

duty of 35 on Rifampicin.
[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2402/92]

(vii) No. 253/92 Customs, dated the 31st July, 1992, amending Notification No. 190/92-Customs, dated the 14th May, 1992 so as to exempt goods covered by notification Nos. 250/92 and 251/92-Customs, both dated the 31st July, 1992, from the whole of auxiliary duty of customs
[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2403/92]

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE STATEMENT BY MINISTER

United Nations conference on
environments and development—*contd.*

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN
(Madhya Pradesh) : Madam Vice-Chairman. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether, in his view, there is a relationship between population, environment and development. If the answer is 'Yes', may I know why there is no mention of such an important thing like population in this whole statement ?

[The Vice-Chairman (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) in the chair]

Sir, in the Stockholm Conference which was held twenty years back, a slogan was coined. This slogan was based on the relationship between poverty and population control. The thinking was that because we were poor, we continued to produce more children. The slogan was 'Development is the best contraceptive'. At that time twenty years ago, when I was just a young doctor...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY
(Pondicherry) : Dr. Jain, you are talking about the medical profession. This is regarding environment.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN
I never interrupt you. Mr. Narayanasamy. At least, for two minutes, be kind.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY
Right from the time you started speaking, you are speaking on the medical profession and not on environment.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN
Be kind to me. I never interrupt you
(Interruptions)

SHRI SOM PAL (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, on a point of order. In the case of clarifications, the practice is that only one speaker is allowed from each party.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN
I had sought the permission of the Chair.

SHRI SOM PAL : That is all right, but I am just pointing out about the practice.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN
You took more time. (Interruptions)
Mr. Narayanasamy, if you continue to harass me, it is not fair. That is all I would say. (Interruptions)

Sir, it is an established fact now that development is the best contraceptive. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister and that of Mr. Narayanasamy, who is interrupting me constantly—to the Rajiv Gandhi Memorial Lecture delivered in New Delhi on May 23, 1992, by a very distinguished man of our times, Mr. Robert McNamara wherein he delineated this principle in great detail. He established a formula. He gave authentic statistics about the relationship between population, consumption and environmental damage. I would mention just one thing from this whole lecture, which directly concerns the hon. Minister. At the moment our population is 850 million. According to Mr. McNamara's calculation

if India's population effort succeeds in next 30 years we are going to add another 435 million people to our existing population. The consumption of such a large number of people and the environment degradation that will take place as a result of such a large population on such a small land area, he says, is not sustainable for India. If after 30 years—Sir, I am quoting.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI : JAGESH DESAI) : Don't quote. Your time is over.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN: This such a grave warning that the Minister of Environment and all others should be concerned with. This Rio meeting was a right place to have brought to the attention of the world this kind of a danger which is facing our nation. Many more things should have been brought in here. I do not know whether the hon. Minister mentioned about this population dimension while discussing environmental development at the Rio meeting.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH) : Sir, I thank the Members who have complimented the Indian delegation for the kind words. This Conference was held 20 years after the Stockholm Conference. Just to refresh the memory of Members in the 1972 Stockholm Conference Mrs. Gandhi was the only head of the Government to be present there. In these 20 years, from 1972 to 1992, many things have happened. With the advancement of science and technology we were not produce more toxic, more hazardous materials and chemicals, not only was there development which was not sustainable that took place but also science and technology advanced for us to assess and evaluate the degradation which takes place in the environment. Many things which were not known 20 to 25 years ago, which only

scientists and highly technical people knew, today are known to all of us. So, whereas the Stockholm Conference only created a fora for discussing this, it was a conference on environment, the Rio Conference after 20 years was a Conference on Environment and Development. We were able to, in this Conference, articulate that environment cannot be looked at in isolation. The main planks, main platforms of environment are development and poverty. If we have to talk of sustainable development, we have to talk of poverty, we have to talk of development.

A point was made that in Stockholm nothing happened. After 20 years of the Stockholm Conference we went to Rio and then we will go from Rio to some other place, yet nothing will happen. Sir, the difference between both the Conferences has been that at the Rio Conference it has been decided to set up a Commission on Sustainable Development and this Commission on Sustainable Development will be under the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The functioning, the modalities as to where it will be located and other issues will be discussed in the U.N. General Assembly which is going to start its session very soon. These things will be formulated then, but this time from Rio we have got a monitoring body. We have a body agreed to not just on the level of the Stockholm Conference. We must remember that Rio Conference was the largest ever gathering of the heads of States and heads of Government. That is the kind of importance it assumed. It was not a conference.

6.00 P.M.

SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM (Uttar Pradesh) : It was a *mela*.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : No, no, no. You should not belittle it by saying that.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : Well, we can deride it and decry it. There is no end to all this.

SHRI JAGMOHAN (Nominated) : So far as setting up of a commission is concerned, after the Human Settlement Conference, the Human Settlement Commission was also set up. Has it led to improvement of housing conditions in poor countries ? Similarly, now a Commission for Environment and Development is being set up. But the point is what is going to happen to this Commission?

SHRI KAMAL NATH : Sir, the hon Member is very right that if it is just merely setting up of the Commission it does not mean that everything will flow from that Commission and that everything will happen. I will just react to that.

I was at the point that this was the largest ever gathering signifying the kind of importance the world is giving to environment. Not only is it giving this kind of importance to environment, but it is also recognising development and poverty to be the central themes of environment. It was India's position all along, and we succeeded in this, that when we talk of environment, we must be talking of development, we must be talking of poverty, we have to talk of poverty-eradication programmes, we have to talk not only in terms of development, but along with that sustainable development also. This was the main issue.

We all know that it was the developed countries which, in their pursuit of development, have caused this environmental degradation which has led to the current

global crisis. The United States has an emission of five tonnes per capita, whereas in India it is only 0.2 tonne per capita. So, it was India's position and the position of other developing countries that developed countries must plough back into the earth a small portion of their prosperity, in the pursuit of which, in the attainment of which they had caused this environmental degradation.

Sir, in the case of the Human Settlement Commission, I am not aware whether there was any treaty, whether there was any convention signed, whether there was any agreement signed. But in Rio four things happened. There was the signing of the Biodiversity Convention. There was the signing of the Convention on Climate Change. There was the adoption of Agenda-21. Agenda-21 lays down the agenda for the twenty-first century. It encompasses the needs, the problems of the developing countries. It takes into account the problem of drinking water. It takes into account soil degradation. It takes into account population.

Hon. Member mentioned about population. Population was an issue. It has not been mentioned in my statement, but population was an issue, and population is a pressure on environment. It was our position that when we talk of population, I agree with the hon. Member, we cannot merely talk of birth-control programmes, but when we talk of population, we have to talk of literacy, specially female literacy. When we talk of population, we have to talk of health. We have undertaken some of the most major family-planning programmes of the world, and we have seen ourselves that the success in our family-programmes is in those areas which have been coupled with programmes of literacy and programmes of health. So, Agenda-21, is a very comprehensive document which

covers all facets. As far as the Biodiversity Convention is concerned, it is a separate treaty.

The United States, despite persuasion, did not agree to sign it. It has apprehensions that this would affect its own industry. But, Sir, we must know that in this the United States was alone.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN
(SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Isolated.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : Its traditional allies, its traditional friends went ahead and signed it. The Biodiversity Convention basically establishes a linkage between bio-material and bio-technology. Som Palji talked of our bio-material, of our bio-genetic resources. Our bio-genetic resources are perhaps one of the largest in the world. We have some of the greatest bio-diversities of this planet. Our genetic resources, our bio-materials have been going to the developed countries and we have to pay through our nose for the bio-technology which has been developed out of this. Bio-diversity Convention is a convention which establishes linkages between bio-materials and bio-technology. It is this linkage which will help us and assist us in not having to pay for the bio-technology derived from our bio-resources. All countries of the world, except the United States, went along with it. This Bio-diversity Convention helps us because we are spending a lot of money ourselves on ecological development schemes, on our sanctuaries, on our national parks and on several other ecologically sensitive areas in our forests, the funding of which will now be enhanced by virtue of the funding mechanism created. I may come to the funding mechanism as a separate issue because that is a common thing. So, Bio-diversity Treaty for a country like India and for countries with a large bio-diversity is now a tremendous gain. Great advances

have been made in it and great progress will be made in the future. Are we to pay for bio-materials taken from our country ? This was the position before.

During the discussions, the question of intellectual property rights came up. Many countries raised this issue as to how to transfer technology because that is already in the private sector. A provision was made in the Biodiversity Treaty that those Governments can acquire this technology. This had never been the case before. You can look at the GATT talks or any other commercial treaty which has been signed. We in India respect intellectual property rights. But when we talk of intellectual property rights, we cannot talk of intellectual property rights merely of bio-technology. We have also to talk of the intellectual property rights of the bio-materials. There is a linkage between the bio-material and the bio-technology. The Governments of developed countries can acquire this technology. India is a country which has preserved its bio-diversity. It has cost us. For us it has a tremendous cost. Now we look forward to the reimbursement of what we spent in preserving our bio-diversity in terms of our diverse forests, in terms of our sanctuaries and in terms of our national parks.

Then we had the Climate Change Treaty. The developed countries are the biggest polluters in the world. After having polluted the world and after having caused this global crisis, the developed countries were of the view that the developing countries should in their road to development, adopt certain technology and do certain things and not do certain things, which would put us into difficulty. The Climate Change Treaty intends to change this situation. We would have liked to see the Climate Change Convention to be far more firm to put commitments on developed coun.

[Shri Kamal Nath]

tries in terms of their emissions. During the discussions most of the developed countries agreed for stabilisation or reduction of missions but some countries had problems. In the Climate Change Convention there are statements on intents of stabilising and reducing emission, whereas for developing countries like India clean technologies will be required and will be assisted for. It was our point that these clean technologies should not be on commercial terms, but on concessional terms and all that we are required to do must be compensated to us, that there must be a flow and additional funding to meet our technological requirements for sustainable development. That was our point and that has been taken care of in the Climate Change Convention which specifically talks of all incremental costs. All incremental costs will have to be funded by the developed countries.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Has that been agreed to ?

SHRI KAMAL NATH : Yes, that has been agreed to. That was part of the treaty. The United States also signed Climate Change Treaty. Now in both these Treaties there is a funding mechanism, including Global Environmental Facility as an interim measure. It was our position all along that the Global Environment Facility is not democratically administered, is not transparent, has a donor-bias. During the negotiations we were successfully able to negotiate that the GF will be reformed. I appreciate the apprehensions of Members that the GEF has not necessarily been at times sympathetic or attuned with the needs and problems of the developing countries. It has been really a window of the World Bank. In these Treaties, it is envisaged very specifically that the Global Environmental Facility will be reformed

It shall be made transparent. After that it has also been agreed that it will only be an interim measure because we have an apprehension that if this reform was not adequate what were we committing ourselves to ? So, a time limit was set. After creating the kind of transparency that we want, still if it is found inadequate, then, it shall be reviewed and new mechanism adopted if deemed necessary. So the apprehension of the Members was felt by us also and we have taken care of that.

Sir, I was talking about Agenda 21 whereas the Convention on Conservation of Bio-diversity and the Convention on Climate Change have specified funding mechanism for the GEF. The Agenda-21 really encompasses a large part of our own on-going programmes. The funding of that worldwide was estimated by the UNCED Secretariat at \$625 billion per year. The UNCED Secretariat estimated that \$125 billion per year would be required as Overseas Development Assistance on a bilateral or multilateral basis to service this kind of fund. So, Sir, for Agenda-21 it was agreed at the highest levels of Governments where the Presidents and the Prime Ministers were present that an attempt will be made to reach 0.7 per cent of their own country's GNP as soon as possible.

Sir, this was not a Conference where we could extract a commitment. It was never meant to be in terms of specific amounts. This was a Conference at the highest level and commitments made at such a forum, at the highest level expressing categorical intent of reaching 0.7 per cent of their GNP, we thought were adequate. Sir, 0.7 per cent of the GNP of the developed countries amounts to \$120 billion per year.

As it is India has been receiving ODA. In 1990, India received \$1,586 million under the Overseas Development Assistance. We have been receiving it under bilateral agreements and from multilateral institutions' funding. But in future with this funding mechanism, with this statement of intent having been made, I am confident that the funds which we need for our forests will flow for our various environmental measures so that they can be strengthened and can go up substantially. Sir, the other issue which was raised was of forests. How forests should be viewed by the world has been a contentious issue. We do not view our forests as a revenue resource; we do not view our forests in terms of timber. We view our forests as natural resources; we view our forests as a subsidy to the poor; we view our forests as fuel wood, as fodder to sustain 500 million cattle; we view forests as a means to sustain millions; at least 100 million families. That is the real subsidy to the poor. Sir, I would like to inform the House, through you, that by an estimate, the contribution of the forestry sector to our economy, outside the market economy, is Rs. 21,000 crores per year. If we are to add the cost of fuel wood which is more or less supplied free of cost to the poorest of the poor in our country—our fuel wood requirement is 160 million tonnes, if we are to add the value of the fodder—at the rate of 5 kg. of fodder per head of cattle the figures, the contribution by forests to our economy, would be astounding. And this is outside our market economy! We do not look at our forests as a revenue resource. We had to pledge our gold. I have said this to the various countries there. We pledged our gold for 500 million dollars. All we had to do was to go by the route of forests. Forests worth 500 million dollars are very, very easily available in our country. But we chose to go to the IMF and not to use our

forests. So, can we be preached by those countries who have no forest left? We cannot be preached by those countries who have timber revenues of 20 billion dollars or 50 billion dollars. The timber revenue of the United States is in excess of 20 billion dollars per year. Forests are our own natural resources. There can be no question of globalising them. This was the position we very strongly took because forests are CO₂ sinks; they are carbon-dioxide sinks. It is very easy for the developed world to talk about the forests in India to be protected to preserve the global environment and not to do anything about their own emissions. We made the point that forests are our own national natural resources and there is no question of looking at them globally. There was an effort to globalise forests, to bring in forests under international management, to have some kind of a treaty on forests which would have hurt our country. We were able to successfully resist that by bringing out India's position. And, India's position on this is one of the most unique in the world. We are one of the countries who are not using forests as a revenue resource. For as, forest-cutting is because of silviculture, because of the life-span of the tree. This is arising out of forest management. The question once asked was: How do you have these forest auctions, these timber auctions? These forests are cut because of silviculture process when the tree is naturally aged. Otherwise, it rots from the core. Sir, we had a statement of principles on forests. We were able to explain our position how India had maintained its forests in terms of hectares. Germany may talk of 30 per cent of its area being under forests. And we can talk of 18 per cent but in terms of hectares, in terms of the diversity of our forests we have the tropical forests, we have the temperate forests, The bio-diversity which is found in our forests is not found in the forests of other

[Shri Kamal Nath]

countries. So we had a statement of principle on the forests where it was specifically mentioned that the forest is a resource for the poor, the forest is a fuel-wood resource, the forest is a fodder resource. So we expect, in future, great attention will be paid to the forestry sector. We expect both—bilateral and multilateral aid and assistance in the forestry sector. I have covered the point of the GEF.

One of the questions asked was whether we will pressurise the United States. It is not a question of pressurising but I do hope that the United States does realise that it is in global interest, it is in their own interest as world leaders, to lead the way in this and we shall keep attempting to persuade them to be a signatory to the bio-diversity convention.

One question was asked whether Anand Margis were in the delegation. The composition of the delegation is known. I don't think even remote association with Anand Margis can be made. There were a large number of people from India who went there on their own. They had nothing to do with the Government delegation. There was a peoples' conference, as mentioned by Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, going on there, which was called by the NGOs. It was also very successful. Our Prime Minister was there. I myself went there. There were a large number of NGOs from India. Now, if there were some isolated people whom we did not know or who we were not concerned with us, I do not know this.

Dr. Naunihal Singh talked about environment and development. I will try to make this point clear with a specific reference to his point about agriculture. This has been adequately covered in agenda 21 and I have said in my statement that I have not been able to lay the agenda 21 in the Library because this was finalised at the last moment. It was finalised two days

before it was adopted. It is a 400 page document. The corrections the amendments, which were finally agreed to, are still being sent to us and as soon as I have it, I will place it in the Library.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : I think you have covered all the points. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOM PAL : None of my four points have been mentioned.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : You should satisfy him. (*Interruptions*) You dealt with them at great length. I know you are an expert in this. He has made a very wide study in this field.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : I can wind up if the hon. Members so desire. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGMOHAN : The point was, whatever funding they will permit under this agreement which has been....(*Interruptions*)...I will just put it—how do you ensure that they do not take it back by unfair practices into their country? They may give by one hand and take back by another hand.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : Sir, one of the points raised by the hon. Members was that the instruments available with the developed countries are aid, trade and debt. The terms of trade and debt were the issues which were discussed and these have been taken care of. I appreciate the hon. Member for raising this point because there were a lot of discussions held why this fund flow comes in and the incremental amount goes out in the end. This has been taken care of. That is why these funding mechanisms are completely separate from the bilateral arrangements. If the fund flow is mainly on a bilateral basis, then there is a problem in this. It goes back to those countries

through some door by using the same equipment of getting some technology from there. But if there is a multilateral institution like the GEF,—we expect this will be brought in—and when we get in to sign the protocols arising out of these conventions, we shall be taking adequate care of this because the next step is the signing of the protocols, setting the plans, laying out the programmes, specifics flow out of these conventions and we shall be taking this into account.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : I think, you have covered all the points.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : Shri Som Pal said...

SHRIMATI SARALA MAHESHWARI (West Bengal) : Sir, regarding Anand Marg I want to ask a question.

SHRI SOM PAL : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, five very specific points I have made—use of the huge land resource, then the water resource, the toxic material, conservation of the traditional practices in medicine and preservation of our medicinal plants and other... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : You can discuss all these things with him. You are an expert.

SHRI SOM PAL : So we have no national programme to cover all this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : About national programme you can ask. It is an important point.

SHRI SOM PAL : Sir, it is a very specific point. I have not made general statements or platitudes.

श्रीमती सरला महेश्वरी : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक मिनट की अनुमति दीजिए मुझे। मैं मंत्री महोदय ने अपने जवाब में कहा है कि उन्हें इस बात की जानकारी नहीं है कि आनन्द मार्गीयों ने... *(व्यवधान)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : That is a small point. Why do you ask it ?... *(Interruptions)*... He says, he does not know. He does not know. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SOM PAL : Sir, that was an official conference. The Minister cannot stop anyone.

(Interruptions)

Sir, this is an irrelevant question. She is wasting the time of the House.

SHRIMATI SARALA MAHESHWARI : It is not my fault... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SOM PAL : Sir, Anand Margis have never gone to the official conference... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : He has already said that he does not know about it. He has said, he does not know.

श्रीमती सरला महेश्वरी : मैं पूछना चाहती हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय की यह जानकारी में नहीं है। लेकिन आनन्द मार्गी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय संस्थाओं से सम्बद्ध रहे हैं और अब्बासों में जब यह आया है तो मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगी कि क्या वे इस बात की तहकीकात करेंगे कि उनके किस तरह के सम्बन्ध अंतर्राष्ट्रीय संस्थाओं में हैं ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : नहीं नहीं, think, Mr. Kamal Nath, you can wind up now. You have given all the details. We are a satisfied.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : Sir Sompal still remains dissatisfied. In the next one minute I shall attempt

[Shri Kamal Nath]

to satisfy him. He mentioned a point about the degraded land. Sir, degraded lands are about 120 million hectares in our country, not 40 million hectares.

SHRI SOM PAL : I said 44 million, which is culturable or which is capable of being brought under green cover. I know it is 120 million you try, but it is not possible.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : I know you are an expert in it. I know at least.

SHRI SOM PAL : It is not a question of expertise... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : No, you have made a very wide study on it... (*Interruptions*)... I know to what extent you have studied it.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : Sir, some very valuable points and suggestions have been made, there is no doubt about it and... (*Interruption*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Please take care of them also.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : I will draw the attention of the Members to the Policy statement on pollution which I laid on the Table. So I could not elaborate; I don't remember, but in the last ten months we have come out with a National Conservation Policy, we have come out with a National Pollution Policy and elements like toxic material are taken care there. So far as the question of soil management and the Integrated Water Management Schemes are concerned, these are the ongoing schemes of the Agriculture Ministry whereas for degraded lands there are programmes we do have an Integrated Wasteland Development Programme. It is in a small way. We are trying to enlarge it and I hope arising out of Rio, this awareness will not only be global because while the problem is global, the action has to be local. Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : The House stands adjourned and we will meet again on Monday at 11 A.M.

The House then adjourned at twenty-nine minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 3rd August, 1992.