided that implementation issues must be resolved prior to any fresh negotiations. This includes a whole basket of issues emerging from the Uruguay round of talks. We failed in this endeavour because far from a prior resolution, they are now part of the dynamics of the new negotiating process.

Third, on some key issues of immediate relevance to us like textiles, subsidies and anti-dumping, we have not got anywhere.

Fourth, we failed to kill labour and environment from getting mainstream subsequently, after two years, in the negotiating process.

From an overall perspective, our commercial diplomacy is weak. Our foreign policy and economic policies are not hand in hand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am objecting to your reading a speech. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : I am hurriedly going through it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It should not be taken as a precedent. *â€* *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : Fine, Sir. I sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri Ramesh Chennithala...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : She was finishing her last point. ...*(Interruptions)* यह आखिरी बात कह रही थीं।

सभापति महोदय : काफी बात आपकी तरफ से आ चुकी है।*â€* (ब्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : अब आप कनक्लूड कीजिए।

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : These are the points from which he could have benefited. ...*(Interruptions)*

I would request the hon. Minister that a new Parliamentary Committee should be constituted on the WTO. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA (MAVELIKARA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the trade is the key engine for growth. The Governments across the world have increasingly recognised the need for a new global trade rules. Recently, China has entered the WTO as a new Member. China, of course, is going to play a very major role in the global economic scenario.

Sir, in the emerging global trade order, India has to focus on specific problems. Our share in the global trade is very meagre, that is, 0.7 per cent. With this share, we cannot expect miracles. Of course, we have to strengthen ourselves. In the changing world scenario, India has to play a very positive role to fight for the justice.

Of course, the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry, Shri Murasoli Maran has tried his level best to achieve this goal. I have no doubt about it but at the same time, we have to see certain very important aspects of this. He mentioned that this is a necessary evil. Sir, 142 countries are in the WTO. The global trade regulatory bodies are always ignoring the interests of the developing countries. The major economic powers like the European Union the US and Japan are dictating the agenda to the WTO.

We are always raising these issues in all the Ministerial Conferences. Manipulation and arm-twisting by the economically strong nations is not a healthy practice. WTO must provide equal treatment to all the members. Of course, we are always trying to get that. If we look at the scenario which has emerged in Doha, you would find that the developing countries were not united. They were not at all collectively raising their voice against this discrimination. Every developing country was interested in pushing its own agenda. Sir, India relied excessively on the developing countries on critical issues. The countries across Asia, Africa, Caribbean, and Latin American countries had promised support on main issues, but at last, India was isolated, their support was not there, and they were pushing their own agenda. When they got something, they backed out. There was no common agenda. There was no common thinking and support for each other.

Sir, here is a point. I would like to mention a point that India always stood for the developing countries. We tried to unite the developing countries. Here we failed. What are the reasons for this failure? We would like to know whether a proper exercise has been done or not and also whether proper homework has been done or not. What is the situation that has emerged there? A Group of Like-minded countries (LMG) tend to be a Group of Unlike-minded countries at the end of the Conference. What is the reason? Why did it happen? India was banking on LMG countries to bargain for an earlier than scheduled end to the quota system of textile exports to the US. Finally, Pakistan also walked out. India was kept in isolation. We cut a sorry figure. We would like to know whether our strategy had failed. What were the reasons for all other LMG countries showing an aversion to our stand on these very important issues?

We should not cry for the spilt milk. What are our future plans? That is the most important thing. The developing

countries constitute three-fourths of the WTO members. We cannot walk-out from the WTO. We cannot ignore the role of the WTO. Even in the US, some people are against the WTO saying that the new role of the WTO is against the US. Even the developing countries are also accusing the WTO. That means, they are playing a key role in the global trade. So, Sir, we have to set up our priorities. What are our priorities? We would like to know whether in the coming round, we can agree for a common agenda, which is agreed by all the developing countries. Whether we agree or not, we are going to have another round of discussion, and in that discussion, whether India can prepare a common agenda with the total agreement of all the developing countries.

Sir, the developing countries must agree for the market access negotiation, which could cut tariff and trade-distorted subsidies, particularly in agriculture and textiles.

Second is, negotiations on services could enable developing countries to increase export of services and skills. Greater competition can be invited in some service sectors. Keeping in view of the situation in India.

Third is, a trade round could tackle the remaining obstacles to manufacturing aspects of developing countries. We may not agree to the proposal which will only help to increase the gap between the rich and poor. I agree with the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry, Shri Murasoli Maran. He tried his level best. It is because of some faulty strategy, we failed in certain aspects, but we achieved certain things. I am only realistic in my approach. I am not saying that we have completely failed. ...*(Interruptions)* I am concluding.

We achieved something but greater efforts are needed for pursuing our goals. Our efforts should be to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor. Traditionally we are arguing the cause of the developing countries. We are always championing the cause of the poor. So, we shall continue to do that. We have to raise these issues in the International Trade Forums. Greater efforts may be undertaken by India for just and equitable trade rules so as to eliminate arm-twisting of economic powers, exploitation of rich nations and discriminatory approach of the developed world. By uniting the poor and developing countries by an extensive discussion and by formulating a common agenda, which will help the poor countries to develop, I think, in this way, in the coming round of discussions, India has to play a very crucial and effective role so as to get more and more benefits out of the WTO agreements.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): But we cannot get out of WTO.

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA (MAVELIKARA): Can you get out of WTO?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please take your seat.

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : Is there any country in the world which has got out of WTO?

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh was very vocal. He said, 'You get out of the WTO'....*(Interruptions)* That is why, I am just reminding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Without my permission, Shri Kharabela Swain, what are you doing? ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, please take your seat.

श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले (मालेगांव) : सभापति जी, मैं आपका आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया। सदन में विश्व व्यापार संगठन के बारे में बहस चल रही है। हमारे श्रेष्ठ वक्ता माननीय रघुवंश जी ने जो विचार रखे हैं, मैं उनका समर्थन करता हूँ। महोदय, विश्व व्यापार संगठन के बारे में माननीय मंत्री जी ने अच्छा काम किया है और उनके मन में अच्छे विचार हैं। मन में अच्छे विचार आना ही काफी नहीं है लेकिन रास्ते में क्या दीवारें आने वाली हैं, वह देखना चाहिए। पहली दीवार तो मन में आना चाहिए। मंत्री महोदय के मन में आया। दूसरी दीवार होती है कि अभ्यास होना चाहिए। इस बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सिंह जानवरों का राजा होता है फिर भी इधर-उधर देखता रहता है, इसी तरह मंत्री जी को भी इधर-उधर देखते रहना चाहिए। * ~~वे~~ (व्यवधान)

श्री रमेश चैन्नितला : इन्होंने अनपार्लियामेंटरी शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया है।

सभापति महोदय : जो भी असंसदीय शब्द होगा, वह रेकार्ड से निकाल दिया जाएगा।

श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले : उन्होंने सोचा कि भारत में 35 प्रतिशत लोग गरीबी रेखा के नीचे हैं, और जो 25 प्रतिशत लोग हैं, उनकी जेब से पैसा निकालना है। ऐसा अमेरिका ने सोचा है। इसलिए पहली दीवार उन्होंने पार की है। लेकिन अभ्यास करना चाहिए। किसान की स्थिति क्या है? बिजली की हालत क्या है, अनाज की स्थिति क्या है, खेती को पानी मिलता है या नहीं, व्यापार ठीक है या नहीं, किसानों को उचित दर मिलती है या नहीं, सहकारी संगठन ठीक हैं या नहीं यह भी सोचना चाहिए। तीसरी दीवार यश की दीवार है।

भारत के जो भी आदमी हैं, उन्होंने अच्छी तरह सोचा है। ऋषि हों या मुनि, महात्मा गांधी हों या नेहरू, उन्होंने अच्छी तरह से सोचा और संसार में पहला नंबर लिया। संसार भारत के बारे में पता नहीं क्या सोचता है, लेकिन भारत की शक्ति कम नहीं है। इस शक्ति को अच्छी तरह से संगठित करने की जरूरत है। यही मेरा निवेदन है।

*Expunged as ordered by the chair.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank all hon. Members for participating in this important debate. We have heard criticisms: constructive and otherwise also.

I would like to congratulate my brother hon. Member Thiru Mani Shankar Aiyar for his comments. We all know he belongs to a different league, he is a former Indian Foreign Service Officer and a former diplomat. We all know that diplomats alone have the right and privilege of uttering falsehoods and twisting words and facts. I would say that he has proved his mettle today. It is not only that but I would give ten out of ten for his eloquence and at the same time I would also give ten out of ten for his twisting capacity and misinterpreting everything.

I was hurt when he said that our position, that is, India's position was impotent posturing. At least, he did accept that there was some 'posturing'. I am very sorry but I am really hurt. He has hurt the entire nation because I was not a single individual who went there but I represented our one billion people and our Government. If this is impotent posturing, how would he describe the stand taken at the Uruguay Round Agreement? ...*(Interruptions)* Would he describe it as mere 'impotency' – pure and simple? I am very sorry; I do not want to create such kinds of exchanges and accusations.

Here are some international agreements. I would agree with Shri Ramesh Chennithala in the sense that at least in these kinds of matters there should be some commonality and some appreciation. Therefore, I would go into all the points one by one in a faster way.

The first is implementation-related issues and concerns. We have been urging that these concerns should first be addressed for the past three years. The hon. Prime Minister, while addressing the United Nations has stated this very clearly. The United Nations indeed is not a place for talking about the WTO. I do not know what he talked to President Bush; probably, Shri Aiyar might be knowing it! The hon. Prime Minister has stated it very clearly: 'In the Uruguay Round, we were given a cheque that bounced. We will not be prepared for receiving a post-dated cheque.' This formed the foundation of our stand.

First, the developed countries refused to accept the implementation-related concerns and issues. They closed their eyes to it. They merrily misused and misinterpreted all the provisions of the Uruguay Round. I do not find fault with the previous government. They signed it in good faith but the Western world misinterpreted it to their own benefit. Therefore, along with the so-called LMG countries, India played a key role in packaging them and categorising them. So, what happened is this. If you just look at the Declaration, you would find the 'Work Programme'. Under this Declaration there is no word like 'Round'. It is all semantics, whether you call it 'Round' or 'Development Round'. Under the heading 'Work Programme', the first issue at paragraph 12 is implementation-related issues and concerns. So, what I would say is that some issues have been addressed at Doha, some issues would go for negotiations and some would be addressed by the concerned committees. Therefore, the Trade Negotiating Committee would decide them and further action would be taken by the end of 2002. This is an acknowledgement, accreditation and a future roadmap for resolution of implementation concerns and issues. It is a victory or a major accomplishment. I do not want to go into all the details.

The hon. lady Member and others said that we have not got anything in textiles.

You can see in this Declaration that there were five issues relating to textiles. Three issues have been accepted; only two issues have not been accepted – not accepted means, they have not been rejected. These issues relate to growth on growth under A.T.C. They have agreed to some growth and then on growth, they gave us some factor to increase our quota. So, that has not been rejected. Now it will go to the Council for Trade in Goods and it will make recommendations to the General Council by 31st July, 2002 for appropriate action. So, it is over and above the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing (ATC). I would only say that we have not lost anything at all. We wanted some additionality; it has been postponed. I do not want to go into the facts because it will hurt us. As one Professor of Research and Information System for non-aligned and other developing countries says:

"India has not lost out on the textile issue as such because Indian companies are not in a shape that can use access to market to our advantage. There is a danger that lifting of quota restrictions would be used mostly by the other South-East Asian countries." Therefore, this issue relates to implementation issue; it does not relate to ATC at all. "

Now, what is the opinion of other countries? Implementation issues you all rejected. This is not an achievement according to hon. Member, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar. Here, Pascal Lamy, the European Commissioner for Trade says: "EU has played its full part in helping to pull together a valuable implementation package" - it is valuable to Pascal Lamy, not to hon. Shri Aiyar - "which the developing countries rightly made such a priority. They have forced this issue on to the agenda and though you must ask them, I am sure, they have far exceeded their expectations." These are the words of Pascal Lamy. Then, the European Union has made an assessment of the result and

published a memo dated 14th November, 2001. Here, I want to quote under the heading 'implementation':

"The European Union recognised from the outset that a new Trade Round could only be launched" – this is a pre-condition – "if there were demonstrable progress on implementation issues raised by a group of developing countries" – that is, India and the like-minded group – "the progress has now been made on the decisions reached at Doha and indeed before Doha, they have resolved a number of problems."

That is why I say, here we have achieved something significant.

Then, regarding TRIPS and public health, here is a major achievement for India and developing countries because this is a unique Declaration, a landmark Declaration, we know. I do not want to quote how the Westernised world is looting the developing countries. Just I want to quote the Nobel Laureate, Prof. Stiglitz, who was formerly in World Bank. He says: "Stiglitz likens free trade WTO style to the opium war, as it allows MNCs to fleece people in poor countries by charging usurious prices for branded medicines and other services. We know how AIDS is taking a heavy toll. At the end of 2000, it is not only an African disease, it is in India also. At the end of 2,000, 3.86 million Indians are living with HIV and AIDS. Every hour, almost 600 persons are getting infected by the deadly HIV virus and more than sixty children are dying because of this disease in the world. The poor Africans and others could not get the medicine. Therefore, we have got a separate Declaration. People may ask, why. This is because of public pressure. India, along with Brazil and 55 African countries, pressed that they should do this because here is a time to show that WTO also has a human face. So, they were compelled to agree to this. What is the TRIPS Agreement? Now, they wanted to say only during health crisis, you can use all these kinds of problems.

No; now the crisis has been substituted by 'health problems'. They wanted to show only HIV AIDS. No, HIV AIDS alone will not do. That is why we have added it because India was one of the members in the Drafting Committee that besides HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, Malaria and other epidemics be mentioned. They did not want to use the word 'epidemics'. They wanted to use the word 'pandemic' which means from continent to continent. We argued that India is a sub-continent. What happens here? There maybe an epidemic there in South India – in Tamil Nadu or in Kerala – but it may not be there in the North-Eastern India. Therefore, at our insistence these words were included.

Not only that – hon. Member Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar wanted to know as to where are the references to prices of the medicines. Here, in paragraph 4, it is said : "To promote access to medicine for all". It is there. What is it? It is because we have to negotiate this. We are not re-writing the TRIPS. We got, with a great effort, some flexibilities, some explanations and some clarifications. Here, I would read : "TRIPS agreement does not and should not prevent members from taking measures to protect public health". That means the sovereign Government has got the right. Not only that – while reiterating our commitment to the TRIPS agreement we affirmed that the agreement can and should be interpreted and implemented in a manner supportive of WTO's members' right to protect public health.

Here, I want to make two distinctions. This agreement can be interpreted in support of citizens' life. It means it is a signal to the national Government, the sovereign Government that you can use it and 'should be interpreted in such a manner' means, it is a signal to the dispute settlement body in Geneva. So, here is a major thing. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Please allow me for a minute. There was a general amendment for using the word 'shall' in place of 'should'.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: I will tell you. There was a suggestion. We suggested that the word 'shall' should be used.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : There was a suggestion.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Yes, countries like United States of America objected to it. I spoke in the Committee of the whole in the WTO. I said why are you objecting for the word 'shall'. They said it is a legalistic word in the United States of America. I said in Ten Commandments it is said 'Thou shall not steal Thou shall not do it' etc. Do you mean to say Moses was a great lawyer?

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Okay, you tried and you did it.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Yes. But we could not succeed. But, we consulted many people. They said that this will do – 'does not prevent and should not prevent'. Therefore, these flexibilities are there. Each country can see it. How is to determine an emergency or an extreme urgency? Who will determine it? According to this Declaration, the national Governments, the sovereign Governments can determine whether there is an emergency or there is an extreme urgency for getting cheaper generic medicine. Of course, there is one loophole, loophole in the sense the one which we could not achieve.

For example, suppose a country has no specific skill; not India as we are pioneers in producing generic medicine, What would happen if a poor country, an African country cannot produce, cannot have the capacity? This matter has been referred to the General Council and expeditious solution will be coming forth before the end of 2002. This is a landmark decision. You may ask how was it possible, who said so and all those things.

Here is a paper of Brazil. It says : "Brazil claims drug patents' victory." That is the headline. You see how patriotic they are. Inside it they say – "Developing countries like Brazil and India' They say it is with India's efforts also. They acknowledge. But I am sorry to say that we do not acknowledge it.

This is another Brazil paper. It says – "Brazil hails victory over drug patents". But inside it is said Brazil and India will now have all those things. Brazil acknowledges us; but we do not acknowledge.

There is another thing. Here is the *Asian Wall Street Journal*. I quote from it : "Most significantly for India the developed countries also agreed to elevate the rights of poor countries seeking cheap medicines above the rights of international drug companies seeking to protect their patents". So, the *Asian Wall Street Journal* could recognize it; but I am sorry the learned Member, hon. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar could not recognize it.

Here is *The Economist*, a much respected magazine. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar knows it very well. I just want to quote from it – "First they, (they means the developing countries), scored a coup"; Yes; they used the word 'coup' "with a declaration that intellectual property rules should not stop poor countries gaining access to cheap medicines."

This is the sentence I am reading from *The Economist*. Further, they say:

"In a sign of their increasing clout, poor countries win a clear victory over the drug-makers. "

We have got a victory over the multinationals, the drug-makers. As one activist admitted:

"Two years ago, you would never have got anything like this through WTO. "

We got it because all the developing countries were together. It was a proposal based on a proposal by India, Brazil and other more than 55 African countries.

Recently, the French Minister of State, Mr. Huwart had come to address the World Economic Forum. He says:

"This Declaration is considered by the entire world as one of the great successes to come out of Doha. "

These are not my words, but the words of a French Minister. Then, I would like to point out this to the hon. Member, Shri Rupchand Pal. Here is *Economic and Political Weekly*. We know, it is one of the most progressive weeklies in India. It says:

"The most tangible gain has been on TRIPS. The existing provisions have been clarified – they are not re-written – to give greater precedence to public health. "

Now, a national Government can determine without being challenged in a WTO Disputes Settlement Mechanism, when a public health emergency has arisen and patent rights need to be suspended. Epidemics suffice to suspend patent rights; pandemics are not required. This is the clarification. What I have stated, they have put it very simply in a very dignified manner. Tuberculosis and Malaria are explicitly recognised as epidemics. That might warrant suspension of patent rights and not just HIV AIDS. These are the words they have used.

Then, also related is geographical indication, CBD, Convention on Biodiversity, protection of traditional knowledge and folklore and other new developments. These are all in paragraphs 18 and 19. So, a short time-table has been fixed because wine and spirit have been given higher protection, but not our Basmati rice, not our Darjeeling tea, not our Alphonso mango. Now, for considering all these things, a short time-table has been fixed. The TRIPS Council has been asked to address this issue of GIS on a matter of priority and submit a report to the Trade Negotiating Committee by the end of 2002 for appropriate action. So, the work programme on TRIPS review has been on the mainstream. Therefore, the Committee on TRIPS is totally loaded with all these problems. The time

has almost been spent. We do not want to waste the time. All these issues will be considered.

Regarding geographic indications, I want to make it very clear. Here is a statement of European Union's Agriculture Commissioner, Mr. Fischler. He had issued a statement on 14th November, 2001 because Europeans also supported our move for geographic indication. It says:

"Another positive aspect of the deal is that we will now negotiate on geographical indications with a view to protecting quality products ranging from Indian Basmati rice to Italian Parmigiano – I do not know how to pronounce it – cheese from being pirated by other WTO countries. "

Is it not a significant gain? I think, this is a significant gain.

Somebody said, we have yielded to 'labour'. I am very sorry. We wanted to take away the entire paragraph because it has been settled once and for all at Singapore, that is, the labour standards belong to ILO. It comes under the domain of ILO. WTO has nothing to do with it. But we gained. What is the sentence that has been removed? It says:

"The ILO provides the appropriate forum for a substantive dialogue on various aspects of this issue. "

Why did we object to it? It is because if you say substantive dialogue, they will say unsubstantive dialogues will be taken over by WTO. They are clever enough. Therefore, if you have any doubt, I would again quote *The Economist*. What did they say? It is not Indian opinion or the opinion of Government of India. It says:

"For developing countries, the lack of any commitments in the area of trade and labour is another victory.
"

So, Shri Rupchand Pal should be happy.

Sir, then I would come to the issue of agriculture. I have answered a question only recently on this. But again I would like to say as to what we have got on this account. We already have started the negotiations on agriculture. AOA – the Agreement on Agriculture came into effect on 1.1.1995. This is the sixth year. The negotiation has started since 2000. Negotiations are going on. What does the EU say in this regard? They say that it is an open-ended negotiation. There is no end to it. There are no words saying that this negotiation should end by such and such year. So, we would not close the negotiations. They are increasing the export subsidy. The Indian agriculturists cannot compete with them because the EU and other countries are keeping their prices low by giving subsidy. But we have got a mandate that is much more favourable than Article 20 of AOA. Here, I would like to quote. It says, '...with a view to phasing out all forms of export subsidy will be undertaken'. Here is a mandate for those countries who give subsidy. What have we gained?

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : We have got only assurance.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Whatever it is. But we have to negotiate. This is only a paragraph as like it is there in the Budget speech. The Budget speech is read out and then the demands are considered. This is just like a Budget speech. We would have to negotiate. What have we got? I would again quote. It says, 'to effectively take into account all the development needs including food security and rural development probably may lead to a development box. Special and differential treatment for developing countries shall be an integral part of all the elements'. The developing countries would get a special and differential treatment. Special and a differential treatment means, fewer discipline and longer time frames for transformation or change. You may ask as to where is the time for it? It again says, 'the modalities for further commitment including provision for special and differential treatment shall be not later than 31 March, 2003. Of course, the entire thing is supposed to come to an end by the year 2005. So, here the time limit has been fixed. This is also a big achievement.

Sir, then comes the Singapore issue. This was the bone of contention. We discussed it for 36 hours non-stop. What did they say? Actually there was a climax to the whole thing. After 35 hours and 45 minutes of deliberations they introduced a draft and the meeting ended. We were taken aback. We were shocked. That is why we had to say, 'no, India could not take part in the consensus'. But what was the next stage? It came to a stand still. Then, the Chairman extended the period of discussion by another 18 hours. People were coming to us for arriving at a compromise. But we could not agree. We said that all the four Singapore issues could not be taken up for negotiations just now. A Working Group is studying it. Let the Working Group complete its study and give its report

and then, if necessary, we may consider this on the basis of explicit consensus in the next Ministerial Conference. Then the Chairman came up with a compromise. I would like to quote the statement of the Chairman. He said, 'I would like to note that some delegates have requested clarifications concerning paragraphs 20, 23, 26 and 27 of the Draft Declaration. Let me say with respect to the reference to "explicit consensus" being needed in these paragraphs for a decision to be taken at the 5th Session of the Ministerial Conference, my understanding is that, at that Session, that is in the next Ministerial Conference, a decision would indeed need to be taken by explicit consensus before negotiations on Trade and Investment, Trade and Competition Policy and also on Transparency in Government Procurement and Trade Facilitation could proceed. Previously, we got an explicit consensus only on two issues but now we have got an explicit consensus on two more. The Chairman further noted and I quote, 'This would also give each member the right to take a position on modalities that would prevent negotiations from proceeding after the 5th Session of the Ministerial Conference until that member is prepared to join in an explicit consensus'.

Sir, this is a great victory. I would again quote to Shri Pal what has been written in *The Political and Economic Weekly*. It says, "Such negotiations can take place only according to the modalities arrived at through explicit consensus among all members." In other wordsâ€¦ (Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : It does not mean that the Members of Parliament will have to agree to whatever is written in *The Political and Economic Weekly* or *The Economist*.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Therefore, let us not have any doubt. Why should we raise doubts about our stand? It is not my stand! It is India's stand; it is your stand; it is everybody's stand.

In other words, negotiations on these issues can be stalled by simply expedient of refusing to agree on the modalities of negotiations. So, not only for negotiations, for modalities too consensus is necessary.

I would now like to quote from *The Guardian*. *The Guardian* is a much-respected paper in the United Kingdom. Actually this newspaper cutting was sent to me by hon. Member of Parliament Shri Ahmed who was in London at that time. I would only quote a few words. It says, "But the most dramatic demonstration of the new power of the developing countries came on the last day when India succeeded in leading a rebellion against the EU's insistence on widening Doha Round."

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Will you please yield for a while?

We understand your difficulties. We understand what has been the achievement. But we do not understand as to why certificates given by others are being quoted on the floor of the House. We would like to know as to what is actually achieved, based on the facts. You convince us based on the information which is available with you, not on the basis of certificates given by others.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Sometimes people do not trust us. That is why I have to give certification. If you do not believe us, at least believe somebody who is there not in the country.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : We would like to believe you rather than others.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Thank you. Then, that criticism was not at all necessary.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Please tell us what you want to. Do not read out those things.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would close my argument.

Doha is behind us now. What we need is some kind of a development coalition, as Shri Chennithala said.

Probably Shri Chennithala would be interested in rubber. So, while ban on import of free natural rubber for and advance licence continues, they will now get natural rubber from domestic sources through STC, with STC getting the deemed export benefit of Rs.3.50 per kilogram. To keep track of imports, Kolkata and Visakhapatnam are made the only ports through which imported rubber can come into India. Then, it has been made mandatory for natural rubber importers to register themselves with Rubber Board. The imports are coming without any standards. Specific BI on quality of domestic rubber will be made applicable to imported rubber also. Sorry for that digression.

Sir, Doha is behind us. Today we are here and tomorrow somebody else may come. But we should have some kind of a consensus. What is the use of building a development alliance with other countries? First let us create a development alliance inside this House. Let all parties cooperate together.

When the Cabinet Committee on WTO decided about the mandate to be given to us, hon. Prime Minister asked us to keep the country's flag flying. When there was a crisis in Doha, I telephoned him. He asked me to be firm. We

stood firm and we kept the flag flying high. Therefore, I would say that we should cooperate with each other cutting across party lines. Negotiations will start soon and they will come to an end by 2005. I seek your cooperation.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Has any self-critical review been made about style of negotiations, about *modus operandi*, about preparations for the negotiations?

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Yes. I consulted all the parties.

Actually, what did I represent? I represented the stake-holders' view of India. Who are the stake holders? They are: Members of Parliament; our polity; our business and our agriculture. We did our duty. We should all see that India succeeds.

Therefore, I want your cooperation. Let us all cooperate and get success for India in the coming years. We have got still five more years, probably. Uruguay Round took eight years; Tokyo Round took six years and this may go on for 10 years. Therefore, let us all work together.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Mr. Minister, would you accept the suggestion of Shrimati Shyama Singh that we have a Parliamentary Committee on WTO.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: In fact, there is already a Joint Parliamentary Committee on WTO.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : There is no such Committee. There is one Joint Parliamentary Consultative Committee dealing with it.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: No. There is a separate Committee on WTO consisting of Members from Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I think, Mr. Minister, you are referring to the Standing Committee on Commerce.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: No, that is a different Committee. On WTO alone, we have a Joint Parliamentary Committee of which, subject to correction, Shri Sikandar Bhakt is the Chairman.

SHRIMATI SHYAMA SINGH : Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, the House stands adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. tomorrow, the 11th December, 2001.

19.51 hrs

**The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock
on Tuesday, December 11, 2001/Agrahayana 20, 1923 (Saka)**
