

Fourteenth Loksabha

Session : 6

Date : 07-12-2005

Participants : [Panda Shri Prabodh](#),[Singh Shri Ajit Kumar](#),[Swain Shri M.A. Kharabela](#),[Mistry Shri Madhusudan Devram](#),[Pal Shri Rupchand](#),[Singh Shri Mohan](#),[Yadav Shri Devendra Prasad](#),[Kuppusami Shri C.](#),[Patil Shri Annasaheb](#),[Rao Shri K. Chandra Shekhar](#),[Mahtab Shri Bhartruhari](#),[Dhindsa Shri Sukhdev Singh](#),[Ramadass Prof. M.](#),[Veerendra Kumar Shri M. P.](#),[Rathod Shri Harisingh Nasaru](#),[Chinta Mohan Dr.](#),[Barman Shri Hiten](#),[Thomas Shri P.C.](#),[Yadav Shri Ram Kripal](#),[Yerrannaidu Shri Kinjarapu](#),[Kamal Nath Shri](#)

>

Title : Discussion regarding role of India in WTO with particular reference to the forthcoming Sixth Ministerial Conference of WTO in Hong Kong.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the House will take up item number 17 - discussion under Rule 193 regarding role of India in WTO with particular reference to the forthcoming 6th Ministerial Conference of WTO in Hong Kong.

Shri Prabodh Panda to speak.

SHRI PRABODH PANDA Sir, at the very outset, I thank you very much for giving me the opportunity for discussing on the role of India in WTO with particular reference to the forthcoming Sixth Ministerial conference of WTO in Hong Kong. ... (*Interruptions*) Our distinguished hon. Minister is very much busy in talking with other Ministers. So, how can I draw his attention to this subject? ... (*Interruptions*) It is very regrettable. ... (*Interruptions*) Sir, I draw the kind attention of the hon. Minister through you.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI KAMAL NATH): I am listening.

SHRI PRABODH PANDA : It was expected that the distinguished hon. Minister, Shri Kamal Nath, would issue a White Paper on this matter earlier. I found in several newspapers that hon. Minister has said that he is going to play an important role in respect of our country in the forthcoming Summit based on the consensus. Yes, I do admit that there is a consensus. But the consensus was there that before going to Hong Kong, the concerned Ministry should bring out a White Paper or a draft paper so that the consensus could be achieved based on that. I think he did not take it into cognisance, rather it was ignored. So, I must tell you that this is a very sorry state of affairs.

14.23 hrs.

(Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan *in the Chair*)

The matter is taken up for discussion today while not even a week is remaining for the commencement of the Sixth Ministerial Conference of WTO in

Hongkong. We have just heard from the hon. Minister, Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmuni that the hon. Minister is going tomorrow itself to Hong Kong for attending the business of this Summit. ... (*Interruptions*)

Since it was revealed that WTO is an instrument to maintain the corporate hegemony of the global North over the global South, the world-wide protests were there against the WTO negotiations by the global civil societies and the world witnessed side-by-side that negotiations failed in Seattle, Doha and even in Cancun.

What is expected from our country? India's long-term interests are best served by making the common cause with the developing countries. The formation of G-20 and G-33 at the time of Ministerial Conference in Cancun in 2003 was a positive step. Our country is a founder of the G-20 countries. I must appreciate it. It is expected that our country will lead not only G-20 countries but also lead the developing countries and stand on the occasion to face the monopolistic design of the developed countries[\[R34\]](#).

But, Sir, the subsequent events, specially, India becoming a part of the five interested parties are to be seen here. It is clear that there are two sides in the WTO. One is the developed countries and the other is the developing countries. One is North and the other is South. Our country has become a part of the five interested parties – that is USA,

European Union, Australia, Brazil and our own country. This is not understood. Its role in bringing about the July framework agreement is to be seen. India is co-chairing the Service Group with the USA and maintaining silence in regard to the attempts made by the developed countries; but nothing has been raised regarding the commitments to the unity of the developing countries.

That is why, my submission is that our country should play a proactive role in the WTO Ministerial. What we have noticed earlier should not be repeated. Our country should be bold enough in this and should stand on the occasion on the

point. Due to paucity of time I do not want to elaborate all my points covering all the aspects in this regard. I am particularly confining myself to the Agreement on Agriculture. I think, this is the core of the negotiations in the WTO Meet. This is the opportunity. This opportunity should be utilised properly by our country and enough pressure should be mounted against the monopoly of the capitalist forces for their commitment for the developing countries in regard to the three pillars – market access, export subsidies and domestic support. These are the three pillars. On these three pillars the commitment for the developing countries by the developed countries should be made and enough pressure should be mounted on this point.

It is in the interest of our citizens that our Government should pull out agriculture from WTO negotiations. When it was included in the WTO, at that time it was told that agriculture was drafted in the WTO for the interest of our country, for the interest of our peasant community. But what is the result? What is happening is just contrary to that. There is a need to examine the outcome of that Agreement on Agriculture, AOA as compared with the promise that was given in terms of benefits of the developing countries.

The basic principles were enunciated in the Preamble. I am quoting :

“The parties to this Agreement, recognising that their relations in the field of and economic endeavour should be conducted with a view to raising standards of living, ensuring full employment and a large and steadily growing volume of real income and effective demand, and expanding the production of and trade in goods, and services, while allowing for the optimal

use of the world's resources in accordance with the objective of sustainable development, seeking both to protect and preserve the environment and to enhance the means of doing so in a manner consistent with their respective needs and concerns at different levels of development[[krr35](#)].”

Sir, in the 2001 Doha Declaration it is already mentioned that :

“We reaffirm that the provision of SDT is an integral part of the WTO agreement. We, therefore, agree that all SDT provisions shall be reviewed with a view to strengthening them and making them more precise, effective and operational.”

This should be reviewed, and there is also a need to examine the outcome of AOA in relation to the promise that was given in terms of benefits for the developing countries. I am only mentioning some of the points, and giving some suggestions. I am not elaborating all the points here because of paucity of time.

All export subsidies including export credit guarantee and export insurance by the developed countries should be eliminated. We should also demand to drop the blue box from all the places where this magic box is being used. The developed countries are using these magic boxes, namely, the blue boxes and green boxes to provide enough subsidies in agriculture. So, the blue boxes, in any form, should be dropped. I am also saying this because most green box measures are indeed distorting. We should raise the demand for elimination of these magic boxes considering the vital role that agriculture is playing in providing livelihood to a large majority of the workforce in the developing countries.

The developed countries continue to give heavy subsidy in agriculture and trade. This fact is now revealed. What would be the role of our country? I do not know what all suggestions are being made in it. The hon. Minister is present here, and I would request him to kindly tell us on this issue also.

What are the subsidies that are being given? The United States expressed its willingness to reduce the trade distorting support by 60 per cent provided three conditions were met. Firstly, the European Union would have to reduce its support by 75 per cent. Secondly, the spending on blue box support should be kept at 2.5 per cent of the value of agricultural production. Thirdly, there should not be any limit on the green box opening. The WTO Members are not required to limit their

spending on subsidies, which can be included in either the blue box or the green box [\[ak36\]](#). This is their stand. The USA should, therefore, have ensured that it would not only be able to return 70 per cent of its domestic support first in the Green Box. It would also succeed in providing more than five billion dollars in the form of Blue Box support. How far are we going to put pressure on them so that this box system would be eliminated and they would be forced to decline their subsidies? This is a matter of great concern. I think the Minister will explain everything here.

If developed countries have a right to provide huge subsidies for their domestic production in agriculture, the developing countries also have their rights. It is the right of the developing countries to impose quantitative restrictions on imports to safeguard the livelihood of three billion peasants. This should be enshrined as an integral part of the Agreement on Agriculture. The quantitative restrictions system is withdrawn. That should be reinstated. If developed countries have the right to provide huge subsidies, developing countries also have their own right to impose quantitative restrictions. This point should be taken note of. Our hon. Minister should press on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Panda, how long will you take?

SHRI PRABODH PANDA : I will take 20 minutes more, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You do not have that much of time. There are many speakers and they may not get time to speak. Please conclude in five minutes. Otherwise, there will not be much participation.

SHRI PRABODH PANDA : All right, Sir.

Developing countries should be enlisted to provide subsidies for domestic products for domestic consumption in order to ensure food security. Developing countries should be allowed to use the Special Safeguard Mechanism (SSM) in agricultural commodities. This is very important. This time I think our Minister is also interested in putting all these items here.

There should be expansion of TRQ maintained by developing countries beyond the levels earmarked for specific countries and should be available to all countries without discrimination. There are many devices and many avenues being resorted to by the developed countries. Various non-tariff barriers imposed by developed countries also need to be eliminated.

Under S&D provisions, developing countries may provide export subsidies especially for adoption of higher technology, adoption of product and process standards as well as to compensate for various handicaps, for financing, guarantees and insurance in respect of product exports [\[KMR37\]](#).

I am coming to another point. Today, I have noticed in the national newspapers the statement by the hon. Minister that our country will not be allowed to be the dumping ground of other countries. But what is happening? See the impact of the WTO on India's agriculture in the earlier days. It has not only been studied by us but also by many experts and intellectuals. The acting Director of the Delhi-based National Centre for Agriculture, Economic and Policy Research has found that the first three years after the implementation of the WTO agreement, we witnessed a major spurt in the agricultural exports. The study estimates that the annual import of agricultural goods rose from \$1.190 million in the three years preceding the WTO to \$1.996 million in the first triennium after the WTO. In the same period, export increased from \$3.725 million to \$6.530 million. But the favourable trend in the initial years of the WTO did not last long. This is what I want to underline.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have covered all the important points.

SHRI PRABODH PANDA : In the next three years, we have witnessed a hopping rise in imports and slight decline in exports. What does this fact reveal? This reveals that imports is improving and the export is declining. Whether we like it or not, whether our country wants it or not, the policy pursued so far has made our country the dumping ground of the developed country. So, India should say in concrete terms that as to whether it is in Group-5 interest parties or it will lead the G-20 developed countries. India should lead the G-20 countries. India should play a pro-active or lead role. It should play a leading stand so that developing countries can stand on the occasion against the hegemony and designs of the capitalist countries.

I would like to say that our country will not follow the footsteps of the earlier Government. Expectation from the UPA Government is much more. The UPA Government has given the commitments to the peasants of our country. The UPA Government has to play an active role. I think, it will not follow the footsteps of the earlier NDA Government, which have succumbed to the pressure of the US hegemony. So many points are there to be raised. A number of questions have been raised about the role of India in regard of the WTO Summit. I hope the Minister will clear it, and he would take the bold stand. The whole nation is watching. I think, he would not do injustice to the nation. He would not do injustice to the billions of peasants of our country, and fight boldly and stand correctly against the hegemonic designs of the capitalist countries. With these words, I conclude [\[R38\]](#).

श्री अजित कुमार सिंह सभापति महोदय, माननीय मंत्री जी देश की तरफ से जो वहां कल भाग लेने जा रहे हैं, इसके लिए मैं उन्हें बधाई देता हूं। मैं अपने आप को रैस्ट्रिक्ट करके केवल एग्रीकल्चर पर ही, चूंकि डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. पर चर्चा है, इसलिए उसी पर अपने आप को सीमित रखूंगा। माननीय मंत्री जी का मैं ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहूंगा कि जो डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. है, आज यह किसानों का देश है और इस हाउस में भी 70 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा किसानों के प्रतिनिधि हैं। अगर देखा जाए तो टैक्नीकली पांच साल से इस देश में डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. पर चर्चाएं चल रही हैं लेकिन जब भी चर्चा होती है तो यह केवल इंटरलैक्चुअल्स और एयरकंडीशंड फाइव स्टार होटलों तक ही सीमित होती हैं। आज किसानों के मन में एक डर लगा हुआ है कि यह जो ब्लू बॉक्स है, यह जो ग्रीन बॉक्स है, आखिर हमारा भाग्य इन बक्सों में क्यों बंद रखा गया है ?

मैं आपके माध्यम से दो-तीन बिन्दुओं पर चर्चा करना चाहूंगा। अगर आप देखें, जैसे कि हमारे साथी इस पर विस्तार से चर्चा नहीं कर पाए, इस देश में पल्सेज और ऑयल सीड्स का भारी अभाव है। देश का जो लक्ष्य है कि गेहूं, चावल को छोड़कर हमें दलहन और तिलहन का उत्पादन बढ़ाना है। लेकिन जब से डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. आया है, हमने करीब-करीब 4000 करोड़ का विगत तीन-चार सालों में बाहर से दलहन और तिलहन इम्पोर्ट किया है। एक तरफ हमारे देश में दलहन और तिलहन का अभाव है और दूसरी तरफ जो हमारा कोर्स ग्रेन है, भंडारण पड़ा हुआ है और एक तरफ हम फॉरेन एक्सचेंज बाहर से इम्पोर्ट कर रहे हैं, दूसरी तरफ हमारा जो अपना कोर्स ग्रेन है, भंडारण है, वह पंजाब और हरियाणा में सड़ रहा है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहूंगा कि यह जो टैरिफ बैरियर आपने लगाया है, तीन साल पहले जो मुझे जानकारी है, 70 प्रतिशत का आपने टैक्स लगाया है जिसको आप 150 प्रतिशत तक बढ़ा सकते हैं। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि किसके प्रैशर में कोलालामपुर से इम्पोर्ट हो रहा है, यह आप बताएं। हमारे देश में क्यों इम्पोर्ट को इतना बढ़ावा दिया जा रहा है जबकि दूसरी तरफ हमारे देश में खाद्यान्न सड़ रहे हैं। इसलिए मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा और विशोकर मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान इस तरफ आकृष्ट करना चाहूंगा कि दलहन और तिलहन पर जिस तरह से हम इम्पोर्ट कर रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ हमारे खाद्यान्न अपने देश में सड़ रहे हैं। एक तरफ हमारा फॉरेन एक्सचेंज बाहर जा रहा है, दूसरी तरफ सरकारी खरीददारी... (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Your time is over. Please conclude. You wanted to go at 2.45 p.m.

श्री अजित कुमार सिंह : एक तरफ हम सरकारी खरीददारी कर रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ हमारा अपना खाद्यान्न हमारे गोदामों में पड़ा सड़ रहा है। उसे भी हम अच्छे रेट पर नहीं बेच पा रहे हैं। इसीलिए मेरा आपसे आग्रह होगा कि इस विषय पर विशोकर आप ध्यान दें। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं और आशा करता हूं कि आप देश के हित और किसानों के हित को ध्यान में रखेंगे।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Swain to speak.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN Sir, can I speak from this seat?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, please. Normally, you should speak from your seat. But I want to save the time of the House. You can continue from here[\[p39\]](#).

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not have much of an expectation from the forthcoming Sixth Ministerial Conference of WTO in Hongkong. It is because, since the days of Doha Conference, practically nothing has happened. Since the days of Doha Conference, practically the negotiations are running at a snail's pace. If this continues, this would lead to a lot of frustration among the developing countries and the least developed countries(LDCs).

A perception is gradually gaining ground that the WTO has become a mechanism of the developed countries and the countries of the West, to get market access, which has already saturated in their countries, to the developing countries and to the least developed countries. But we are all very strongly with the Government of India. There is no question of any party just opposing the activities of the Government. We are all with hon. Shri Kamal Nathji when he goes and fights for the cause of India. The Bhartiya Janata Party, the principal Opposition party is very strongly with him.

Sir, in my small speech, I would just like to seek some clarifications from the hon. Minister and I would make some suggestions. Every developed country in the world must understand that there should be a level playing field for everybody -- for the developed countries, for the developing countries and for the least developed countries.

Sir, on this, I am not much worried. It is because the developed countries are in no way in a position to push their market access to our country. I do not think that this would be possible. As a Member of the Steering Committee of the Parliamentary Forum on WTO, I was also present in the Cancun. We know, most of the resistance came, not from the developing country led by India but from the least developed countries. The real resistance came from the African countries, from the poorest of the poor countries, which

never had any courage to fight against economic imperialism of America. They raised their voice. It was the African countries, the have-nots, fought it out. Although we had a group of 21 – we led the G-21 nations – we were on the sidelines just watching the poor countries fighting the rich.

With regard to agriculture, the bound rates are high and the actual rates are low. So, we have a lot of cushion. The bound rates, what we have, is actually low. So, whenever they ask us to reduce it, we have a cushion, and we can just adjust it. So, from that point of view, I do not have much of a fear. The only point is how to remove the trade disparity regarding domestic support.

I fully agree with the hon. Minister that there must be reciprocity in market access. Now, the point is how to ensure parallel elimination of all forms of export subsidies. I hope, the hon. Minister would just try to ascertain from the developed countries not only about the elimination of all forms of export subsidies but also with a credible end date. In the Doha Declaration, 31st December, 2001 was the end date. But where is that 31st December, 2001? Today, we are in December, 2005. Four years have already passed in the meantime[k40].

So, hon. Minister must ensure that there is an end-date and there should be convergence of some elements of discipline with respect to export credits, export credit guarantees and insurance programmes.

My next point is with regard to the identification of special products. That is one of the major points of mine. It should have some special mechanism; we are having altogether about 695 agricultural products; it has to be identified by the Government that of these 695 agricultural products we have, which are those specific products which will be endangered, if we enter into agricultural negotiation with other countries. The Government must ensure that and they must find it out.

The next point is this. My suggestion to the hon. Minister is that in India, in order to compete globally in the agricultural field, we must modernise agriculture. The investment in agriculture must be substantial – both public and private investments. Fifty to sixty crops should be identified; they should be protected because they are related to the livelihood of the people of this country. So, there should be absolutely no compromise on those 50-60 crops.

The farmers of this country should be taken into confidence. The hon. Minister must negotiate; he must talk to the farmers in different parts of this country, to ascertain which are those agricultural products which should be protected at any cost.

Take the example of soya bean. Soya bean in Madhya Pradesh is one of the major crops. If there is any compromise on soya bean, naturally, the farmers will be affected. I am giving the example of soya bean, but the hon. Minister should find out which are the other crops which should be protected.

As the hon. Member Shri Panda said sometime back, let us not depend on the conflict between the European Union and the Americans in the WTO. Let us not hope that they are at cross-purposes and so, we will get some advantage. All of a sudden, some day, we will find that they have come to some compromise or understanding. Let us not go into that; and let us see to it that we have protected our products and we should find that out.

My next point is – it is very important – about special and differential treatment. That was the advantage that we wanted to have and Doha Declaration very specifically mentions about those special and differential treatments. In those special and differential treatments, we have three pillars – domestic support, export competition and market access. The hon. Minister must ensure that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude. There are five speakers from the BJP and the time is 30 minutes put together.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : The first speaker from the 10-Member Party took about 25 minutes and you are not giving time for the 145-Member Party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are five speakers from your Party.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I do not think that they will get an opportunity, since you are saying that within two hours, it should be concluded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude because other hon. Members also may take time.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : With regard to cotton, I want to say something. In order to just protect only 25,000 cotton growers in the USA, four African countries will be ruined. So, there must be some domestic reforms[\[R41\]](#).

To enhance the productivity and efficiency, there must be domestic efforts to reform. These should be ensured.

With regard to the service negotiations, my request to the hon. Minister is that if the developed countries give ambitious offers on MOD-I, that is cross border supply of services such as outsourcing and MOD-IV, movement of the professionals, then only we could come to some sort of negotiations with others.

Environmental negotiation is another vital point. What is environment doing in the trade? Why should environment be brought into trade? Taking this example, all the Western countries have put all sorts of barriers against the products being sent from our country to them. Glaciers are melting, Arctic is melting. In such a devastating environmental situation, USA is not signing the Kyoto protocol. They still say that they will try to bring in environmental angle to these trade negotiations, which we very strongly object to.

What measures are being taken to integrate small and vulnerable economies into the multilateral trading system without creating a sub category of WTO members? That is one of the questions I would put to the hon. Minister. He should try to ascertain it. How to ensure the increase of flow of technology to the

developed countries? The flow of technology is one of the major points which was raised in the Doha Declaration. Has anybody ensured as to whether there has been any flow of technology or there has been any increase in trade-related technology assistance. That was also one of the areas which could have been dealt with. How to bring about meaningful integration of LDCs into multilateral trading system? How to ensure it? In order to integrate the least developed countries into the multilateral system, there must be skill development and capacity building among those countries and to secure adequate level of funding for trade related capacity building. The hon. Minister must ensure that there must be adequate funding source to the least developed countries. The Minister must ensure adequate funding source by the developed countries.

I must ask another specific question. In Cancun, Pakistanis were saying that theirs' is not an LDC country. They were saying that they were somewhere between the developed and LDC countries. Have they found any such sub category for them? They were demanding that they did not want to be categorised as LDCs with the poor African countries. What has happened to that? I would like the Minister to respond on this.

In Cancun, every day in our hotel where we stayed, I found that India took the lead. The representatives of other countries were coming to our hotel. Representatives from South Africa, Brazil, Argentina and even China used to come to our hotel and India took the lead of G-21 countries.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : You may leave some points for other speakers also.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, I am on my last point. I am also a Member of the BAC, which is scheduled at 1500 hours. So, I will have to go.

Late Murasoli Maran made a very valiant effort in Doha. He safeguarded the interest of India but at that time he was alone. In Cancun, India took the lead. I am not saying that you are not doing anything but I would like to know from the

principal Party, what efforts has it taken in this regard because we will have to form a group with all these developing countries and even the least developed countries to fight it out because single-handedly it may not be possible on the part of India to fight for it. With these words, I thank you.

SHRI MADHUSUDAN MISTRY Sir, I rise to speak on this motion regarding the forthcoming ministerial meeting in Hong Kong. At the outset, I must congratulate the Minister of Commerce who had safeguarded the interest of the millions of people and the farmers of this country in the last WTO meeting. Not only that, he has provided even the lead on a number of issues. He has protected our agriculture. He did not enter into any kind of agreement or negotiations which may harm the interest of agriculture, small

industry, intellectual property rights. He even protected our traditional knowledge on which a number of countries are doing research and trying to show that there is an original invention. In fact, they are not declaring the name of the country from whom they acquired such a traditional knowledge. This is all for much of the apprehension of the people sitting on my right who have always raised some doubts. I am also very happy that the principal Opposition Party has done some constructive things today. They have not spent their time in disrupting the Parliament. So, I am really happy and hope that they would adopt this approach for the remaining days of the Session.

As you know, there are a number of issues which will be discussed in the forthcoming meeting in Hong Kong. They include Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Market Access, the trade related intellectual property rights, the trade environment and the services sector. A number of points have been made so far but I do not agree with all of them. I think Mr. Prabodh Panda has made a statement that the Minister was to make a reference to a White Paper. But the papers that I have do not mention anywhere that the Minister or the Ministry agreed to come out with a White Paper. I also congratulate the Minister for having a very wide range of consultations with the experts, institutions which are interested in WTO, NGOs which also have a large concern, academic and research institutions, etc. If I am not wrong I think the Left Parties have also submitted some 14-page proposal containing their concerns to the Ministry. If I am not correct, you can correct me. This is what I gathered from the newspaper reports. I am not making much of the points in the sense that some of the points have already been made. In fact, we have been pressurising G-20 and other G-33 countries that the developed countries should reduce their subsidies which include all kinds of subsidies, namely, export, green box and blue box. One of the things which I would like to say to the Minister since they have already given a presentation in the WTO is that the developed countries must reduce this in a very specified time limit which should be five years. The EU countries want more than 10 years or so. I think the developing countries must stick to this time limit which will give them much more leverage for negotiations with the developed countries. I agree with my colleague from Opposition that there are special items which have to be protected as far as agriculture is concerned. You know very well that this country is highly dependent on agriculture. Our growth rate also depends on agriculture because with the good monsoon the purchasing capacity of the farmers increases and as a result

the economy also gets a boost. Now any negotiations which may harm or may be detrimental to our agriculture and its progress in the country should be avoided. It is because agriculture labour and all other sectors are solidly dependent on agriculture alone. Take the example of myself[r42].

I hail from a artisans' community that includes people involved in professions like carpentry, building houses and such other things. The success of these professions are largely inter-dependent. The profession of one class of people of artisans flourish if the other related artisan groups are flourishing. One group gets work from another group. Their whole livelihood depends on having a good monsoon. A good monsoon brings good income to them in particular and to the rural economy in general. I am sure the future of these groups of people are safe in the hands of our very able Commerce Minister and he would negotiate in the best possible manner keeping their interest in view. I do not have much to say on the agriculture sector as such. All that I would like to submit is that we should stick to our position and stand that the Government has taken along with other developing countries of the world.

Sir, as far as accessing the non-agriculture market is concerned, it has rightly been said that it is not just one market as such, but the market of the entire developing countries of the world. It has been mentioned here as to whether we should think ten times before agreeing to lower our tariff on the bound items and as well as on bringing new items into the binding. I do not think we should be ashamed of saying, 'yes, we do have a high tariff'. It is because we want to push our domestic market and our domestic industries. But here a delicate balance has to be struck. On the one hand we would have to protect our agriculture and on the other hand we would have to see that our agricultural products get exported to other countries as well. A very delicate balance would have to struck while negotiating or making a presentation on this issue. We have to see how best it can be done with the G-20 countries and other developing countries of the world. I think, such a decision should best be left to the Commerce Minister because it would certainly depend on what kind of a situation will arise there on account of presentations being made by Ministers of other countries.

Sir, in regard to the service sector it has been stated that we need free flow of professional and intellectuals and the countries should open their borders if they want to access this market. I feel there would be much more pressure on us because of this. It is because the developing countries see in our country a tremendous possibility and opportunity for them in this regard. That is why we are likely to face a lot of pressure from those countries for opening up our market and lowering our tariff on their goods in this country as well as agricultural produce. I just wonder if such a thing happens and if a dairy industry enters the State of Gujarat, then the entire milk-cooperative of the State would simply collapse. We should stick to our stated position. It is because the interest of the country as a whole is supreme. By remaining within the framework of WTO we have to find out ways as to how best we could serve the interest of our farmers, intellectuals, small industries, artisans and so on. I think, that is what has to be negotiated. I am sure, the hon. Minister concerned is capable of doing that. I wish him success. He will bring good news when he came back from there and would certainly apprise us as to what had transpired in that conference in Hong Kong.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL Sir, this is a brief opportunity to express our views. Rather it is very brief. Even in a *pyjama* cricket, you have a certain number of overs by which you can plan your programme. But in this one and a half hours, I do not know how to start bowling and how to do the batting. Without wasting time, I shall directly come to the points.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): They are changing the rules of cricket now.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Is it that new rules are being framed in this one and a half hours?

This opportunity has given me some scope to make some observations on the situation and also make some suggestions as briefly as possible.

The Sixth Ministerial Conference is offering opportunities and also challenges and we should see as to how best we can use the opportunities and meet the challenges. But, as known to all of us, in this unequal world, equitable, non-discriminatory, multilateral trading system is a distant goal. From Cancun to Doha, when it was salvaged from total disaster, hopes have been raised. Just like a millennium development round, it was hoped Doha will provide opportunities for the developing and under-developed countries to develop and come at par with others and trade will offer that opportunity to develop like in poverty alleviation and all such measures. But as is shown in all this period, in this inequitable discriminatory unilateral world, it is not to be like that. What is happening? Commitments are being interpreted; confusion is being created; developed countries are backing out systematically with a pattern and promises are not being kept. If I have to sum up as to what is going to happen in Hong Kong, on the final draft that has come out, our hon. Minister has rightly commented that it is disappointing. Even Pascal Lami has been working out the arithmetic as two-third or something like that. But it all depends on how this World Trade Organisation itself and the deliberations particularly in Hong Kong are taken by the developing countries like the US and the EU. It is because the core issue is agriculture and at the central stage is the issue of farm subsidy, reduction of domestic support and export subsidy which the developed countries are evading in newer and newer dubious and innovative ways like from the Green Box to the Blue Box and from the Blue Box to somewhere else.

I suggest that some clarification should be sought on this concept of Green Box as to what do you mean by that. The original meaning is, when you are shifting from the Blue Box to the Green Box, you are availing the opportunity. On the one hand, they are reluctant to reduce the farm subsidy, domestic support and export subsidy which is huge as a result of which agriculture in different developing countries of the world are going to be ruined if the July package is to be taken into account. They are dragging their feet on the subsidy issue. On the other hand, they are very aggressive on the issue of industrial tariff and services. Now, we have got to be very cautious about agriculture and I have some suggestions to make.

Removal of Quantitative Restrictions was done and it may be said that, within the WTO framework, we cannot reintroduce Quantitative Restrictions. I will give you one

example of textiles and clothing. The quota system is persisting and with certain sorts of newer explanations, this is being continued. Why can it not be done like this? You know that as far as India is concerned, agriculture is not commercial as such. It is our livelihood and it is sustenance agriculture. On special products in terms of food security and rural economy, we must have autonomous selection of such rights as has been demanded by G-33 and we are a party to it[[bru43](#)].

The inequities and the imbalances that are there in the July Package should be sought to be removed as best as possible. I believe that the instrument of quantitative restriction is one such and removal of that quantitative restriction should be there. One can say that it is not compatible with the WTO framework and all that. But this is, in practice, continuing.

With regard to the special safeguards issue, particularly the special products issue and with regard to the NAMA, our suggestions will be that instead of the line-by-line stipulation, the average should be taken as the yardstick. After all, any commitment made to the WTO is irreversible.

About the bound-rate, if we make such a commitment of line-by-line stipulation, at a point of time, we will lose the autonomous right to go beyond that stipulation. In such a situation, the average – earlier also that was there – should be taken as the yardstick. We should not succumb to the western pressure. There is the pressure of the developed countries which are always playing a game to spit on the developing nations. It has been rightly mentioned that the Least Developed Countries sometimes feel let out, they are being ignored. In such a situation, what is happening? In the name of giving certain concessions to the Least Developing Countries, the developed countries are playing a very dirty game to divide the developing countries among themselves also between the developing countries and the Least Developing Countries.

About the Services Sector, as is known, India is most interested in MODE-I, that is, cross border terrorism including the BPO and, also, of course, MODE-IV – Movement of the Natural Persons. We do find that several measures are standing in our way to take

away the opportunities of the emerging economy, particularly the Free Movement of the Natural Persons, in the form of visa regulation and so many other things. Had I the time, I would have elaborated on them. It is known to you all.

About the Offer List, we have already made a suggestion that water, health and education should never be allowed to be incorporated in the List.

About the Financial Services, occasionally we find that the very important people, particularly the US and of course, the EU, are saying that India should open up its financial services sector. There is too much of pressure in the insurance and banking sectors. The previous Governments, in certain notifications, made certain things. For example, I can mention one or two things. In the name of sickness, the foreign banks can acquire 74 per cent of the equity in the private banks. It is a dangerous proposition. So also is the raising of the cap in respect of insurance.

There is privatisation of water. We do have our experience of Delhi and the surrounding places. We know how the foreign companies can play havoc with the life of the people in dealing with drinking water. So, it should never be allowed. There are certain other sensitive areas in the services sector like *quid pro quo*, trade-offs etc. Certainly, we have our demands in the areas of MODE-I and MODE-IV. But that does not mean that we shall compromise in such a manner that our other areas will suffer immensely and there will be damage to our basic culture, ethos and basic foundations of our economy and all these things.

I shall conclude with certain words of caution. What happens in the negotiations is the main thing. Sometimes, promises are made. I do not know whether he is in a mood to make any promise. But there are certain dos and don'ts [\[R44\]](#). Certain 'don'ts' are even after the allurements and the pressures. We should not surrender in terms of, say, for example, our basic needs about agriculture, our food security, our basic industrial needs. You open up and in the name of competition, as it is happening, after the removal of the quantitative restrictions our industries are suffering. The domestic industry is at the receiving end. So, our agriculture is totally different from the agriculture of the developed countries of the world which survive, patronise with huge quantum of subsidy which we cannot afford. Our agriculture is totally qualitatively different. So, taking into account,

remembering our situation, our ethos, our condition, our stage of development, nothing should be done. We should learn from the past. There have been compromises; there have been surrenders to pressure. The Government of India, its representatives, had acted in a manner which is really questionable but this Government, this Minister, and this Ministry has taken, I hope, lessons from the past. With the sort of experience and lessons we have drawn from our past experience, we shall be very careful, very cautious not to compromise any of the basic needs of this nation.

With these words I wish him success at Hong Kong. The Minister is here only. I wish the Minister and his delegation a grand success.

श्री मोहन सिंह सभापति महोदय, हांगकांग में समृद्ध देशों के मंत्रियों की विश्व व्यापार संगठन के तहत बैठक हो रही है। ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Minister has to attend the Rajya Sabha also.

श्री मोहन सिंह : महोदय, हम तो वैसे भी बहुत कम बोलते हैं। विश्व व्यापार संगठन में मंत्रियों की बैठक में जाने से पहले भारत के व्यापार मंत्री ने सभी दलों की कल और परसों सभा बुलाई थी और सभी दलों ने अपनी-अपनी राय दी थी। मुझे खुशी है कि संसद को भी विश्वास में लेने की मंत्री जी ने कोशिश की है। मैं जानता हूँ कि भारत का कोई भी व्यापार मंत्री हो, वह किसी भी विश्व व्यापार संगठन में भारत के हितों के खिलाफ काम नहीं करेगा। यह हमारी आंतरिक मान्यता है और इसीलिए हमारी अकेली पार्टी थी, जिसने श्री कमलनाथ की सार्वजनिक तौर पर व्यापार संगठन में उनकी पिछली भूमिका की प्रशंसा की थी। इसी विश्वास के साथ प्रशंसा की थी कि भविय में वे इसी तरह से भारत के हितों की हिफाजत करेंगे। दोहा से केनकन तक हमारा अनुभव है कि दुनिया के जितने भी विकसित देश हैं, व्यापारिक दृष्टि से छोटे देशों को बाजार और व्यापार में लूट का हिस्सा बनाना चाहते हैं, इसलिए वैट नैगोशिएशंस के बाद, डब्ल्यूटीओ का हिस्सा बनने के लिए भारत की दसवीं लोकसभा में प्रस्ताव आए थे, तब हम लोगों ने आशंकाएं व्यक्त की थीं कि दुनिया की गरीबी बढ़ेगी और गरीब देश लूट के शिकार होंगे। पूंजीशाही का नया औजार है - डब्ल्यूटीओ। दुनिया के पूंजीवादी देश समझ रहे हैं कि दुनिया को राजनीतिक उपनिवेशवाद के रूप में काबू करके

रखना आज की तारीख में संभव नहीं है, इसलिए वित्तीय रूप से गुलाम बना कर रखेंगे और विश्व बैंक तथा अंतरराष्ट्रीय मुद्रा को की सहमति ले कर, उनके द्वारा दिए गए खाके के अनुसार डब्ल्यूटीओ का ढांचा दुनिया ने स्वीकार किया। हमने दसवीं लोकसभा में सुझाव दिए थे कि दो चीजों पर संकट आ सकते हैं। खास तौर से स्वास्थ्य तथा दवा पर और उसके साथ-साथ कृषि भी है। यदि इन्हें हम विश्व व्यापार के हिस्से से अलग कर दें तो भारत के हितों के अनुकूल [\[145\]](#)।

महोदय, उस समय दी गई चेतावनी आज की तारीख में सही साबित हो रही है। इस संसद में एक बहस होनी चाहिए कि विश्व व्यापार का हिस्सा होने के बाद, डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. का हिस्सा होने के बाद, भारत की अर्थव्यवस्था को क्या लाभ पहुंचा, क्या नुकसान हुआ और इसका एक लेखा-जोखा, एक बैलेंस-शीट, व्हाइट पेपर के रूप में सदन में प्रस्तुत किया जाए और सदन उस पर चर्चा करे, जिससे यह निश्चित कर सकें कि किन-किन क्षेत्रों को हमें विश्व व्यापार का हिस्सा नहीं बनने देना चाहिए।

सभापति महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप अपने अनुभव से देख सकते हैं कि विश्व बैंक ने नई अर्थव्यवस्था का जो मूल्यांकन किया है उसके अनुसार दुनिया की 6 अरब आबादी में से 2 अरब आबादी गरीब, भिखमंगी, नंगी और भूखी है और उनके अनुसार इसमें से सबसे अधिक आबादी, तकरीबन 60 करोड़, अकेले चीन और हिन्दुस्तान में बसती है।

महोदय, हमारे वित्त मंत्री कहते रहे हैं कि हमारे देश की अमीरी बढ़ रही है और अपनी पीठ ठोकते रहे हैं। हम अपनी तरफ से कहते हैं कि अगर हम अपने देश की जो आमदनी है, जो पूंजी है वह 8 अथवा 10 प्रतिशत के हिसाब से बढ़ाएं, तो हम इतने समय के बाद दुनिया के विकसित देशों में शामिल हो जाएंगे। हमारे वित्त मंत्री बहुत प्रसन्नता के साथ कहते हैं कि अब अमरीका, जापान और जर्मनी की बजाय दुनिया में चीन और हिन्दुस्तान का जमाना आने वाला है, क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान तरक्की कर रहा है। इसमें हमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं हो सकता है, लेकिन गरीबी के मामले में, बीमारी के मामले में और भूमिहीनों के मामले में भी हमारा देश तरक्की कर रहा है। यह भी एक सच्चाई है। इस पर भी हमें सोचना चाहिए।

महोदय, हमारे देश में कृषि लगातार डेढ़ फीसदी से दो फीसदी के हिसाब से घटती जा रही है। हमारे देश की अर्थव्यवस्था में कृषि की हिस्सेदारी लगातार कम हो रही है। उसके क्या कारण हैं ? मौसम भी ठीक हो रहा है, प्रति हैक्टेयर किसान के निवेश में भी वृद्धि हो रही है, लेकिन प्रति हैक्टेयर उपज में कमी आ रही है ? उसका एक प्रमुख कारण है कि जो विदेशी उर्वरक, पैस्टीसाइड्स और विदेशी बीज है, वह हमारी परिस्थितियों के अनुकूल नहीं है।

हमारे देश की प्रति हैक्टेयर उपज में कमी के लिए उसका बहुत बड़ा रोल है और यही कारण है कि हमारे देश में प्रति हैक्टेयर उपज में लगातार कमी हो रही है।

महोदय, इसी सदन में, लोक सभा में, मैंने एक सवाल किया था कि अपने देश के उर्वरक के कारखाने बन्द कर के बाहर से उर्वरक आयात करने का क्या औचित्य है ? उस ओर से, सदन में प्रधान मंत्री महोदय की ओर से दिए गए जवाब पर मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ, जब उन्होंने कहा कि अपने देश में उत्पादित यूरिया महंगा पड़ता है और विदेश से मंगाना सस्ता। इसलिए हमारे लिए अपने उर्वरक कारखानों को चलाने से अच्छा है कि हम विदेश से यूरिया आयात करें। यही सोच हमारे देश की कृषि को मार रही है।

महोदय, दुनिया के अलग-अलग देश, अपने-अपने संगठन बनाकर अपने हितों की रक्षा में जुटे हुए हैं। किसी ने 'आसियान' के नाम पर, किसी ने 'यूरोपियन कॉमन मार्केट' के नाम पर संगठन बना लिए हैं और वे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मंचों पर सामूहिक तौर पर संघर्ष करते हैं। वे किसी भी कीमत पर अपने देश में दी जाने वाली कृषि की छूट और एक्सपोर्ट सब्सिडी में किसी भी तरह की कोई कटौती करने वाले नहीं हैं। इसलिए स्वयं उनके देशों में इस बात पर तनाव है। ब्रिटेन के अंदर तूफान उठ रहा है कि हमारे देश में कृषि क्षेत्र में जो सब्सिडी है, वह बेल्जियम और जर्मनी के मुकाबले कम है। यूरोपियन कॉमन मार्केट के देशों में इस बात पर संघर्ष होता रहता है कि सब्सिडी का जो रूप पोलैंड, बेल्जियम और जर्मनी में है, यदि उसे कम नहीं किया गया, तो ब्रिटेन की खेती प्रभावित होगी, लेकिन जब ये देश अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मंचों पर बात करते हैं, तो ठीक इसके विपरीत तर्क देते हैं। दूसरे देशों के अंदर सब्सिडी घटाने पर जोर देते हैं, लेकिन अपने देश के अंदर सब्सिडी घटाने का विरोध करते हैं। मुझे खुशी है कि हमारे देश ने, दुनियाभर के दबाव के बावजूद, अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति के भारत आगमन के बावजूद, किसी ऐसी स्वीकृति पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं किए जिससे देश के हितों पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़े।

महोदय, मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हम लोगों की पहले से जो राय है, उस पर मंत्री जी विचार करते हुए, जैसे पहले की बैठकों में उन्होंने भारत के हितों की हिफाजत के लिए संघर्ष किया है, उसी प्रकार हांगकांग में होने वाली बैठक में भी वे भारत के हितों को पेश करेंगे और उनकी रक्षा करेंगे [rpm46]। उसी मजबूती के साथ हमारे हितों की हिफाजत करेंगे। मेरा दूसरा सुझाव यह है कि हमारे देश की कृषि के ऊपर जो विदेशी आक्रमण है, उसकी हिफाजत के लिए इस देश की संसद और सरकार क्या करे, इस बैठक के बाद उस पर यहां विचार होना चाहिए। सरकार को अपनी राय इस संसद के अंदर देकर सांसदों के सुझाव लेने चाहिए। इन्हीं चंद सुझावों के साथ मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Hon. Members, there is a request from the hon. Minister. He will reply after the speech of Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav, because he is otherwise busy. So, if the House agrees, I have no objection.

SHRI P.C. THOMAS (MUVATTUPUZHA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have all given notices and are awaiting our turn to speak. How can he reply to the debate now?... (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI KAMAL NATH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, if the House so desires, what I could do is, I will go to Rajya Sabha, make my statement there, finish with clarifications and then come back to reply here.

SHRI P.C. THOMAS : Yes, that is the best thing.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY (PURI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, all the parties should participate in the debate and then only he can reply.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: That is exactly what I am saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN : If the House agrees, he can go to Rajya Sabha and return for giving reply here.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not good. Whenever the House has taken up a discussion on a subject, the Minister should not have a discussion on the same subject in the other House. That is not proper. He cannot be present in both the Houses at the same time.

Mr. Minister, you can entrust the responsibility of making notes of points made by Members to your Minister of State and go to Rajya Sabha, but the reply must be given by you. We have no objection to your going to Rajya Sabha now. The sentiments expressed in the House must be reflected in the Hong Kong Conference also.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How did it happen? When an important discussion is there in this House, if the concerned Minister is not present in the House, it is not a good thing.

SHRI S.K. KHARVENTHAN (PALANI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, an assurance has been given in the House that the Tamil Nadu issue would be taken up at 4 o'clock. So, it should be taken up at 4 o'clock. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is agreed.

Mr. Devendra Prasad Yadav, you may speak now.

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव सभापति महोदय, आज हांग-कांग की बैठक में जाने से पहले, सर्वोच्च सदन में WTO पर जो चर्चा हो रही है, यह विषय केवल राष्ट्रीय महत्व का नहीं है, बल्कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर अपने राष्ट्र के व्यापक हित और दुनिया के विकासशील देशों के हितों को भी रखने की बात है।

सभापति महोदय, अभी तक जो बहस हुई है - चाहे दोहा हो या केनकन हो, उसमें खास कर कृषि मुख्य बिन्दु रहा है। केन्द्र बिन्दु, कृषि का मुद्दा हर एक वार्ताओं में केन्द्र में रहा है, चाहे दोहा हो या केनकन की वार्ता हो। इस पूरे सौदे की बजाए कोई सौदा न हो, वह ज्यादा बेहतर है। मैं यह राय इसलिए देना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि देश के व्यापक हित में ऐसा कोई समझौता न हो, जिसमें हमारे देश के हितों के साथ कोई समझौता हो जाए। WTO के, खास कर एग्रीकल्चर नेगोसिएशन में जो मुद्दे हैं, उनमें तीन प्रमुख मुद्दे हैं - डोमेस्टिक सपोर्ट, मिनिमम सपोर्ट प्राइस, मार्केट एक्सेस और एक्सपोर्ट कम्पीटिशन [\[R47\]](#)। इसमें खासकर विश्व में जो भी किसानों की संख्या होगी, लेकिन हमारे देश भारत के किसानों की संख्या सबसे अधिक है। भारत में 65 करोड़ से अधिक लोग किसान हैं, गरीब लोग हैं, खेती करने वाले लोग हैं, उनकी आजीविका कृषि पर आधारित है, भारत की अर्थव्यवस्था किसानों पर ही निर्भर है। भारत में प्रति कृषक परिवार मुश्किल से 100-125 रुपये सब्सिडी मिलती है, जबकि अमेरिका अपने किसानों को इण्डियन करेन्सी में लगभग 21 हजार रुपये प्रति कृषक परिवार सब्सिडी देता है। यह सब्सिडी इनपुट्स के नाम पर, इम्प्लीमेंट्स के नाम पर तथा फूड आदि के नाम पर दी जाती है, लेकिन अमेरिका अपने देश में सब्सिडी को कम नहीं करना चाहता। ऐसी स्थिति में जो अमेरिका जैसे विकसित देश हैं, वे विकासशील देशों में अपना मार्केट बनाना चाहते

हैं, हिन्दुस्तान जैसे विकासशील देशों को इण्टरनेशनल मार्केट बनाना चाहते हैं, यह मूल सवाल है। मैं इसीलिए इस बात पर जोर देना चाहता हूँ कि अमेरिका जैसे देश का अनाज जब भारत में उपलब्ध होगा तो वह सस्ती दर पर होगा। भारत के मूल्य से वह सस्ती दर पर उपलब्ध हो जायेगा, क्योंकि वहाँ बहुत ज्यादा सब्सिडी है। सब्सिडीयुक्त अमेरिका और यूरोपीय संघ का अनाज भारत में आता रहेगा तो भारतीय कृषि उत्पादन के मुकाबले में वह उत्पाद सस्ता हो जायेगा। इससे निश्चित रूप से भारत के किसानों की आजीविका पर कुप्रभाव पड़ेगा, इसीलिए भारत के दरवाजे विदेशी कृषि उत्पादन के लिए, फूड प्रोडक्ट्स के लिए नहीं खोलने चाहिए। भारत को विदेशी अनाज पर काउण्टर वेलिंग ड्यूटी लगानी चाहिए। मैं इसीलिए मांग करना चाहता हूँ, इस पर स्ट्रेस देना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि पिछली बार जब दोहा में डिक्लेरेशन हुआ था और दोहा के बाद कैनकुन में मैं क्या कहा गया: “The key concern of India in agriculture has been adequately safeguarded in the Declaration.” सेफगार्ड क्या हुआ, वह मैं बताना चाहता हूँ, जो बहुत ही कौतुक है। “We commit ourselves to comprehensive negotiations and add substantial improvements in market...reduction with a view to phase out all forms of export subsidy and substantial reduction in trade distorting domestic support.” ट्रेड डिस्टोर्टिंग डोमेस्टिक सपोर्ट किसे कहा गया है, जो भारत मिनिमम सपोर्ट प्राइस अपने किसानों को देता है, जो हमारे यहाँ समर्थन मूल्य है, उसे ट्रेड डिस्टोर्टिंग डोमेस्टिक सपोर्ट कहा गया है। यह भाग है, यह डैफिनीशन दोहा में हुई। कैनकुन में बहुत जोर लगाया, लेकिन खोदा पहाड़ निकली चुहिया, मैं श्री मुरासोली मारन जी को बहुत धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ, अब तो वे दिवंगत हो गये, उन्होंने कैनकुन में भारत के पक्ष को मजबूती से रखा था। लेकिन उसका रिजल्ट क्या आया, उसका रिजल्ट नहीं आ पा रहा है। कहीं न कहीं सांप 1991 में बिल में घुस गया, अब हमें इस बात को कहने में कोई हर्ज नहीं है कि हम लोग लाठी पीट रहे हैं। सांप जब अन्दर घुस गया तो हम ऊपर से लाठी मार रहे हैं तो सांप को लगेगी क्या?

डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में हमारे देश के व्यापक हितों को कैसे संरक्षित किया जाये, कैसे सेफगार्ड किया जाये, यह बहुत जटिल सवाल है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसके लिए देश को, संसद को, करोड़ों लोगों को और विकासशील देशों को खड़ा होना होगा। सभी को अभी भी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर एकजुट होने की जरूरत है। इसीलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कई तरह के दरवाजे खुल गये हैं, जैसे क्वाण्टिटेटिव रैस्ट्रिक्शंस उठा ली गई हैं, बहुत ज्यादा रास्ते पहले निकाल लिए कि हम लोगों का कैसे एक्सप्लायटेशन किया जाये, इसका इन्तजाम पहले से किया हुआ है। इसीलिए मैं इस बात को कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब इस तरह के शब्द का इस्तेमाल कि ट्रेड डिस्टोर्टिंग डोमेस्टिक सपोर्ट एम.एस.पी. को माना जायेगा। आज एम.एस.पी. नहीं मिलने के कारण हिन्दुस्तान के हजारों किसान आत्महत्याएं करते हैं। कैश क्राप वाले किसान, जहाँ कपास पैदा होती है, जहाँ गन्ना पैदा होता है, हम उनको लाभकारी मूल्य नहीं दे पाते।[\[i48\]](#)

हिन्दुस्तान की स्थिति यह है कि किसानों को आत्महत्या करनी पड़ती है। यह शर्मनाक बात है। आजादी के 57 साल बाद भी हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों को लाभकारी मूल्य न मिलने के कारण आत्महत्या करने की नौबत आ

जाती है। यह कोई छिपी बात नहीं है, फिर चाहे कोई भी सरकार हो। ऐसी घटनाएं घट रही हैं, यह चिन्ता का विषय है। मैंने शुरू में ही अपने सम्बोधन में कहा कि बुरा समझौता नहीं हो तो बेहतर होगा। बुरा समझौता नहीं होने से कोई बड़ी बात नहीं होगी। बुरे समझौते के बजाय देश के व्यापक हितों को संरक्षित किया जाना चाहिए। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बाहर से जो अनाज आए, उस पर काउंटर विलिंग ड्यूटी लगाने की जोरदार वकालत विश्व मंच पर होनी चाहिए।

हम कम्पीटीशन में कैसे उतरेंगे? एक सब्सीडाइज़ अनाज है, जो विदेशी मुल्कों द्वारा उत्पादित है, जो अमरीका द्वारा उत्पादित है, वह हमारे देश की मार्किट में आकर हिन्दुस्तान को विदेशी अनाज का डम्पिंग ग्राउंड बनाएगा। यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण बात है। हम अपने देश को विदेशी कृषि उत्पादन का डम्पिंग ग्राउंड नहीं बनने देंगे, इस प्रकार का दृढ़ संकल्प लेने की जरूरत है। यदि ऐसा हो गया तो करोड़ों किसानों की आजीविका पर खतरा उत्पन्न हो जाएगा। उनके पेट पर खतरा उत्पन्न हो जाएगा। भारत की अर्थव्यवस्था किसान और कृषि पर निर्भर करती है, इसीलिए मैंने इस बात का जिक्र किया।

जहां तक प्रतिस्पर्धा का सवाल है, जिसमें मार्किट एक्सेस आता है। यह मार्किट एक्सेस क्या है? इसका मतलब है कि आप मार्किट में विदेशी अनाज के लिए खुली छूट दे दीजिए। हम अपने कृषि उत्पादन को सीमा से अधिक सब्सिडी नहीं दे सकते हैं, केवल एक सीमा तक ही सब्सिडी दे सकते हैं। उससे ज्यादा नहीं दे सकते हैं। डब्ल्यूटीओ कहता है कि आपकी जो सब्सिडी है, उसे प्रतिस्पर्धात्मक बनाइए। विकासशील देश अपनी सब्सिडी घटाएं। उसे विकसित देशों के कम्पीटीशन में उतारें और हमें खुली छूट दें। इसका क्या अंजाम होगा, मैं इसका छोटा सा उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। अभी भारत में गेहू का समर्थन मूल्य 620 रुपये प्रति क्विंटल है। डब्ल्यूटीओ कह रहा है कि इसे 60 से 70 प्रतिशत तक घटाइए। 620 रुपये में से यदि 60 प्रतिशत घट जाएगा तो कितना बचेगा? केवल ढाई या पौने तीन सौ रुपये ही प्रति क्विंटल गेहू का दाम होगा। वे कह रहे हैं कि ढाई सौ रुपये ही एमएसपी दीजिए। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि किसानों की आत्महत्या को और बढ़ावा दीजिए। आंध्र प्रदेश हो या भारत का कोई भी प्रदेश जहां पर भी कौश क्रॉप होता है, वहां आत्महत्या को और बढ़ावा दीजिए। यह प्रस्ताव बहुत ही खतरनाक है। पांचवें मंत्री स्तरीय सम्मेलन में कहा गया था कि इसे आगे ठीक किया जाएगा। लेकिन अब छठा सम्मेलन हांगकांग में होने जा रहा है, उसमें यह कैसे ठीक होगा, क्योंकि यह प्रस्ताव ही खत्म नहीं हुआ है। देश के व्यापक हित के लिए अडने की जरूरत है। दृढ़संकल्प लेकर अपने देश के पक्ष में खड़े होने की जरूरत है।

सिंगापुर में जो व्यापार समझौता हुआ था, उसमें सेवा व्यापार समझौते को लेकर सरकारी खरीद के मुद्दे का भारत ने जोरदार विरोध किया था [\[MSOffice49\]](#)। इस विरोध के कारण लम्बी लड़ाई के बाद उपरोक्त मुद्दे को सिंगापुर वार्ता से बाहर कराया जा सके। लेकिन अब हांगकांग वार्ता में क्या हो रहा है। हांगकांग वार्ता के प्रारूप में सरकारी खरीद, जिसपर इतनी बहस होती है, तीन-तीन, चार-चार दिन हाउस नहीं चलता, उसमें सतर्कता बरतने की जरूरत है। हांगकांग वार्ता के प्रारूप में सरकारी खरीद को फिर से शामिल करने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है।

इसलिए मैं सरकार को इस बारे में भी सतर्क और सावधान करना चाहता हूँ कि समझौते के प्रारूप में जो चालाकी से, पिछले दरवाजे से उसे शामिल करने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है, जिसे पहले से ही सिंगापुर में एजेंडे से बाहर कर दिया गया था। इसलिए भारत को अपने स्टैंड पर अड़ना चाहिए और जो पिछले दरवाजे से सेवा व्यापार समझौते को शामिल करना चाहते हैं, उनका जोरदार विरोध करना चाहिए।

हांगकांग की बैठक में सरकार का पक्ष रखने वाणिज्य मंत्री, श्री कमलनाथ जी जा रहे हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसी भी कीमत पर फूड सिक्युरिटी से और देश के किसानों की बुनियादी समस्या, बुनियादी हित या एमएसपी को कम करने करने के सवाल पर कोई समझौता नहीं होना चाहिए और खासकर फूड सुरक्षा मामले में भी सरकार को प्राथमिकता रखनी चाहिए।

मैं इस सम्मेलन की सफलता की कामना करता हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, Shri C. Kuppusami. You please take only two minutes.

SHRI C. KUPPUSAMI Sir, I rise to take part, on behalf of my Party, the DMK, in the Discussion on the forthcoming 6th Ministerial Conference of WTO to be held at Hong Kong.

Sir, the House may recall the contributions made by our beloved leader, our former Commerce Minister, late Thiru Murasoli Maran for whom not only our State of Tamil Nadu but the entire country is proud of, in the WTO deliberations, at Doha Round, wherein he not only convinced the developing world for safeguarding the Agriculture interests and labour interests of the Third world countries but the developed countries also and turned around the WTO discussion in favour of countries like India and other developing ones. Our former Commerce and Industry Minister, Thiru Murasoli Maran who had represented India at the Doha round, despite his ill health, as he went to attend the Conference after his heart surgery, protected and safeguarded the agriculture interests and labour interests of our country.

I would urge upon the present hon. Minister, Thiru Kamal Nath also to leave no stone unturned to protect India's interests in the negotiations.

India is predominantly an agriculture country and our economy is based on agriculture. The interests of the agriculturists should be safeguarded. The public distribution system

should be strengthened instead of dismantling it. Similarly, the policy of giving subsidy and providing minimum support price for most of the commodities should be continued. Land reforms and land for the tillers should be continued and should not be given a go by. On the labour front, the interests of labour should be protected as unemployment is increasing day by day. Collective bargaining power should be retained and minimum guarantee should be provided to labours who are in formal and informal sectors.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, there is a request from the hon. Minister. He wants to reply to the Calling Attention moved by Dr. Chinta Mohan now. If the House agrees, then I will allow him to reply to the Calling Attention and then this Discussion under Rule 193 can continue. What is the sense of the House? If the House agrees, then I will allow the Minister to speak.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ANNASAHEB M.K. PATIL (ERANDOL): No, Sir. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB (CUTTACK): Sir, we have to participate in the Discussion under Rule 193 and to give our views. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a matter concerning the flood situation in Tamil Nadu.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S.K. KHARVENTHAN : Sir, the entire Madras is marooned. People are going by boat from one street to another. It is a very serious situation. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nobody can speak now. The Minister will reply to the Calling Attention.

... (*Interruptions* [[lh50](#)])

MR. CHAIRMAN : Speeches are over. If the House agrees, I will allow him to reply to the Calling Attention.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A. KRISHNASWAMY : Sir, the Cabinet Minister should respond to our Calling Attention. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: All of you have spoken in the Calling Attention discussion. There should be no further discussion. He will give a reply.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A. KRISHNASWAMY : We want the Cabinet Minister to respond. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Almost all the hon. Members from Tamil Nadu have taken part in the Calling Attention discussion. You have amply raised the situation that is prevailing in Tamil Nadu. If you agree, the hon. Minister will reply.

SHRI A. KRISHNASWAMY : He has already replied. We are not satisfied. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: If he has already replied, then what more do you want?

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A. KRISHNASWAMY : A Cabinet Minister should respond to our Calling Attention.

SHRI K.V. THANGKABALU : We want responsible answers.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want a Cabinet Minister to reply?

SHRI A. KRISHNASWAMY : Yes. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated. As I understand, this morning you wanted a reply from a Cabinet Minister. The Minister for State has already replied. I presume the

Members are not satisfied with that reply. They want a reply from the Cabinet Minister. That is arranged. If you agree, you will have a further reply.

SHRI A. KRISHNASWAMY : All right.

SHRI K.V. THANGKABALU : We also want to seek some clarifications.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not now.

SHRI ANNASAHEB M.K. PATIL Sir, the 6th International Ministerial Meet of WTO at Hong Kong is going to be held from 13th to 20th of December. As you may be knowing, the 4th and 5th Meets of the WTO at that time were represented by Ministers like Mr. Maran about whom the DMK Party Member had already said what he had done for the country. Similarly in Cancun, Mr. Arun Jaitley was there.

Sir, WTO had failed to arrive at a consensus on certain diversification of issues which were talked earlier in the first three Meets. So, they had emphasised that our country should be saved from the invasion of the European Union as well as from the United States making India as a dumping ground. In fact, the G-20 countries had assembled and got together with the idea that the poor countries should be saved from the rich countries on account of WTO which is going to definitely invade the poor countries.

At present, there are issues on that ground, particularly in three sectors, namely agriculture, industrial goods and services. I am not afraid of the two sectors, particularly the service sector and trade. But agriculture is an important sector in this country. As you know, more than 70 per cent of our people in the country are from the farmers' community. This country's total economy is dependent upon the farmers' livelihood as well as their situation. Therefore, I feel that the representative who is going to represent in Hong Kong from our country should bear in mind that this country has 65 per cent of the farmers and the other countries, particularly the USA and EU, have only four or five per cent of the farmers[m51].

Therefore, the whole issue lies around farmers. The main thing that he has to consider is as to what we have to export and as to what we have to import. As we know, we cannot import goods that are in ample number or are in plenty in our own country such as wheat, rice or food materials. But we have definitely to import to meet the necessity of the country, namely, oilseeds, oil and to some extent good quality of cotton and other things. We should not have to import things like dairy products and some other products. Therefore, we have to keep in mind that when we import indigenous products and produces from the farmers community are safeguarded and we have also to keep in mind as to what we have to export so to encourage the farmers of the country.

Sir, these are the three areas. Particularly farmers' interests have to be safeguarded. One is that ' गरीब एवं विकसित देश के लिए बनाए गए सुरक्षात्मक उपाय, विशेष एवं अन्तरीय व्यवहार ' that is special and differential treatment, *vishesh utpad*, that is, special product, and *vishesh surakshatmak tantra*, that is, special safeguard mechanism; प्राथमिकता के आधार पर तय किया जाए। उसके बाद ही आगे वार्ताओं में अच्छी तरह से, पिछली दो मीटिंग्स में जो निर्णय लिए गए थे, उन्हें रखा जाना चाहिए। This is very important aspect. EU and USA always inter-mix the subsidy among three categories of areas, namely, Zones - Amber, Blue and Green. They should not be inter-mixing from one zone to another so that they can take the advantage of one zone and another zone because they can shift it to one-another region. Therefore, we should be particular and we should have a definite stand on that ground so that we are not going to lose our grounds of the agriculturists.

Sir, there are three types of main issues. Particularly India can push the EU and the USA for eliminating their domestic and export subsidies. Secondly, what we are going to negotiate is to protect the special products on which livelihood of millions of Indian farmers is depending upon. And the third one as I have already stated is to safeguard the existing special mechanism. These are the three things that I have to say.

SHRI K.S. RAO Sir, in the international agreements, national interest is supreme. No nation is interested to sacrifice its own national interest no matter what type of agreement

it enters into with various nationals of the world. If USA and EU and most of the developed countries were to coin some clauses or some agreements, would they be interested in other countries? No. It is only to see that they find their own market. They want to find market for their products. They want to build up all these things [t52].

When [r53] it comes to the question of industrial goods, all their love for India and China and the underdeveloped countries is only to find a market for their products. In America, it is said, only two per cent of the people are living on agriculture; while in India, not less than 60 per cent of the people have to survive on agriculture. It is a very serious matter for us. We cannot sacrifice the interests of the farmers in this country by entering into an agreement in a haphazard way or in a hasty manner getting lured by their concessions that they would give some advantage to us in services and industrial products.

16.06 hrs.

(Shrimati Sumitra Mahajan *in the Chair*)

It is said that in USA subsidy is being given to agriculturists in a big way. When they give subsidy to their own agriculturists, naturally they could export their commodities at prices lesser than the price at which we are producing them here. Already my predecessors have stated that since the Minimum Support Price was not remunerative to the Indian farmers we have been reading in the newspapers that they have been committing suicides. In addition to this, if we were to open up our economy to foreign farm products, the number would be enormous. It would run into thousands or even lakhs. So, we have to protect our farming community first and then think of any other thing.

Why do they restrict Indians from entering America? Today, America is putting a limit on the visas that they give to foreigners. They say, they would allow only 60,000, 70,000 or 100,000 people in a year. If they want free trade, let there be free movement of people also. Our country has got an enormous number of technical manpower. That is our asset. That is our resource. That is the source through which we could earn foreign exchange. That is the source through which our people could live comfortably. They are

putting restrictions on a commodity which is available in plenty in our country but they want us to accept everything that comes from there.

We were exporting prawn from this country to America. When they found that it was not in their interests, they coined a new expression, 'anti-dumping duty', and suddenly levied it at 15 per cent on our prawns, which is against all international agreements. So, it became unremunerative for our farming community to raise prawn.

More recently, I read in a newspaper that one of our non-resident Indians, Ms. Neelima, working in a software company in America was being victimised regularly and harassed by her own white colleagues on the ground that they were jealous of outsourced jobs going to India in a big way and also Indians getting jobs in America while the locals were not getting jobs. They were harassing her regularly. While the management agreed that they were harassing her, it could not secure her interests. They have only secured the interests of the local citizens. So, it is common knowledge that national interest is supreme. In our country also, we should feel that the interests of our farming community is supreme.

Tomorrow, if we permit, by reducing tariffs and removing restrictions, free movement of foreign farm products into this country, our agricultural community would become unemployed. When they become unemployed, where would they find alternative employment? They are all trained for generations to raise farm crops. They cannot be taken to the industrial sector or the services sector overnight^[r54].

Then, imagine what will be the situation in this country. It is terrible. So, the hon. Minister must be extremely cautious when he deals with these negotiations, keeping the particular and specific thing available in this country.

Madam, it was said that a thousand years back India was doing one-third of the world trade. Today, it is reduced to about six per cent or even much less than that. It may be because other countries have become more materialistic and we are more spiritualistic and they have taken the advantage. It is not because we lack in intelligence or talent or ability.

Madam, in regard to the farm products, patenting is a surprise sometimes. When we go and read some of our mythology, *neem* tree has played a very vital role. It has become useful in medicines and so many things. Now, you will be shocked to hear that some of the western countries are trying to patent on *neem* which is actually our source of strength for thousands of years. So, likewise, when it comes to the question of farm products, we have to be extremely cautious, safeguarding and asking for special conditions favouring our country, particularly developing countries in regard to agriculture.

When we reach a stage in our country, if people were to depend on agriculture only at two per cent or four per cent growth, then there will be a level playing field, there can be competition and there can be mutual agreement. But conditions are differing from country to country. We cannot accept this. So, I would request the hon. Minister to see this aspect. I am sure that he also made a statement that he would not sacrifice the interests of the farmers and make them unemployed. As has been mentioned by many of the hon. Members that they want to close the discussion early, I do not want to take long time. Once again, I would request the hon. Minister to be extremely cautious, more particularly about the import of farm products into this country, which will destroy the entire economy of this country because 600 million farmers are dependent on farm products.

-

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Now, we would continue with the Discussion under Rule 193.

SHRI B. MAHTAB Madam Chairperson, we are discussing on the role of India in the WTO with particular reference to the forthcoming Sixth Ministerial Conference of WTO

in Hong Kong. Very often, we hear statements, like, 'WTO is a necessary evil. India should remain at the WTO.' These types of statements are very uncalled for. If India is not a part of this rules-based system, the country would have to deal with issues unilaterally and in situation which can best be described as 'survival of the fittest'.

Indeed, with one per cent share in the global trade, India can challenge today the mightiest at the WTO if its interests are violated. This has happened as India won several disputes at the WTO rich nations like the European Union and the United States. For that matter, this can happen with any WTO Member. This explains why China was desperate in joining this body, and big countries like Russia are expected to join soon.

We have travelled a long way from the Dunkel Agreement and Uruguay Round. Now, the Minister of Commerce is more geared up to face the international players single-handedly. We can go in for the service sector but we have to open up.

At the same time, I would also like to mention here that there are no permanent friends and foes in politics, it has been often said. Politics have strange bedfellows. This should be the case when India takes its position at the WTO. The world has changed since the old-fashioned third worldism of 1950s to 1980s. India has learnt this lesson at the WTO forum. We have built up coalitions. But such coalitions have to be issue-specific, as we have today G-20 coalition on agriculture. We should enter into such coalitions after a thorough analysis of India's offensive as well as defensive positions on specific issues. The bottom line is to take position in a manner so that the Doha Round of WTO Negotiations is a development round, not just a market access round.

Since the early Nineties, as I have said earlier, there has been a paradigm shift in the approach to economic management in India. There is now a greater recognition of the significance of market -friendly processes in the economy. However, this does not mean that the Government ceases to be responsible.

In the forthcoming World Trade Organisation Ministerial Conference at Hong Kong, China is expected to provide an important space in bringing the comprehensive Doha Round of Negotiations, commonly known as Doha Development Agenda (DDA) to a successful completion[\[k55\]](#).

The DDA was launched in 2001 at the Doha Ministerial Conference of the WTO. The Doha Round, with the stated goals of improving the livelihood – this is more specific – of billions of people living in the developing world, is at a critical point and that is why, it is of immense importance for both the rich and the poor countries.

In 2003, the Cancun Ministerial Conference of the WTO ended abruptly due to the conflicting interests of the poor and the rich. While the developing countries wanted to finish pending issues mostly on agriculture that affect them the most, the rich wanted to talk of new issues that would benefit them the most.

After Cancun, initiatives were taken by the WTO members to re-start the talk in Geneva. Finally an agreement was reached to have a ‘Packaged Framework’ called ‘July Package’ by the end of July 2004. It provides broad guidelines to move forward on key negotiating areas. India played a major role in arriving at this Framework. The Framework of modalities decided by the WTO members in July 2004 is guiding the current negotiations.

It is expected that negotiations before, during and after the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference are going to determine the future of global trading system under the WTO and more significantly, will have a serious implication on the long-term development agenda, particularly that of the poor countries.

Now, I come to the present scenario.

MADAM CHAIRMAN : Now you have to conclude. Only five minutes can be given to each hon. Member because there are more than ten hon. Members who want to speak on this. So, please be brief.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : But those ten hon. Members are not from my Party!

MADAM CHAIRMAN: But we have to take care of all the hon. Members, and not merely those belonging to your Party. Please conclude now.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : I will try to concise my speech.

There are three aspects which need deliberation. The first which is discussed was agriculture. I will come to the other two aspects later. The first aspect here is increased trade. Firstly, I want to make it very clear that Indian farmers do not indulge in commercial activity. Trade is something different; farming is something different. But the general perception throughout the rich world is – because of the Western perception – agriculture is trade. That is the basic difficulty which at one point of time we face.

Increased trade, that is, more market access through tariff reductions, reduction of domestic and export subsidies are the three pillars of agricultural negotiations. The Doha agenda calls for three things: one is reduction with a view to phasing out all types of export subsidies; the second is, substantial reduction of trade-distorting domestic subsidies; and the third is, substantial improvement in market access.

While the first two are not applicable to India, the third one is and here lies the importance of ‘special products’. We should continue to insist on maintaining substantial tariffs on those products, which are concerned with the livelihood of millions of farmers, thus, ‘special’.

One of the earlier speakers mentioned about soya bean. I will mention about oil seeds; so also apples of Himachal Pradesh, and cardamom of Kerala. State specific products are there. Oil seeds could be a product on which India could ask for special status. The rich countries are still providing huge subsidies and high protective measures to their corporate agriculture. No concrete agreement has been reached on any of these issues [\[R56\]](#).

There is a deadlock in agricultural negotiations. We have very rightly taken a stance that we will not accept any formula for tariff cut unless the European Union and the United States reduce domestic and export subsidy and also provide concession to the Indian exporters. We should continue to insist on no tariff reduction or minimum tariff reduction. Special safeguard mechanism for special products identified on the basis of land holding pattern to ensure food security and rural development should also be looked into.

I come to the second aspect, which is production of industrial goods. The WTO's language, negotiations on industrial goods are known as Non-Agricultural Market Access or NAMA. The Doha Agenda aims to reduce tariff and non-tariff barriers. At present, negotiations are progressing slowly as no substantial progress has been made on the issue of the formula for tariff reduction. Along with Argentina and Brazil, India has proposed for a tariff reduction formula which will help developing countries' industries to compete globally. We can only look at it after the formula for tariff reduction is agreed and that too on voluntary basis. We cannot accept zero for zero tariff cut proposal. To explain it, if the European Union cuts tariff to zero for a particular product, India may not reduce its tariff to zero for that product. We cannot accept the ideas of rich countries.

I come to the last aspect, that is services. As we all are aware, service negotiations are based on bilateral "request and offer". However, as of date, this approach has not yielded a balanced and substantive output. Rich countries like the European Union and the United States have not offered much in terms of

providing greater access to other WTO Members, particularly the developing countries. We are in an advantageous position no doubt but our services are not being taken care of by the rich countries. More importantly, their offers are much less on sectors which are of importance to India. Rich countries want the developing countries to open more sectors such as telecommunication, retail, etc. for Foreign Direct Investment and here comes the problem. More access through FDI route would reduce policy making space of poor countries.

Service negotiation has become more complex as it has reached a stage where countries are preparing for inter-sectoral bargaining. We can play a very greater role, a proactive role, in the service talks. Our major interest lies in cross border trade, that means business, knowledge process outsourcing and temporary movement of professionals, both skilled and unskilled.

With these words I conclude by saying that India should liberalise sectors to get more services in other developing countries. We can have friends in that level which the Government is driving at but in the other two sectors we have to be very cautious.

Especially, in the agricultural sector we have to be more cautious because more than 70 per cent of our farmers depend on agriculture.

MADAM CHAIRMAN : I request all the Members to be brief.

SHRI SUKHDEV SINGH DHINDSA (SANGRUR): Madam, how much time is available to me?

MADAM CHAIRMAN: You have got five minutes only.

श्री सुखदेव सिंह ढींडसा सभापति जी, आज जो मोशन पाण्डा जी लाये हैं, वह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण मोशन है। हांगकांग में जो इण्टर मिनिस्टीरियल डब्ल्यूटीओ कांफ्रेंस होने जा रही है, वह हमारे देश के किसानों की किस्मत का फैसला करने जा रही है। आज मैंने सभी तरफ से सुना है, सभी सदस्यों ने कृषि पर जोर दिया है। मैं यह महसूस करता हूँ कि यह किसी पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है, यह देश का सवाल है। दोहा में मुरासोली मारन जी गए थे, उन्होंने भारत का केस बहुत अच्छी तरह से रखा था, लेकिन उसमें कोई एग्रीमेंट नहीं हो सका। कानकून में अरुण जेटली जी गए थे और उन्होंने जी-20 बनाकर, उनका नेतृत्व किया, लेकिन वहां पर भी कोई एग्रीमेंट नहीं हो सका। अब सिंगापुर में जो कांफ्रेंस होने जा रही है, इसमें कैसे होगा? लेकिन मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ जिन्होंने अपनी स्टेटमेंट में कहा है कि वह किसानों का नुकसान नहीं होने देंगे।

मैं पंजाब से आता हूँ, जिसकी अर्थव्यवस्था कृषि पर आधारित है। वैसे तो पूरे देश की अर्थव्यवस्था ही कृषि पर आधारित है, लेकिन जब से गैट का एग्रीमेन्ट हुआ है हमारी पार्टी शिरोमणि अकाली दल और मैं इसका विरोध करते आ रहे हैं। हम इसका विरोध इसलिए कर रहे हैं, क्योंकि इससे किसानों का बहुत नुकसान होगा। यदि कोई ऐसा एग्रीमेंट हो जाता है, जिसके बारे में हम सुन रहे हैं, तो हिन्दुस्तान का किसान खत्म हो जाएगा। पंजाब ने कृषि में कई रिकार्ड बनाए हैं, जिनमें पर-हैक्टेयर कृषि उत्पादन में लुधियाना संसार में प्रथम स्थान पर आया है। पंजाब में डेढ़ प्रतिशत जमीन है और डेढ़ प्रतिशत ही आबादी है, लेकिन पंजाब 60 से 70 प्रतिशत तक फूड ग्रेन्स भारत के सैन्ट्रल पूल में देता है। हमें इस पर गर्व है।

यूरोपियन देश, अमरीका, आस्ट्रेलिया या अन्य विकसित देश अपने किसानों को इतनी सब्सिडी देते हैं, जितनी विकासशील देश नहीं दे सकते हैं। भारतीय सांसदों का एक डेलिगेशन राज्य सभा के डिप्टी-चैयरमैन की अध्यक्षता में यूरोपियन पार्लियामेंट में गया था। वहां हमने जब सब्सिडी के मुद्दे को उठाया और कहा कि आप क्यों नहीं

सब्सिडी को लेवल प्लेयिंग फील्ड तक देते हैं, आपके किसानों को तो 80 प्रतिशत तक सब्सिडी मिलती है, उसे खत्म कर देना चाहिए, उन्होंने कहा कि अगली मीटिंग में हम इस पर बात करेंगे क्योंकि हमारी कृषि संबंधी कमेटी के चैयरमैन फ्रांस से हैं, जब वह आएंगे तब हम इस पर बात करेंगे। अगली मीटिंग में हमने यह सवाल उठाया तो उन्होंने साफ मना कर दिया कि हम अपनी सब्सिडी को खत्म नहीं करने जा रहे हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि हम अपने किसानों को उतनी ही सब्सिडी देंगे, उसे कम नहीं करेंगे। फिर आप इस एग्रीमेन्ट से क्या हासिल कर लेंगे, मुझे यह समझ में नहीं आता है। यदि हमारे किसानों को भी उतनी सुविधा नहीं मिलेगी, तो कैसे होगा? हम चाहते हैं कि ऐसा कोई तरीका बनाया जाए, जिसमें

लेवल प्लेयिंग फील्ड हो। जैसा हमारे मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि यदि ऐसा कोई एग्रीमेंट हो गया तो हमारा मुल्क तबाह होता चला जाएगा। जिससे वापस निकलना मुश्किल हो जाएगा।

मैं मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो वे कह रहे हैं, उसी पर तवज्जो दें। कोई ऐसा एग्रीमेंट न होने पाए जिससे किसानों का अहित हो। वैसे तो सभी के बारे में कहा जा रहा है, लेकिन मैं उन बातों को रिपीट नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। मैं ज्यादा जोर कृषि पर ही देना चाहता हूँ और सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने वैसे तो कृषि पर ही जोर दिया है। हमारे देश की 70 प्रतिशत आबादी कृषि पर निर्भर करती है [\[MSOffice57\]](#)।

17.00 hrs.

सब माननीय सदस्यों ने एग्रीकल्चर पर ही ज्यादा जोर दिया है क्योंकि यहां के 60 प्रतिशत लोग एग्रीकल्चर पर ही बसर करते हैं।

मैं पुरजोर शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा कोई एग्रीमेंट नहीं हो जिससे हमारा देश तबाह हो जाए, एग्रीकल्चर तबाह हो जाए और देश की इकोनॉमी पर असर पड़े।

सभापति महोदया : धन्यवाद, आपने समय का बहुत ध्यान रखा।

PROF. M. RAMADASS Respected Chairperson, the forthcoming WTO Ministerial Conference to be held at Hong Kong is critical for the growth of the developing countries,

including India. We are happy that an able and skilful Minister is attending this Conference to negotiate on various issues of great concern for India, as well as the developing countries. He has already proved his mettle in some of the country conferences and attained certain advantages for India. But at the same time while he goes to Hong Kong I would only like to impress upon him the feeling that is gathering round not only in this august House but also in different parts of the country.

There is an inescapable feeling that the GATT agreement and the WTO agreement have always gone against the interest of the developing countries including India. There are empirical evidences from the Indian economy, whether it is agriculture, or industry or the services that we are not able to get as much advantage as we are giving out to other countries. Especially in agriculture we have seen that there has been a complete marginalisation of agriculture where the small and the landless farmers have come to grief. I cannot say that is only because of the WTO agreement that we have entered into, but I would only say that it has only added to the woes of the Indian agriculturists. It is because the nature of the agreement that we have entered into is an unequal agreement. It is an agreement between unequals. It is an agreement between India and America. It is an agreement between the developed countries and the developing countries. What is the state of development between these two categories of countries and what can be the negotiating arguments and areas and whether we can derive more advantages? Therefore, there should have been a built-in mechanism within the agreement itself whether you are able to follow the principle of unequal treatment for unequals or not. Unfortunately, we have followed the principle of equal treatment to unequals and that is why countries like India are suffering in the event of a WTO agreement. So, this national interest must guide our Minister in the WTO conference.

We wish that he succeeds. His negotiating skills should help India to get lot of advantages. While wishing the Minister God speed and success, at the same time I would like to draw his attention to the fact that the road to Hong Kong is a bumpy road and not a smooth one. The developed countries are already becoming more aggressive than they were hitherto. They are trying to break the unity that has been established amongst the developing countries. We have to strive hard to bring a kind of a consensus amongst the developing countries. But unfortunately the developed countries today are resorting to the tactics of divide and rule and therefore, the developing countries are not in a position to do that. So, the question is whether the developing countries would be able to resist the pressure of the developed countries and succeed in their objective, or whether they would crumble under the pressure and become a victim of the negotiations.

Now, we have been told by the Press that the Government is going to enter into negotiations in the areas of agriculture, services, industrial goods, TRIPS as well as trade facilitation[[snb58](#)].

Madam[[bru59](#)], now, as far as agriculture is concerned, there are three areas where negotiations would centre around. One is domestic support in the form of Green Box subsidies and Blue Box subsidies, tariff and export subsidies. As far as tariff is concerned, India has lost its advantage to the WTO because the moment it was decided in the first meeting that there should be a tariff reduction, India rushed into reducing tariff from the peak rate of 300 to even zero in some products. But some developed countries have not reciprocated that even today to that level. I do not know how the previous Government rushed into such a kind of reduction in tariff which has created an unequal situation between developed countries and developing countries. But there is no point in lamenting on what has happened. Therefore, we should now be able to target on tariffs, domestic support and export subsidies. The Hon. Minister must see that, in all these three areas, we are able to protect the interests of India by reducing what is called the dumping process. The import of commodities from foreign countries will come if we are not going to succeed. At the same time, we should be able to improve our exports so that, at the end of the negotiations, we are able to bring a balance in trade where there is excess of exports over imports in the country. Now, for both these objectives, it is in India's interest for elimination or substantial reduction in subsidies and we should be able to motivate the G-20 partners in concentrating more on subsidy reduction rather than focussing our attention on all other aspects of tariff reduction. We may not be able to succeed in reducing tariffs but we would be able to succeed in reducing the subsidies which would give a better advantage to India than harping on tariff reduction. If both come, it is all right. But in a negotiating table, it would not be possible for us to get both. Therefore, if there is a matter of preference, all the G-20 countries as well as G-33 countries must join together and ask for substantial reduction or elimination of subsidies that are practised by foreign countries rather than harping or concentrating on tariffs.

-

17.06 hrs.

(Shri Ajay Maken *in the Chair*)

It is also important to work closely with G-33 countries to have usable and effective provisions for special products and seek exemptions from the deductions on *de-minimis* support provided by developing countries.

In industrial tariffs, though India has moved into line-by-line tariff reduction and full bounding coverage, there can still be scope for specifically targetting tariff peak and high tariffs of the developed countries. For example, it can revive its earlier proposal of a ceiling three times of the current average tariff. It can also explore the possibility of targeted cuts in the high tariffs and the peaks in specific developed countries by offering reduction in its own tariffs in products of their own interest. Now, in services, the current system of request over negotiations is suitable in India. In such a format of negotiations, it can press for useful liberalization in the developed countries in return for its own commitment. Across the board minimum commitment which has been proposed by the developed countries may not be in India's interest.

Another area of importance is in respect of rules. India should aim and work for improving the objectivity and in taking action under agreements. We also have to understand that this is a bargain. We have to give something and we have to take something. Now, where should we give? In the case of industrial tariffs, we can give. But in the case of agriculture, we have to take. This overall balance of what we give and what we take should be positive and that positive quantity should help India's development, India's agriculture and our objective of achieving 8 per cent growth rate, and the world countries should help in this goal. Our Minister must be able to negotiate in such a way that we are able to achieve this objective.

With these words, I wish the Minister all success and his negotiating skills should help India to get a better deal.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Minister has to reply at 5.30 p.m. We have got another six or seven Members to speak. Each Member will be given five minutes to speak. Then only will the hon. Minister be able to reply at 5.30 p.m.

SHRI M.P. VEERENDRA KUMAR Sir, I want to raise only a few points. The first point is regarding imports to our country. The increase in imports is quite high in the last so many years. They are below the cost of production. That is quite dangerous. In the case of cotton, sugar and oil the import was many times higher. I have figures with me, but I have no time. I do not want to quote them. Let me just quote one or two figures. In the case of spices, the import increased from 24.28 thousand tonnes in 1995-96 to 147.69 thousand tonnes in 2003-04; in the case of sugar, it increased from 29 thousand tonnes in 1996-97 to 932.3 thousand tonnes in 2004-05; in the case of edible oil, it increased from 1061.99 thousand tonnes in 1995-96 to 5290.2 thousand tonnes in 2003-04 and in the case of cotton, it increased from 2.92 thousand tonnes in 1996-97 to 387 thousand tonnes in 2001-02.

At the same time, the 2003 figures for the US show that the agriculture exports from the US by its agri-business corporations were sold below the cost of production. Wheat was exported at an average price of 28 per cent below cost of production; soya beans were exported at an average price of 10 per cent below cost of production; corn was exported at an average price of 10 per cent below cost of production; cotton was exported at an average price of 47 per cent below cost of production; rice was exported at an average price of 26 per cent below cost of production. How will our agriculturists survive? I do not want to go into the details. We say that we cannot have Quantitative Restrictions any more. But developed countries have got a mechanism for that. The developed countries have evolved an alternative Quantitative Restrictions mechanisms in the form of TRQs where a fixed volume of imports is allowed at a lower tariff rate and beyond that level, imports are allowed only at prohibitive tariffs. They also have several NTBs and Sanitary and Phytosanitary measures to restrict imports. For example, US rejected 251 food export consignments from India in May 2005, 216 in June, 78 in July and 256 in August 2005 on SPS and other technical grounds, while the EU has rejected 16 Indian food consignments in May 2005, 12 in June, 6 in July 2005.

Trapped in the market access paradigm, the G-20 believes that lowering tariffs will provide them access to developed countries' market; a distant dream. So, the developed countries have several import restrictions and other mechanisms.

I would like to mention one more thing. The US has also disregarded the WTO's Dispute Settlement Body, the DSB, ruling in March 2005 to withdraw subsidies given to its cotton growers by September 2005. The DSB also confirmed that subsidies of US \$12.5 billion were given to cotton growers between 1999 and 2002, which boosted US cotton exports but depressed prices at the expense of Brazilian and other producers. The WTO has also ruled against the European Union declaring their export subsidies for sugar as illegal and directed its withdrawal. Ironically, despite these distortions by developed nations, the WTO has failed to act effectively against such distortions.

I do not want to quote many figures. But what is happening is that the WTO has become a tool for developed countries in making the developing countries a dumping yard for them.

In the name of NAMA, that is Non Agricultural Market Access, they are talking of Swiss formula, the July Framework etc. There is more divergence and convergence. It is very dangerous to go on those lines because ultimately what will happen is that there will be two sets of standards for developed and developing countries. If you open up our service sector in the manner in which it has been suggested -- I do not have much time to explain -- ultimately the Minister will come to this House and say that this has become mandatory. In the last four rounds of negotiations, they talked of Swiss Model. Any negotiation becomes mandatory ultimately. Whatever suggestions that come from the European Union and America ultimately will be binding on us. The WTO and other organisations cannot be substitutes for Governments. We have our sovereignty. We have to protect our people. In the garb of globalisation, what is happening is corporatisation[\[r60\]](#).

We want globalization where the resources will be equitably distributed, where everybody gets share. What is happening is that the developing countries are becoming poorer and poorer, the least developed countries are becoming more poor and poor whereas the developed countries are grabbing the entire resources. The money and everything is grabbed by them. Is it globalization? That cannot be.

Again, Sir, Parliament must be taken into confidence. I think the Minister should come before this Parliament before signing any agreement there. The bureaucrats go and

sign the agreement. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI M.P. VEERENDRA KUMAR : I am coming to a close. For example, the bureaucrats go and sign the FTA agreement. What happens is that the entire States are gone. Take, for instance, pauper. They go inside SAARC and non-SAARC countries with whom we have agreements. What is happening is that the imports from SAARC countries have zero duty. So, it is destroying our market and our agriculture. Now, they are opening service on NAMA. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude. We are running short of time.

SHRI M.P. VEERENDRA KUMAR : Otherwise, it will jeopardize our own sovereignty. Globalization cannot be for transnational corporations; globalization cannot be corporatization. I urge the Minister and all those who are going for the WTO meeting in Hong Kong to see that our interests are protected. If America can protect its own interest, our interest must also be protected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, the Minister has to reply.

Just a minute, Mr. Minister. There are five speakers. Only 2 minutes each will be allowed. Do not let me stop you after 2 minutes. You should prepare your speech so that you can conclude within 2 minutes.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI KAMAL NATH): Sir, I would like to tell the hon. Member, through you, that there is also a debate going on in Rajya Sabha. So I need to go back there and reply to Rajya Sabha also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, two minutes each will be allowed.

श्री हरिभाऊ राठौड़ सभापति महोदय, विश्व व्यापार संगठन को स्थापित हुए आज दस साल हो रहे हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में जो आगामी बैठक होने जा रही है, वह काफी महत्वपूर्ण है। इस चर्चा का जवाब मंत्री जी अच्छी तैयारी के साथ देने की कोशिश करेंगे, ऐसी हम सभी को उम्मीद है। आज विश्व में विश्व व्यापार और आर्थिक संगठन तथा गैट के अनुसार उरुग्वे वार्ता के दौर से जो परिणाम आए, उस पर सारी चर्चाएं आकर रुक जाती हैं। जहां तक अपने देश का सवाल है, उसे कृषि प्रधान देश कहा जाता है। हम अपनी सरकारों द्वारा बनाई गई नीतियों का परिणाम पिछले 50 सालों से देख रहे हैं। एक तरफ हम देखते हैं कि रोटी, कपड़ा और मकान की बात की जाती है।

सभापति महोदय : आप सीधे पाइंट पर आए, क्योंकि कुछ और सदस्यों ने भी बोलना है। इसलिए जल्दी अपनी बात समाप्त करें।

श्री हरिभाऊ राठौड़ : मैं दो मिनट में अपनी बात कह दूंगा।

सभापति महोदय : दो मिनट तो हो गए हैं और आप अभी रोटी, कपड़ा और मकान की ही बात कर रहे हैं।

श्री हरिभाऊ राठौड़ : रोटी, कपड़ा और मकान ही तो सबसे महत्वपूर्ण वस्तुएं हैं और यही चीज नहीं देखी गई है। इसीलिए हमारे देश में काश्तकार आत्महत्याएं कर रहे हैं। सरकार की नीतियों का ही परिणाम है कि एक तरफ हम कहते हैं कि गरीबों को कम दाम पर अनाज मिलना चाहिए और दूसरी तरफ हम खेती के उत्पादों के बारे में कहते हैं कि न्यूनतम समर्थन मूल्य मिलना चाहिए। इस तरह से हमारी दो तरफा नीति है। इस पर हमें गौर करना चाहिए। मंत्री जी वार्ता के लिए हांगकांग जाने वाले हैं, वह अपने देश की बात वहां रखेंगे। वहां हमसे भी कहा जाएगा कि अपनी सब्सिडी कम करो, लेकिन हम घरेलू व्यापार में क्या कर रहे हैं, यह देखना चाहिए।

DR. CHINTA MOHAN (TIRUPATI): Sir, I have been given only two minutes. So, I will mention only two points. The hon. Minister is in a hurry to go to Hong Kong.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : No, I have to go to Rajya Sabha.... (*Interruptions*) I already said that I would have to go to Rajya Sabha.... (*Interruptions*)

DR. CHINTA MOHAN : Before going to Hong Kong, he wanted to go to Rajya Sabha.

Coming to the point, I would like to say that he is going to meet the rich countries in Hong Kong. Before meeting the rich countries, I want that he should take an independent role in protecting the interests of the poor people and the farmers of this country. He should take a pro-active stand. That is one point that is very important. He should not forget it any time.

The second point is about subsidy and import duty. We should not taper the import duties. That is not going to help. When we go to the markets, we see apples from other countries; we see grapes from other countries and we see the maize from other countries. These are all produced in India. On the one side, the cotton farmers are dying in Andhra Pradesh. On the other side, we are trying to import it from outside. This is the thing where I want that he should take a very delicate stand, a very sensitive stand to protect the interests of the farmers of this country.

Next, I would say that the subsidies are a must. When America and the rich countries are giving subsidies in the form of green box, blue box and amber box, why should he not give subsidy to our farmers? Our entire economy depends on agriculture. Without agriculture, you cannot survive. So, I would request the hon. Minister to keep these three points in mind and do it in Hong Kong accordingly.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Dr. Chinta Mohan, thank you very much. Now, Shri Hiten Barman to speak.

SHRI HITEN BARMAN Sir, at the outset, I would like to say that already the agriculture sector of our country is being ruined due to the liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation policies in the name of the new economic policy. We know that the new economic policy, which is being implemented under the World Bank, IMF directive, is having the sole aim of destroying the Indian agriculture.

In these circumstances, the forthcoming Hong Kong Conference is to be held from 13th December. The draft agenda will discuss the four aspects: one, Agreement on

Agriculture; two, Non-Agriculture Market Access; three, General Agreement on Trade and, four, Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights. All the agenda points are very important and serious for the agriculture sector of our country.

We know very well that the American Government has already declared that its subsidy would be retained up to the year 2012. The European Union countries already agreed and declared that their subsidy would be retained up to the year 2013. But the draft framework of Hong Kong Ministerial lacks any specificity in respect of agriculture and makes no commitment on agricultural subsidies. Only it retains the interests of the developed countries which have been trying to seek more market access but has been framed in such a way that it actually legitimizes illegal subsidies.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Barman, please conclude. If you have a written text, you can lay it on the Table of the House.

SHRI HITEN BARMAN : I will limit to my points only. I suggest that the hon. Minister should boldly raise the points in the interest of the agriculture sector, of our farmers and peasants and to protect them and protect our country.

SHRI P.C. THOMAS Sir, at the outset, I would like to say that the price of cardamom has come down from Rs.800 per kilo to Rs.150 per kilo. The price of Vanilla has come down from Rs.3000 per kilo to Rs.150 per kilo. The price of pepper has come down from Rs.250 per kilo to Rs.50 per kilo. The position is like this in respect of tea, coffee, apple and pine-apple as also in respect of many other produces of India.

India is a country where the number of people producing agricultural produces is so large compared to other countries. So, we should take a bold initiative and see that we formulate some of the arguments stated below.

First, I think we can say that if the developed countries are going to subsidise their farmers further, up to a stage where they are going to give subsidies to their farmers, we must argue that it should be stopped completely [\[R61\]](#).

We must argue that Blue Boxes and other magic boxes should be abolished, should be eliminated. But, in spite of our arguments, all these things are going to take time. So, in the meanwhile, we want some interim relief. So, India should argue for an interim relief. We should take a lead of such similar-minded countries or similarly standing countries. We should argue for quantitative restrictions on imports, special product issue which we can argue for the producers of India, the agricultural producers as well as the others, and also that we should say specifically that there are countries – say India is one – where suicides are taking place from the part of the countrymen who are in the agricultural field. Therefore, there is absolutely no level playing field. So, there must be a complete revamp of AOA and the matters relating thereto.

श्री राम कृपाल यादव माननीय सभापति महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ और कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप सम्मेलन में भाग लेने के लिए जाएं। देश के हितों की रक्षा के लिए भारत के लोगों ने और भारत सरकार ने हमेशा कटिबद्धता के साथ आगे बढ़ने का काम किया है। हांगकांग की मीटिंग में आप जाएंगे, वहां आपकी जो प्रतिबद्धता है, यूपीए सरकार की जो प्रतिबद्धता है कि आप किसानों के हितों की रक्षा के लिए लड़ेंगे और खास तौर से संसद में आज जो चर्चा हुई, सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने अपने विचार रखे, उसके अनुरूप किसानों के हितों को आप देखने का काम करेंगे और किसी भी स्तर पर कटौती का जो प्रस्ताव है, जो विकासशील देशों के हितों के विरुद्ध है, उसे नहीं मानने का काम करेंगे, यही मेरा निवेदन है।

महोदय, भारत की अर्थव्यवस्था कृषि पर निर्भर करती है। हमारे यहां 75 प्रतिशत किसान हैं और कृषि पर ही किसानों को निर्भर रहना पड़ता है। सब्सिडी में 60 प्रतिशत कटौती का जो प्रस्ताव है, वह बहुत ही अन्यायपूर्ण है। आज जितनी सब्सिडी मिल रही है, उससे भी भारत के कृषक अपनी स्थिति सुदृढ़ नहीं कर पा रहे हैं और लोगों की कृषि में रुचि घट रही है। जब 60 प्रतिशत सब्सिडी आप काट देंगे, तो भारत की कृषि की अर्थव्यवस्था खत्म हो जाएगी, देश की अर्थव्यवस्था खत्म हो जाएगी, इसलिए किसी भी कीमत पर आप इसे नहीं मानेंगे, ऐसा मेरा सुझाव और निवेदन है। यह एक साजिश है। अमरीका जैसे विकसित देश अपनी मार्केट को विकासशील देशों पर इम्पोज़ करना चाहते हैं, इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे जितना भी आपको लड़ना पड़े, आप लड़ें।

पहले भी दो बैठकें दोहा और कानकुन में हुयीं। वहां हमने अपने हितों के साथ समझौता नहीं किया। मुझे विश्वास है कि आप भी देश के हितों के खिलाफ समझौता नहीं करेंगे।

मानव के जीने के लिए अनाज एवं जीवन रक्षक दवाएं अनिवार्य हैं। पहले भारत के पेटेंट एक्ट के अधीन औधियों पर केवल प्रक्रिया पेटेंट लेने की जरूरत होती थी। लेकिन अब उत्पाद पेटेंट लागू होने से औधियों का उत्पादन वही कंपनियां कर पाएंगी, जिन्हें उनका उत्पाद पेटेंट प्राप्त है। उत्पादन पेटेंट अधिकतर बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों को प्राप्त है। बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों के पास असीमित वित्तीय स्रोत हैं। ऐसी दशा में विदेशी कंपनियाँ ही दवाओं का सर्वाधिक मात्रा में उत्पाद कर सकेंगी। इससे भारतीय औधि उत्पादक इकाइयों को गहरा धक्का लगेगा और औधियों की कीमत इतनी बढ़ेगी कि वे गरीब लोगों की पहुंच से बाहर हो जाएंगी। एड्स बीमारी की दवा की कीमत इसका जीता जागता उदाहरण है।

मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि दवा उत्पादन के पेटेंट का जो प्रस्ताव आएगा, देश के गरीबों के हितों के लिए, कृषकों के हितों के लिए, उससे आप समझौता नहीं करेंगे और पूरी दृढ़ता के साथ अपनी मनोधार और मनोविचार के अनुरूप काम करे[[c62](#)]।

MR. CHAIRMAN : The last speaker is Mr. K. Yerrannaidu. Please conclude within two minutes.

SHRI KINJARAPU YERRANNAIDU Mr. Chairman, Sir, our hon. Minister is representing 103 crore people of this country. Our country is depending upon agriculture. Even though the State Governments as well as the Government of India is making a lot of efforts for the farming community, yet the farmers are committing suicide. The farmers are not getting the remunerative prices – be they from Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka or Maharashtra. During the last three years, the chilly farmers, tobacco farmers and other farmers have not been given the remunerative prices. We have discussed elaborately on this issue in the same House. We have to protect the interest of the farming community at any cost. There should be no compromise on this. For this, we have to take support from the G-20 or G-33 countries. If there is any problem, we have to protest or to take consensus – political consensus – of the parliamentary people. Further, we have to negotiate. You and me also were part of the delegation to Seattle. Mr. Maran led that delegation. You are aware that as to how we protected the interests of our country. That is why, we have a lot of confidence on you. We have to keep it mind that we have to protect the interests of the farming community particularly.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to thank the hon. Members for their suggestions and their inputs because almost everybody has spoken outside his political affiliations. Today, the highlight has been very naturally on the issue of agriculture. Not only India but also other developing countries are deeply concerned with the issue of agriculture. Almost 65 per cent of our population depends upon agriculture. The hon. Members have highlighted the concerns which India has in agriculture and they have given their ideas and suggestions.

Sir, undoubtedly, agriculture remains the most structurally flawed part of the global trade of the WTO. Agriculture is a matter which has been discussed in negotiations in the last several months mostly. As I have said separately in other forums that at Hong Kong we are expected to arrive at full modalities after the July Framework with the kind of convergence there. Why is there convergence? Sir, convergence is there because India and other developing countries are not willing to accept the current agriculture trade regime in the world. The subsidies given by the developed countries to their farmers is one billion dollar a day and create artificiality of prices. It is not that the Indian farmer cannot compete with the American farmer. But the Indian farmer has to compete with the US Government. He is not competing with the US farmer. So, agriculture remains the most structurally flawed part in the WTO. This has taken the maximum number of times in discussions.

I am happy to inform that India has stood its ground. It is not only providing market access but also artificial prices. The creation of these artificial prices is because of subsidy. It has to go. It is not only a question of free trade; it is a question of fair trade. That is the issue. 'Fair trade' means 'a level-playing field', and 'a level-playing field' means 'no subsidy'. One of the major issues is export subsidy which they have committed in the July Framework to phase out and until we are going to get commitments

– very specific commitments – but the question is when these export subsidies are going to be phased out in its entirety? Of course, there can be no agreement.

Similarly, in domestic support, the support given by the Government to its farmers has to be substantially reduced[\[a63\]](#). It has to be substantially reduced.

Sir, many points have been made by Members. Some of them have said that WTO is loaded against us. We have to reckon with one fact that today India is a part of the WTO and that is our starting point. Now, within the negotiations we have to make an assessment. The first round of 10 years that we had was the Uruguay Round. Now we are negotiating for the next 10 years, that is the Doha Round. What had happened in the last 10 years? These are facts and figures that are available on the Internet. Were the WTO negotiations good or bad for India in terms of trade? I have the figures with me here.

Sir, what was our export in industrial goods in 1995? What was our export in services and what was our export in agriculture? Our export in merchandise in 1995 was to the tune of \$ 30 billion. In 2004 it was \$ 75 billion. This year we are trying to hit \$ 92 billion because of industrial boom.

In agriculture, our export in 1995 was to the tune of \$ 6.3 billion and in 2004 our export was \$ 7.3 billion. So, what we also need is greater market access for India. Our industry is growing. We find that our small-scale industry is also becoming export-oriented. Let us not forget this fact. Our small-scale market is growing.

Sir, my friend Mr. Thomas pointed about cardamom, vanilla and other spices like pepper etc. He is right that the prices of these products have sunk, but those are commodities grown by developing countries. Spices are not grown in the United States of America and European Union. Cardamom is not grown in the United States of America or the European Union, but it is grown in Guatemala and Vietnam.

So, the whole world's economic architecture is changing and we have to look at as to what will be the economic architecture that need for our agriculture and services sectors. In services, we have had a growth. We were at \$ 6.7 billion in 1995 and in 2004, we were almost at \$ 40 billion. So, what should we be looking for now? On the one hand, we have to protect our agriculture sector, undoubtedly and I want to assure our farmers through this House that the Government is going to protect their interests.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY : Kindly enlighten us about the increase in percentage of our exports in terms of world trade.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: It is simple arithmetic.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY : What is the percentage of increase that we got in all these sectors? That is more important.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: In services, our share in world exports was 0.6 per cent in 1995 and we are now having 1.9 per cent. In merchandise, we were having 0.62 per cent in 1995 and now we are having 0.92 per cent. So, our export has gone up even in terms of world trade.

The point that I am trying to make is this. On the one hand, we have to protect our agriculture against the subsidies. We have to protect our farmers against their subsidised products. Take the price of cotton. About 47 per cent of the US price of cotton is composed of subsidy. India buys cotton to the tune of \$ 300 billion. We are forced to buy from America because it is cheap. The farmers of Western Africa are unable to supply at this price. Of course, we do buy some quantity from them [\[k64\]](#).

So [\[r65\]](#), we have to guard. We have to oppose these subsidies, this support, which they give to their farmers. Every Government would like to do it. Any Government in India would like to do it. But we have our budgetary constraints. So, there is no question of us compromising and opening the doors for subsidised imports into our country, which is going to affect the farmers. I want to assure each and every farmer of our country, through this House, that our Government stands to protect the farmers against the subsidised imports, which will come in.

I want to assure you all that we are looking for market access. We are looking for market access for marine products. We are looking for market access for our basmati rice. We are looking for a surplus, which we are going to have in wheat. Where will we go? Where will the farmers go if the prices fall? We have to look at other markets. Today, we have huge exports. We have exports in the agricultural sector. So, we are also interested in market access. Let us not think that we do not want market access.

To maintain our prices in India, we need to export. That is what is happening. That is what the figures show over the last five years. So, we are fighting for this market access. But if the prices are artificial, we are competing with whom? We are competing with artificial prices. That is the problem. So, we will not compromise, whatever we may get, whatever concession we may get in goods or in services. There can be no compromise for 650 million farmers of this country because this is the largest sector and that is what we are going to stand by.

Issues have been raised about special and differential treatment. Of course, India is a developing country. Every game has been played by the developed countries. They are trying to segregate India and I want to inform you all that in the last one year, we have not only mainly coordinated, but I have personally participated in the G-90 meetings of the poorest countries. India is not speaking for itself. India's voice speaks loudly for the least developed countries. We speak loudly for the African countries. We speak loudly for the vulnerable economies and that is India's strengths and that is what is the ethos of India that we never speak for ourselves, we speak for all, the weaker countries. That give us the loudest voice, that took India to the leadership position.

I have, in the last one year, participated in the G-90 meetings in the African Carrabean Pacific countries, the ACP countries' meetings. We had a meeting of the G-20 countries here. I invited the LDC coordinator here. We held a G-20 meeting in Delhi. India hosted it a couple of months ago so that we continue with a coalition, a coalition, which cannot be overpowered by the developed countries and we have found our goods, we are coordinating with all. There is no question of us stumbling or crumbling. We are going to stand firm.

It is not the completion of this round which matters. It is the content of this around that matters. This is the development round. The name of the development round was not given by accident or because there was no better word, it is being given because the global economy cannot move forward, unless, the 120-125 countries also move forward in their path of development. So, this developmental round will be judged on its content.

We are bringing up the issues of non-tariff barriers. We are bringing up the issues of abuse of the anti-dumping laws because the fact is clear before the world. The bigger developing economies today are no more globally competitive. You are seeing that General Motors is laying off 30,000 people. You have read in the newspapers. The

biggest companies, the biggest drivers of the US economy used to be the automobile industry[r66].

Today, they are laying off workers and we are creating employment. That is the ground reality. Take the IT-enabled services. That is why we are fighting in the services sector. You said : “Are we too liberal?” I must say that when we are asking for so much, we have also to give. You cannot just say I want everything, I am going to give you nothing. But, I want to give what suits to generate employment. We want to give what suits us to enhance our economic activity. We want to give what will enhance our economy. That is the whole strategy of our discussion. Today, if there is no agreement, I must tell you – it is India – why this convergence is there. We could not agree in the last couple of months because India stood firm, developing countries stood firm, L.D. countries stood firm, and the African countries stood firm. I am in continuous touch with them on the telephone and otherwise also through several meetings. As you have seen my absence from this House very often. It was only because I am going for a day here, or for two days there so that the countries can also feel that large country like India have a commonality that we have a stake. Our stake in the future is a common stake.

I want to just dwell on one or two points which have been raised by my friend here. Shri Kharabela Swain said that nothing has happened after Doha meeting. It is true that nothing has happened. Things have been slow after Doha, and they continue to be slow. What are they slow? It is only because we are not agreeing. If we agree to everything, things would have been very fast. So, we are standing firm. We are not letting it happen. We will continue to stand firm because we cannot play with the livelihood security of the people of our country. You mentioned about special products. You are right. I must tell you that when we were negotiating the framework agreement, the special products was the concept which we brought in. We framed it in that manner and we laid down the criteria. Of course we are going to have adequate number of special products so that our farmers remain secured and have special safeguard mechanism against any surge in imports. These are the two safeguards.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Have you identified those special products?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Yes, we have identified them. We are in the process of it. You said about 50 or 60 are there. I took note of that. Of course, we take note of it. Our dairy products are very vulnerable, our spices are very vulnerable, our rice, wheat and sugar are very vulnerable. These are vulnerable products. Of course we are going to use every

mechanism. We are not going to give it away that the markets are going to be flooded with this. There is no question on this.

You raised the question of special and differential treatment. Special and differential treatment is again the basis of this Round. There has to be a special and differential treatment and that has a stand alone. The S&D permeates across every aspect of the negotiation. That is the stand we have taken, and there is less than full reciprocity. That permeates everywhere. You do this much and I will do less than that – we are doing that. We are not going to budge from that.

On environmental issues, I must say that there are no environmental issues as such which are coming. We are not going to see that any environmental conditions are put in as non-tariff barriers. We are living together in this. You mentioned about Pakistan. Pakistan today comes in the category of developing countries. We also coordinate with Pakistan. Pakistan is a member of G-20. When I had the G-20 meeting, their Minister was here. Again, I talked with the Minister on the telephone. We are coordinating with all the developing countries. Even if it is Pakistan, it does not matter because we have to see that developing countries together remain united.

There are other issues. You mentioned about bound rates. Yes, our bound rates are high so we have great flexibility. But, we must also understand that India is not living in a vacuum. We are living in Asia. What are the tariff rates in Thailand, Malaysia and Philippines? We are a large country. People are looking at us.[\[r67\]](#)

So, we have great concerns because we are a country which is strong in industrial products. We hope to do exports of industrial goods this year to the tune of 92 billion dollars. We are hoping to have a huge surge in our agricultural exports. We are looking for the services. Our engagement with the global economy is 300 billion dollars. That is what we have got to keep in mind.

Then, how do we take our engagement with the global economy higher? How do we export more? What we export is incremental economic activity. It is that part which is not absorbed in the Indian economy. I did a study. I got a study done by RIS as to what does a 20 per cent growth every year means in terms of employment. That study said that 10 lakh jobs would be created. Between 2004 and 2005, we had a 22 per cent increase in exports. RIS study is a very detailed study. It said that this created extra jobs. So, this is incremental economic activity. The goods which are not absorbed in the Indian economy are going out. So, keeping all these things in mind, we have to ensure that whatever we are giving into is going to enhance our economic activity, and it is going to be incremental to us. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB : Sir, please allow me to seek a clarification. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let him complete his reply.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: We have these negotiations.

In conclusion, I assure you that India, in these situations, has not budged. We will do the least of all this time. We are going to see that it is not only in the interest of we as Indians but it is also in the interest of the global economy. Through this House, I want to send a message to the world that the global economy is also dependent today on the Indian economy. The global economy is dependent on the health of the Indian economy. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB : It is dependent on the Indian market. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Mahtab, I will allow you to seek a clarification after he completes his reply.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Not market but on the Indian economy, on the purchasing power of the Indian people. It is not just the market because it is, at the end of the day, the health of the Indian economy. The Indian market is not driven by exports. Even our investment, for your information, FDI, unlike China, is domestic market-driven, and it is not merely export market-driven. As long as it is incremental economic activity and as long as it is employment generation, we will see. We have a young population. The biggest

challenges for us are two – employment and agricultural sector. These are the India's two biggest challenges.

Whatever agreements we have, I do not believe – I must tell you very frankly – that we can make them agree. But if we cannot make them agree, be sure that we are also not going to agree. If Hong Kong has to end with no agreement, so be it. India is strong enough to carry on even after Hong Kong.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : Sir, I would like to seek a clarification. Firstly, we wish you good luck, Mr. Minister. The query is that India insisted on no tariff reduction. It is relating to the agricultural sector and special safeguard mechanism for special products, which you have explained. I want to know whether you are going to identify it on the basis of land holding pattern to ensure food security and rural development.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, I have no question but I will just make two points.

The hon. Minister has to insist on the point of flow of technology from the developed world to the developing countries and the least developed countries.

On the point of integrating the LDCs to the world economy, India must insist – since India is taking the lead – on skill development and capacity building in the LDC. These are my two suggestions.

SHRI PRABODH PANDA : Sir, I just want to know as to what was the compulsion, why India has become a part of the five interested parties.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: It is a very good point. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, there is one more Member who wants to seek a clarification. Shri Vanlal Zawma.

SHRI VANLAL ZAWMA (MIZORAM): While discussing a very important topic for India, I would like to ask one question from the hon. Minister, through you, Sir, about the trade relations of India with Myanmar and Bangladesh on the border of Mizoram [[lh68](#)].

What about the present position of the trade relations with Myanmar on the border of Mizoram and trade relations with Bangladesh on the border of Mizoram?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: The first question is about the Fifths about which hon. Member, Mr. Panda has asked. We are in the Fifths representing the G-20. We are representing the G-20. It is not that we are a part of Fifths. We have represented the G-20 in the Fifths. It is important for us to represent G-20 in the Fifths. That is the reason. I think that adds strength to us. That does not send a wrong signal that we are aligned with these countries. There was a G-33 meeting. When Indonesia co-ordinated it, I myself had chaired the G-33 meeting. So, when I go to the Fifths' meeting I just do not talk of G-20 but I can talk of G-33; I talk of G-90 and I talk of all the LDCs.

Last week, there was a meeting in Geneva of the G-4.

SHRI PRABODH PANDA : Brazil is also a member of the G-20.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: But Brazil represents in the G-4 the South, the other part of the world. We represent the other part of the world. That is the reason. Australia is also there. So, we are not there as members. We are representing there. Whatever position is discussed there, I say we have got to go back to the G-20. I have got to go back to G-33 and discuss with these countries. I cannot decide. But this helps us to remain engaged with the process.

SHRI M.P. VEERENDRA KUMAR : You come back to Parliament also and let us know what you are signing.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Certainly, I am going to come back to Parliament after the framework agreement. Mr. Veerendra Kumar, I am very happy that no politics was brought in. This just shows that how we all are united in our perception of the progress of the country. But this is the first time that before a meeting, a discussion is being held. This was mentioned in Rajya Sabha that on the previous occasions at Doha and Cancun, the discussion was held after the meeting. But this time we held it before. I think it is good. So, certainly I will be at your disposal once the meeting is over.

SHRI M.P. VEERENDRA KUMAR : Thank you.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I will come back and report to you all about the progress and the discussions that were held.

Mr. Rupchand Pal will be there in some other capacity. I am sure I will have the advantage of his inputs there also but not on his inputs which concern QRs because QRs are a subject which, I am afraid, as per the legal text of the WTO, we cannot oppose QRs. QRs are linked with the balance of payments. Today we do not have adverse balance of payments. How do I demand something? They ask this question. Can you not read English? But if Mr. Rupchand Pal still insists, for his sake, maybe, I will mention it somewhere.
