intricacies of the negotiations that we will have to look into. At our conference with the WTO at Geneva, as a partner, we discussed these issues. In the Brussels Conference of the least developed countries, the same concerns were raised by the least developed countries. I was in Doha. Almost bargaining was going on there. When we had a Conference of the IPU in support of the Doha Ministerial Conference, I wish I could stand there, when the Chairman was presiding, so that I could tell him how the support of the Parliamentarians of the developing countries can be taken. If I can be of any help to you, that will help and strengthen your hands. When Shri Mukherjee came, I referred to the ruling I gave that day, when I was addressing, that our Parliament can discuss these issues, but our Parliament, according to the Constitution, is not authorised to ratify any treaty or agreement that you sign abroad. But in many developing countries of Africa and Asia, the Parliaments have to ratify treaties and it is where the problem comes. Mr. Minister, I would request you to take the help of **the** Parliamentarians of developing countries and, then, you will have better support while you bargain.

The House is adjourned for lunch for one hour.

The House then adjourned for lunch at twenty-two minutes past one of the clock.

The House re-assembled, after lunch, at twenty-three minutes past two of the clock,

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI) in the Chair]

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS) 2001-2002

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI NITISH KUMAR): Sir, I lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants (Railways), for the year 2001 -2002.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Decisions adopted at the 4* ministerial meeting in connection with W.T.O. negotiations recently concluded at Doha, which have far reaching implications on the Agriculture, Textile, Pharmaceutical and Chemical Sectors etc. of the country - contd.

डॉ. महेश चन्द्र शर्मा (राजस्थान): उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद, डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के संदर्भ में अल्पकालिक चर्चा में आपने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया। मान्यवर, डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के दोहा सम्मेलन में क्या हुआ, क्या नहीं हुआ इस पर चर्चा करने से पूर्व, दोहा तो एक घटना है, कार्यक्रम है। डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के बारे में आब्जर्वेशन्स है, जो मैं पहले कहना चाहूंगा। डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. पश्चिमी समाज के साम्राज्यवादी मानस का रिफलेक्शन है। यह साम्राज्यवाद नया नहीं है। यह कोलंबस से प्रारम्भ होता है। द्वितीय महायुद्ध से पहले अपने इम्पीरियलिज्म के माध्यम से एक प्रकार का ग्लोबलाइजेशन उन्होंने किया था। द्वितीय महायुद्ध के बाद उन्हें वहां से हटना पड़ा था और उसके बाद का यह जो नये प्रकार का ग्लोबलाइजेशन है, यह भी उसी इम्पीरियलिज्म का एक्सटेंशन है, उसका कंटीन्यूएशन है। जो बात मैं कह रहा हूं उससे मुझे ध्यान में आता है कि पछले वर्ष मैं अपने इसी सदन में आदरणीय प्रणब मुखर्जी को सुन रहा था। प्रणब मुखर्जी वे नायक हैं जिन्होंने इस डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के एग्रीमेंट पर हस्ताक्षर किए थे। उनसे अधिक कोई नहीं जानता कि इस हस्ताक्षर के समय उन्हें क्या सहना पडा था, आजाद भारत की संप्रभु सरकार के प्रतिनिधि के नाते उन्होंने क्या सहा, उन्होंने ने जो कुछ सहा था वह उन्होंने अपने भाषण में पिछले वर्ष कहा था। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं उसे यहां उद्दघृत करना चाहता हूं। उन्होंने कहा था कि, "My submission to the hon. Minister would be that we shall have to remain vigilant in the course of the discussion because", यह महत्वपूर्ण है,"to be very frank, 1 may sound pessimist', अगर प्रणब दा निराश होंगे तो आशान्वित कौन होगा। उन्होंने कहा कि ."from the experience of Uruguay Round, and even before that the Tokyo Round in 1976, what I found was that the position which we took effectively at the beginning of the conference, we could not sustain that". जो पक्ष हमने प्रारंभ में शुरु किया था वह हम रख नहीं सके, "I do not blame anybody because the pressure Is so high", जिन्होंने हस्ताक्षर किए वे कह रहे हैं कि "I do not blame anybody because the pressure is so high, intensive and extensive that most of the countries cannot afford but to succumb to that pressure" विश्व के अधिकांश देशों ने इस एग्रीमेंट पर किस प्रकार हस्ताक्षर किए यह उसका एवीड़ेस है, उसका साक्षी है जो भारत के पूर्व वाणिज्य मंत्री दे रहे हैं और वे कह रहे हैं कि "The pressure is so high, Intensive and extensive that most of the countries cannot afford but to succumb to that pressure", और हम आइसोलेट हो जाऐंगे , हम अलग-थलग पड जाएंगे। इसका ऐसा वातावरण क्रिएट कर दिया गया था, जिसके बारे में श्री प्रणब मुखर्जी कहते हैं: "Therefore, that position should not be there. They are like Casablanca standing on the dock; we are alone and there is nobody, as it happened at the ultimate stage of Uruguay Round talks". यह कासाब्लांका की कहानी मैंने जाने से पहले उनसे जाननी चाही थी। मैं समझता हूं कि यह वह अनुभव है जो इस बात को प्रमाणित करता है कि यह संगठन नियमाधारित, समतापरक, विश्ववादी जैसा है क्या? यह अनुभव कहता है कि यह ऐसा नहीं है। वरन यह दबावों के आधार पर, प्रेशर्स के आधार पर, पुल्स के आधार पर सम्पूर्ण विश्व को घेरने का एक प्रयत्न है। यह एक विषम संगठन है। वैसे लगता है कि जो डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के मैंबर हैं वे सम-स्तरीय हैं, वे समान हैं और सब पर एक ही नियम लागू होते हैं। पर वास्तव में ऐसा नहीं है। यह मल्टीलैटरल एग्रीमेंट है। यह कितना

मल्टीलैटरल है इसका वास्तव में जायजा लिया जाना चाहिए। प्रणब दा ने जो 1998 में कहा था, मैं उसको यहां पर कोट करना चाहूंगा:

> "I think the developing countries have taken a lot of more initiatives in dismantling both tariff and non-tariff barriers compared to developed countries. Very often, the U.S. policy-makers and administrators say that their national laws will prevail. If it is just rhetoric, I have no problem, but if they seriously mean it and they want to implement it, where is the scope of fostering and furthering the interests of the multilateral trade arrangements? If Special 301, Super 301 of U.S.A. has precedence over the Agreement reached through the WTO, then, there is no point of having multilateral organisations."

तो वास्तव में यह रेटरिक है। अमेरिका ने अपने व्यवहार में करके दिखाया है कि जो वह भाषणों में कहता है, वास्तव में वैसा नहीं है। उन्होंने इसके लिए अपने यहां कानून पास किया है। आप सब को मालूम है कि डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. पर हस्ताक्षर करने के लिए शायद अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति को विकासशील देशों को मनाने में इतनी दिक्कत का, इतनी परेशानी का सामना नहीं करना पड़ा, जितनी दिक्कत का सामना उनको स्वंय अमरिकी सीनेट से उसे रेक्टीफाई कराने में करना पड़ा। अमेरिकी संसद ने उरुग्वे राउंड़ एग्रीमेंट को तब तक रेक्टीफाई नहीं किया, तब तक उसे अनुमोदित नहीं किया, जब तक उन्होंने ऐसे दो कानून पास नहीं कर लिए जिनमें उन्होंने घोषणा की कि अमरिकी संविधान डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के मैंड़ेट के ऊपर रहेगा। उन्होंने घोषणा की कि अमरिका का संविधान संघात्मक है इसलिए अमेरिकी स्टेटस् के संविधान डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. से ऊपर रहेंगे। उन्होंने इस बात की भी घोषणा की कि उनके नेशनल इंटरेस्ट जहां पर आहत होंगे, वहां पर वे अपनी सावरेंटी को प्रिवेल करेंगे और उन्होंने अपनी संवैधानिक सर्वोच्चता को कानून द्वारा रक्षित किया। 8-12-1994 को उन्होंने कानून पास किया है, जिसका नाम है उरुग्वे राउंड़ एग्रीमेंट ऐक्ट। उसका एक सेक्शन 102 ए है, जिसको मैं यहां पर पढ़ना चाहूंगा:

> "United States' law shall prevail in conflict. No provision of any of Uruguay Round Agreement nor the application of any provision to any person or circumstances that is inconsistent with any law of the United States shall have effect."

ऐसा कोई भी कानून लागू नहीं होगा जो अमरिकी कानून और उसके व्यवहार को प्रभावित करता हो। उसमें लिखा गया है कि "Nothing in this Act shall be construed (a) to amend or modify any law of United States."

डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. कानून से हम अपने कई कानूनों को बदल रहे हैं। पर अमरिका ने पहले कानून बनाया including any law relating to the protection of human, animal and plant life or health, the protection of the environment or worker safety or to limit any authority conferred unoer the law of United States, including section 301 of Trade Act of 1974 unless specifically provided for in this Act."

इस कानून से अमरीका ने अपनी सर्वोच्चता डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के मेनड़ेट के ऊपर स्थापित की और इसलिए उनका यह कहना कि हमारी स्थिति विशेष है, यह रिहोट्रिक नहीं है, यह केवल वाचालता नहीं है, यह उनके मन की इच्छा है। यह उन्होंने अपने देश में कानून पास कर के बताई है। ऐसा ही कानून संघात्मकता के लिए है। मैं पूरा पढ़ नहीं रहा हूं क्योंकि समय की सीमा है और वैसा ही कानून विशेषकर पेटेंट एक्ट के लिए है। डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के प्रावधानों के अनुकूल पेटेंट लॉ को जिन्होंने अमेंड भी कर लिया है और उनका अमेंडेड लॉ अगर अमरीका के लॉ के अनुकूल नहीं बैठता है तो उसकी बात वह नहीं मानेंगे। ऐसा कानून उन्होंने सेक्शन 182 में पारित किया हुआ है। इसलिए उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बात सेकेंडरी है कि हमने जेनेवा में, सिंगापुर में, सियेटल में और दोहा में क्या पाया और क्या खोया, यह जानना और मानना महत्वपूर्ण है कि हम किस से कहां और क्या व्यवहार कर रहे हैं। यह जो डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. है इसके पीछे जो ग्लोबलाइज़ेशन की अवधारणा है, आखिर यह ग्लोबलाइज़ेशन की अवधारणा किसने प्रस्तुत की, कब प्रस्तुत की, कैसे प्रस्तुत की। हम देखेंगे कि उरुग्वे राऊंड वार्ता प्रारम्भ होने के पहले, जितना मैं पढ़ता हूं, मुझे भारतवर्ष के किसी भी अखबार में, किसी पत्र-पत्रिका में ऐसा कोई आलेख दिखाई नहीं देता जो इकोनोमी के ग्लोबलाइज़ेशन की मांग करता हो, न भारत में और न तृतीय विश्व के किसी देश में वरन् ग्लोबलाइज़ेशन की मांग उन देशों ने शुरु की जिन देशों का द्वितीय महायुद्ध के पहले तृतीय विश्व के देशों पर साम्राज्य था। उनके लिए जीवन कठिन हो गया था क्योंकि विश्व का बाजार उनके हाथ से छूट गया था । उनके लिए कठिन हो गया था कि उन्होंने साम्राज्यवाद को फीड करने के लिए जो इंडस्ट्रीयल रेवोल्यूशन किया था, उनकी भटिटयों को यदि कच्चा माल तृतीय विश्व का नहीं मिले तो उनकी भटटियां बुझ जाए, उनके माल को हमारा बाजार न मिले तो उनका दम घुट जाए। ऐसे लोगों के लिए जरुरी हुआ कि उन्होंने द्वितीय महायुद्ध के बाद जो खोया, उसको वे कैसे पाएं और उसको प्राप्त करने के लिए उन्होंने ग्लोबलाइज़ेशन की मांग शुरु की। जब वहां ग्लोबलाइज़ेशन की बात शुरु हुई तब तृतीय विश्व के लोगों में भी इसकी चर्चा शुरु हुई, चिन्ता शुरु हुई। डा. मनमोहन सिंह सामने बैठे हुए हैं और इस भूमण्डलीयकरण के खिलाफ साऊथ-साऊथ कोआप्रेशन की चर्चा आरम्भ हुई। सोचा गया कि नार्थ-नार्थ का इवेज़न होने वाला है थ्रू ग्लोबलाइज़ेशन तो इसका मुकाबला हम कैसे करेंगे तो उसके मुकाबले के लिए साऊथ-साऊथ कोआप्रेशन की बात शुरु हुई। आज जूलियस न्यरेरे नहीं हैं जो उसके अध्यक्ष थे। डा. मनमोहन सिंह जी हैं, जो उसके महामन्त्री थे। साऊथ-साऊथ कोआप्रेशन अल्टीमेटली इंस्टीटयूशनलाइज़ नहीं हो सका। दक्षिण-दक्षिण सहयोग का सांस्थीकरण नहीं हो सका और ग्लोबलाइज़ेशन का सांस्थीकरण डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के रुप में हो गया। मैं समझता हूं कि डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. की स्थापना के बाद नार्थ-नार्थ का इवेज़न किस प्रकार बढ़ा है। इसे जानना चाहिए मैंने अभी एक आंकड़ा प्राप्त किया कि पिछले पांच सालों में डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में किन देशों ने किन की शिकायतें की, डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के नियम के अनुसार कौन अन्यायग्रस्त हुआ। मुझे यह आंकड़ा मिला कि पिछले पांच सालों में कुल 179 शिकायतें डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में की गई। इनमें से 148 शिकायतें विकसित देशों ने की, यूरो अमरीकी देशों ने 148 शिकायतें की हैं और 31 शिकायतें तृतीय विश्व के देशों ने की हैं। यह आंकड़ा किस बात का द्योतक है? यह आंकड़ा कह रहा है कि विकसित देशों को शिकायत है तृतीय विश्व के देशों से कि वे प्रापर्ली ग्लोबलाइज अपने आपको नहीं कर रहे हैं। डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के माध्यम से 180 बार उन्होंने यह कोशिश की कि तृतीय विश्व के देश उनकी बातों को मानें। हमारे अपने देश से मैंने पता किया था कि हमने पांच साल में कितनी फीस वकीलों को दी। तो डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में केस लड़ने के कारण जो आंकड़ा मिला है वह 1.16

करोड़ है। 1.16 करोड़ रुपए हमने अपने हकों की, अधिकारों की रक्षा करने के लिए डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में खर्च कर दिए। इसलिए महोदय, यह बात महत्वपूर्ण है कि जिनसे हम नेगोशिएशंस कर रहे हैं, जिनसे हम चर्चा कर रहे हैं उनका मानस कैसा है। उसका मानस न्याय का नहीं है, उनका मानस समता का नहीं है, उनका मानस वैश्विकता का नहीं है, उनका मानस इम्पीरियलिस्टिक है, उनका मानस साम्राज्यवादी है, उनका मानस दबाव के माध्यम से विश्व पर हावी होने का है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूं कि इस डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ.की जो मिनिस्टीरियल कान्फ्रेंस है उस कान्फ्रेंस में हमने ज्यादा पाया या नहीं पाया, इसका गणित किया जाए। मैं समझता हूं कि मराकेश से लेकर सिंगापुर, जेनेवा तक हम कुछ ज्यादा नहीं पा सके। हम खोते रहे। लेकिन इसमें एक परिवर्तन आया और परिवर्तन तब हुआ जब जमैका में जी-15 के सम्मेलन में भारतीय प्रधानमंत्री श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी गए और वहां उन्होंने आहवान किया। आहवान किया कि डब्ल्यू टी ओ के भीतर साउथ-साउथ कोआपरेशन को जिंदा किया जाए। इसके लिए उन्होंने सीएटल के पहले बैंगलोर में जी-15 देशों को आमंत्रित भी किया था। यह हम सबको मालूम है कि तब वह सरकार गिर गयी और बैंगलोर में जब मीटिंग हुई तब हम सब लोग चुनाव में लगे हुए थे। लेकिन उस मीटिंग का परिणाम हुआ, और परिणाम सीएटल में हुआ। सीएटल में पहली बार विकासशील देशों ने यानी साउथ-साउथ कोआपरेशन ने विकसित देशों को एक प्रकार की चुनौती दी और कहा की आपके सुझाव आपके समझौते हम स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे तब बड़ा अहमन्य भाषण किया था राष्ट्रपति क्लिंटन ने। बड़े अहंकारपूर्वक उन्होंने कहा था कि यदि आप पर्यावरण और श्रम मानकों को स्वीकार नहीं करते तो हम आप पर आर्थिक प्रतिबंध लगा देंगे । उनकी इस अहमन्य घोषणा के खिलाफ साउथ-साउथ कोआपरेशन और प्रखर हो गया। परिणाम हुआ कि सीएटल में पहली बार ग्रीन रुम डिप्लोमैसी को चुनौती दी गयी और कहा गया कि प्लेनरी में जो लोग बैठे हुए हैं वे अपने देशों के प्रतिनिधि हैं, संप्रभु देश हैं। इसलिए ग्रीन रुम में 10-15-20 देश इकटठे हो जाएं और कन्सेंसस की घोषणा कर दें तो इसमें न ट्रांसपैरेंसी है, न डेमोक्रेसी है और न ह्यूमैनिटी है। उसका परिणाम हुआ। उसका परिणाम हुआ कि सीएटल कान्फ्रेंस विफल हो गया । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह इतिहास का एक टर्निंग प्वाइंट था। यहां से इतिहास मुड़ता है और सीएटल की विफलता ने...(**व्यवधान**)...सीएटल में जो वार्ता विफल हुई, इस विफल वार्ता ने विश्व को एक संदेश दिया कि ग्लोबलाइज़ेशन के समानांतर दक्षिण-दक्षिण सहयोग अब उभरने लगा है। सीएटल का वह संकेत हुआ और एक दुर्घटना हो गयी 11 सितम्बर को अमेरिका में जिसने स्थितियों को बदल दिया। पिछले दो वर्षों की पत्र-पत्रिकाओं का थोड़ा अध्ययन करेंगे तो हमें ध्यान आएगा कि पिछले दो साल में यूरो-अमरिकी वर्ल्ड ने अपने मतभेदों को तो दूर किया, नए वार्ता चक्र के लिए विश्व भर में दबाव ड़ालना शुरु किया। हमारे आज के वाणिज्य मंत्री श्री मुरासोली मारन का मैं अभिनंदन करता हूं कि उन्होंने विकासशील देशों को प्रखर नेतृत्व दिया। उन्होंने जो विकासशील देशों के ट्रेड मिनिस्टर्ज़ को पत्र लिखा वह एक ऐतिहासिक पत्र है और एक मील का पत्थर है। वही प्रखरता उन्होंने दोहा में दिखायी। मान्यवर, दोहा में नई वार्ता के आधार पर विश्व के ऊपर डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. की चौधराहट के खिलाफ भारत ने जम कर संघर्ष किया। बाद में जो प्रतिफल निकला जिसको श्रीमान प्रणबदा ने पढ़ कर सुनाया और उन्होंने शायद ठीक ही कहा कि हर कांफ्रेंस में वही भाषा फिर से दोहरायी जा रही है, वह नयेपन का एहसास तो देती है, परन्तु नयापन उसमें होता नहीं है। लेकिन उस भाषा को प्राप्त करने के लिए जो किया गया और जो करना पड़ा, उसके लिए विकासशील देशों को एक अभिनंदन जाना चाहिए, विकासशील देशों के नेताओं को एक शाबाशी जानी चाहिए कि उन्होंने दोहा में अपने अस्तित्व का एहसास करवाया।

सब बातों का पढ़ना तो संभव नहीं है, लेकिन उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कुछ अखबारों के केवल शीर्षक ही पढ़ना चाहता हूं। वे शीर्षक इस बात को व्यक्त करेंगे कि दोहा में क्या हुआ। दोहा के जो तीन डेक्लेरेशन है उनसे पता लगता नहीं कि क्या हुआ। "गार्डियन" का शीर्षक है, Power shifts in WTO - Developing countries flex their muscles, यह गार्डियन का शीर्षक है। महोदय, द वाल स्ट्रीट जर्नल का शीर्षक है, Tough talkers -- Poor nations with gain in global trade deals, as US compromises; India holds out tit) the end इसका पैरा भी पढ़ने लायक है, जो कि मारन जी के लिए है और अच्छा है। India and Mr. Maran became the men to see at Doha. Frustrating the US and the European efforts to get an agreement. He spent the first five days, refusing to negotiate, and the last day, threatening to walk out of the talks. Before cutting a final deal, Indian delegation, used every argument they could muster from chiding Europe for its legacy of colonialism to charging the US the super power, with arm-twisting यह द वाल स्ट्रीट जर्नल का कथन है। मैं समझता हूं कि विश्व को कोई अखबार ऐसा नहीं होगा जिसने इस बात को रेखांकित नहीं किया हो। यह "फाइनेंशियल टाइम्स" है, Poor nations lead move against trade round यह तो मारन जी का खुद का लिखा-कहा हुआ है इसलिए मैं इसको नहीं पढ़ता। यह "ट्रिब्यून" का संपादकीय है। इसमें लिखा है कि What is heartening for the present is the leadership rote India played at Doha. It was back to 70s when this country led the developing segment मैंने केवल कुछ चुने हुए शीर्षक ही लिए हैं, क्योंकि सब को पढ़ना संभव नहीं है। India arriving at the WTO. The Doha Declaration represents a significant victory for India not just in terms of the items it includes but also items it excludes, says Arvind Panigriya. उपसमाध्यक्ष जी, संपूर्ण विश्व ने जाना, संपूर्ण विश्व ने देखा कि भारतवर्ष नेतृत्य की उसी भंगिमा में आ गया हैं जो भंगिमा सैवंटीज़ में कभी भारतवर्ष की हुआ करती थी।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछली बार जब यहाँ भाषण हो रहे थे और उस समय सी.पी.एम. के विप्लव बाबू जो कि डेलीगेशन में गए थे, उन्होंने अपने भाषण में श्री मारन के लिए कहा था कि सिएटल में उन्होंने जो कुछ भूमिका अदा की है, उसके कारण मैं उन को 100 में से 90 अंक देता हूँ और साथ में यह कहा कि 90 अंक इसलिए कि प्रोफेसर पूरे में से पूरे मार्क्स नहीं दिया करते । महोदय, इसी भाषा में सी.आई.आई. और फिक्की ने कहा है कि हम श्री मारन को 10 में से 10 अंक देना चाहते हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस प्रकार के शीर्षकों की एक पूरी तालिका है। संपूर्ण विश्व के अखबारों को देखने से ध्यान में आता है कि इस दोहा सम्मेलन की प्राप्ति यह तो है ही कि ट्रिप्स एग्रीमेंट में हम वे स्पष्टीकरण ले सके जो हमारे अपने देश के लिए, विकसशील देशों के लिए और जनस्वास्थ्य के लिए जरुरी थे। यह तो हम कर ही सके कि मरोकेश उरुग्वे राउंड़ एग्रीमेंट के जो मुद्दे कार्यान्वयन के भूखे हैं, उन कार्यान्वयन के मुद्दों को हम वहाँ स्वीकार करवा सके और यह कहलवा सकें कि कार्यान्वयन के मुद्दे महत्वपूर्ण हैं। पुराने मुद्दों के कार्यान्वयन के बिना नए मुद्दा को जोडना डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के साथ न्याय नहीं है। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इससे भी बडी प्राप्ति इस बात की है कि जब मराकेश में उरग्वे राउंड़ पर हस्ताक्षर हो रहे थे तो अमरिका के रॉस परेट ने विरोध किया था कि अमरिका को डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. साइन नहीं करना चाहिए। उस बारे में उनके अनेक आर्गुमेंट्स थे जिनमें एक यह था कि यू.एन.ओ. में हम अपनी

भूमिका इसलिए अदा कर पाते हैं कि वहाँ हमारे पास "वीटो" है, आई.एम.एफ. और वर्ल्ड बैंक में हमारे पास इक्विटी है, लेकिन डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में हमारे पास कोई इक्विटी नहीं है, कोई वीटो नहीं है और विकासशील देशों के बहुमत के बीच में अमरिका कभी न कभी लाचार हो जाएगा और इस प्रकार की लाचारी को आमंत्रित करने वाले ड़ाक्युमेंट पर अमरिका को हस्ताक्षर नहीं करना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि अमरिका के लोगों ने दोहा में महसूस किया होगा कि यदि डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के मंच को विकासशील देशों ने कभी उपयोग करना चाहा तो उनके द्वारा आर्म टिवस्टिंग एक सीमा से अधिक संभव नहीं होगी।

मैं अभिनंदन करता हूं कि नई वार्ता के खिलाफ चटटान की तरह अड़िग होकर श्री मारन ने इतिहास में एक नया अध्याय रचा है। लेकिन जिस प्रकार का वह इंस्टूमेंट है, ऑर्गनाजेशन है, उसमें कितना अङना चाहिए? क्या इतना अड़ना चाहिए कि जो आपका साथ दे रहे हैं, उनका साथ छूट जाए? मैं समझता हूँ किसी प्रकार इन विषयों से आगे जाकर जो नई वार्ता के विषय हैं उन विषयों को कम-से-कम दो साल तक डेफर कराया जा सके। फिर नई वार्ता के समय भारत की क्या भूमिका होगी भारत क्या भूमिका अदा करे, इसके लिए फिर से दोहा में जिस प्रकार की चर्चा हुई और दोहा के पहले देश और दुनिया में चर्चा हुई, वैसी चर्चा शायद फिर होने की जरुरत होगी। वैसी चर्चा फिर से हो कि डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के भीतर दोहा में एक नई स्थिति उत्पन्न हुई है कि अब यह मंच केवल विकसित देशों का मंच नहीं है, अब यह मंच केवल यूरो- अमेरिकन वर्ल्ड का मंच नहीं है। दोहा में यह सिद्ध हुआ है कि अब इस मंच के द्वारा विकासशील देशों की एक यात्रा प्रारंभ होती है, विकासशील देशों का एक नया प्रयास प्रारंभ होता है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस संदर्भ में मैं जिस पार्टी का कार्यकर्त्ता हूं – बी.जे.पी उस पार्टी का डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के बारे में क्या परसैप्शन है, वह भी यहां बताना चाहता हूं क्योंकि उसके बिना शायद बात अधूरी रहेगी। बी.जे.पी. का 1998 का जो अंतिम घोषणा पत्र जारी हुआ था, उसमें डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के बारे में हमारा परसैप्शन क्या है, वह मैं पढ़ता हूं

> "In 1991, the BJP cautioned the Government to embark upon internal liberalization first and defer globalization. We advocated the reinstatement of the Swadeshi idea, particularly because of the heavily one-sided pro-West WTO in the offing. However, in a matter of five years, the BJP stand on Swadeshi has been vindicated." This is the perception of my Party.

और डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के बारे में क्या करना चाहिए, उसके बारे में मैं इसका अंतिम पैरा पढ़ता हूं, पूरा पढ़ना तो संभव नहीं है। इसमें है कि

The BJP would strive to work out a strategy and consensus within the nation and with all nations similarly placed, to lobby for iegittmateiy justified modification of the perspective, programmes, rules and schedule of the WTO.

यह हमारा राष्ट्रीय लक्ष्य है। यह राष्ट्रीय गोल है कि डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के भीतर वे परिवर्तन लाए जाएं जो परिवर्तन उसके पर्सपेक्टिव में, उसके प्रोग्राम में, उसके रुल में और उसके शैडयूल में होने अपेक्षित हैं।

मैं समझता हूं कि "दोहा" में एक पडाव हमने पार किया है, उसके आगे की यात्रा हमें

3.00 P.M.

करनी होगी। जिस तरह से द्वितीय महायुद्ध के बाद तृतीय विश्व आज़ाद हुआ था, तो अच्छा रहेगा यदि "दोहा" के बाद तृतीय विश्व डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. की जो पुरानी मानसिकता है साम्राज्यवाद की, उससे मुक्त हो कर स्वतंत्र विश्व के लिए समताप्रद संगठन के नाते आगे बढ़ेगा। यह एक लम्बी लड़ाई है, इस लम्बी लड़ाई में हमें ऐसे ही नायक चाहिए जैसे नायक "दोहा" में थे- श्री मारन। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): अगले वक्ता श्री रामचन्द्रन पिल्लै हैं लेकिन उनकी सहमति से मैं श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक जी को बुलाता हूं।

श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक(उत्तर प्रदेश):श्रीमन, पांच-छः वर्षों के अनुभव के आधार पर इसमें अब कोई संशय की बात नहीं है कि विश्व व्यापार संगठन विकसित देशों में जो परिस्थितियां पैदा हो गई थीं उनसे निजात पाने के लिए, दुनिया में बाजार ढूंढ़ने के लिए किया गया। "गैट" से जब काम नहीं चला तो विश्व व्यापार संगठन का गठन किया गया और विश्व व्यापार संगठन के जरिए से, उसकी शर्तों से हम अपने देश में जो देख रहे हैं, वह यही देख रहे हैं कि हमारी स्वायत्तता, हमारी सार्वभौमिकता और हमारे दूसरे सामाजिक स्तर के काम, संस्कृति के स्तर के काम, सब में दखलंदाज़ी हो रही है।

श्रीमन्, विश्व व्यापार संगठन व्यापार को सर्वोपरि मानता है और जिंदगी के हर क्षेत्र को व्यापार की दृष्टि से देखता है, चाहे वह सामाजिक संबंधों के संबंध में हो, चाहे हमारी संस्कृति के संबंध में हो, चाहे जो विभिन्न सेवाएं हैं, उनके संबंध में हो, वह सबको व्यापार की दृष्टि से देखता है।

इन 5 वर्षों में हमने विश्व व्यापार संगठन की शर्तों के आधार पर क्या पाया है, यह हम सब महसूस करते हैं, सभी भुक्तभोगी हैं और सभी जानते हैं कि न तो हमारे देश का व्यापार बढ़ा है, न हमारे देश की कृषि की स्थिति सुधरी है, न हमारे बेरोज़गार युवकों को रोज़गार मिला है। दोहा का जो डिक्लेरेशन है, दोहा की जो घोषणा है, मंत्री स्तर की जो घोषणा है, उसकी पहली लाइन में ही वे कहते हैं कि हमने विश्व में व्यापार को बढ़ा दिया, बेरोज़गारी को खत्म करके रोज़गार बढ़ा दिया लेकिन अपने देश में कितना रोज़गार बढ़ा है, हमें इस बात को भी देखना होगा। माननीय मंत्री जी का जो बयान है, उसमें सदिच्छाएं तो हैं, उम्मीदें भी हैं कि आगे जाकर यह ठीक होगा, ये चीजें अगली बैठक में तय होंगी, फलां-फलां कमेटी में तय होंगी लेकिन डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. की जो नीयत है, जो विश्व व्यापार संगठन की शर्तें हैं, उन शर्तों पर चलते हुए हम अपने देश के व्यापार को, उद्योग को, कृषि को नुकसान पहुंचाते जा रहे हैं, इसमें कोई दो रायें नहीं हैं।

महोदय, भारत विकासशील देशों का एक संगठन खड़ा करने की और उसका नेतृत्व करने की क्षमता रखता था। सियेटल से पहले ऐसी संभावनाएं दिखाई दी और सियेटल के सम्मेलन में जो मंत्री स्तर का तीसरा सम्मेलन हुआ, उसका नतीजा भी निकला लेकिन दोहा के बाद और दोहा के ड़िक्लेरेशन के बाद हमने क्या पाया है, इसकी तस्वीर स्पष्ट नहीं होती।

मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से सीधे-सीधे सवाल करना चाहता हूं, मुझे भाषण देने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, महेश जी ने बहुत बढ़िया बातें डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के बारे में कहीं लेकिन बाद में

वे भी अपनी पार्टी की नीतियों से बंध गए, क्या करते बेचारे और अंत में उन्होंने समर्थन ही कर दिया। महोदय, मेरा पहला सवाल तो यह है कि स्वास्थ्य-सुरक्षा आदि के अधिकार जैसे व्यापक अर्थ वाले शब्दों को हटाने के विषय में क्या निर्णय हुआ? डिक्लेरेशन में स्वास्थ्य के संबंध में जो बात कही गई है, मंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में कहा है कि

> "A separate landmark declaration on TRIPS and Public Health is a major achievement, in which India played a key role. It recognises the affordability and availability of medicines as a universal right. It would now enable member-countries to take measures to protect public health, as the Declaration recognises the flexibility under the TRIPS Agreement when dealing with public health problems affecting human beings, such as HIV/AIDS, malaria, other epidemics, and the respective national governments would decide about emergencies and epidemics and take appropriate measures to ensure access to medicines. "

इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि सीमित कर दिया गया AIDS तक। मंत्री जी ने बात तो सही कही है कि स्वास्थ्य वाले मामले में, दवाओं वाले मामले में कि पेटेंट का जो कानून हमारे यहां बना, वह केवल इसलिए बना कि बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियां जो दवाएं बनाती रही थीं, उनके हित सधें, उनका व्यापार बढ़े। उस मामले में पहला वाक्य तो ठीक है लेकिन उसका नतीजा क्या निकलता है? और दवाओं का क्या होगा? और जो दवाइयां बन रही हैं और बाज़ार में इतनी मंहगी बिक रही है, उनका क्या होगा? क्या इनके अलावा और बीमारियां नहीं हैं? ये तो ऐपिडेमिक्स हैं, इनकी बात अलग है, एमरजेंसी की बात अलग है लेकिन इससे हमें हासिल क्या हुआ?

तीसरा सवाल मैं यह करना चाहता हूं कि किसानों को सब्सिडी देने पर पाबंदी के संबंध में क्या हुआ? डिक्लेरेशन में यह साफ है कि इस ढ़ंग के प्रोटेक्शन नहीं दिए जाएंगे। उनकी शर्तों को मानते हुए हम किसानों की सब्सिडी को खत्म कर रहे हैं चाहे वह खाद के मामले में हो, चाहे बिजली के मामले में हो, चाहे किसी भी मामले में हो, उनकी सब्सिडी को हम खत्म करते जा रहे हैं। दूसरी ओर अमरीका क्या कर रहा है? मैं सिर्फ एक मिसाल देना चाहूंगा कि पिछले एक साल में 90,000 करोड़ रुपए की सब्सिडी अमरीका ने अपने किसानों को दी है। किस नाम से प्रोटेक्टिव सब्सिडी दी गई? चैक के ज़रिये से सब्सिडी दी गई है उसे प्रोटेक्टिव सब्सिडी का नाम दिया गया है और हम उन सब्सिडियों को जो अपने काश्तकारों को देना चाहते हैं, उनको बंद करते चले जा रहे हैं उनकी शर्तों के मुताबिक। जबकि हमारे किसान की स्थिति में और उनके किसान की स्थिति में फर्क है, बुनियादी फर्क है। उनके किसान को हर वक्त पानी मिलता है, हर वक्त बिजली मिलती है, अच्छा खाद मिलता है, अच्छे से अच्छा बीज मिलता है जबकि हमारे काश्तकारों को समय से बिजली नहीं मिलती है, हमारे काश्तकारों को अच्छा खाद समय से नहीं मिलता है, मंहगा खाद मिलता है, हमारी काश्त पर खर्चा ज्यादा आता है फिर भी हम यह नहीं सोचते हैं कि अमेरिका अपने किसानों को कितनी सब्सिडी दे रहा है, वह चाहे किसी भी नाम से दे रहा है। वह उसे प्रोटेक्टिव सबसिडी के नाम से दे रहा है जो कि डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. की शर्तों में नहीं आता है, उसको डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. की शर्तों में रखा नहीं गया है। इसी प्रकार से यूरोप के जो

30 देश हैं उन्होंने एक आर्गनाइज़ेशन बना रखा है जिसका नाम "आर्गनाइजेशन फार इकनोमिक कोआपरेशन एंड डेवलेपमेंट" रखा है। इन 30 यूरोपियन देशों ने 16 लाख 20 हजार करोड़ रुपये की सब्सिडी दी है और हम अपने यहां सब्सिड़ी खत्म करते चले जा रहे हैं। इसका नतीजा यह है कि हमारे यहां वहां से अनाज आ रहा है, आटा भी मांगने के लिए हम मजबूर हैं क्योंकि डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. की शर्तें हैं, आपको यह सामान वहां से मांगना ही पड़ेगा। आप उद्योग की भी चीजें मंगा रहे हैं जबकि अपने लघु उद्योग बंद होते चले जा रहे हैं । लघु उद्योग की चार लाख अच्छी इकाइयां बन्द हो चुकी हैं और जो 10 लाख बची हैं उनमें कई बीमार हैं, क्यों? इसीलिए कि उनकी शर्तों के मुताबिक आप वह माल भी लाने के लिए मजबूर हैं जो आपके यहां मौजूद हैं। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि अगर देश की तरक्की करनी है तो आपको अपने यहां का मोटा कपड़ा पहनना पड़ेगा, खराब साबुन इस्तेमाल करना पड़ेगा और सिर में ड़ालने का तेल, इत्र जो बाहर से आता है वह ड़ालना बंद करना पड़ेगा और अपने यहां का खराब ही तेल इस्तेमाल करना पड़ेगा तभी आपका देश आगे बढ़ेगा। अपने देश में 35 करोड़ लोग गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहते हैं, 10 करोड़ लोग बेरोज़गार हैं। आप चाहते हैं कि हम अपने देश में उसी ढंग से उन्नति कर लें, उसी ढंग से हम रहने लगे तो यह कैसे सम्भव हो सकता है? आपको अपने किसानों को सब्सिडी देनी पड़ेगी। यह मेरा दूसरा सवाल है। इसके बारे में क्या निश्चित हुआ है?

मेरा तीसरा सवाल बहुपक्षीय निवेश समझौते, प्रतिस्पर्धा नीति, श्रम मानकों और पर्यावरण नीति को शामिल करने के संबंध में है। इसके बारे में क्या निर्णय हुआ है? डिकलेरेशन में कोई ऐसी बात हमें नहीं मिली है। उसमें केवल यह मिला है कि "हां" होगा, आगे वार्ता चलेगी। इसके नतीजे कब निकलेंगे? क्या निकलेंगे? जब हम पूरे रसातल में चले जायेंगे तब निकलेंगे? क्या इसमें हमारा अहित होता रहेगा? मैं यह फिर कहना चाहता हूं कि विकासशील देशों का अगर नेतृत्व देने की क्षमता और हिम्मत भारत करता तो निश्चित रुप से यह फैसला फौरन हो सकता था। यह विकासशील देशों को लिए घातक सिद्ध हो रहा है, इसमें कोई संदेह नहीं है।

मेरा चौथा सवाल है औद्योगिक माल पर तटकर को और कम करने संबंधी और पहल करने से पहले विकासशील देशों के घरेलू उघोगों पर कुप्रभाव न हो, यह हम मानते हैं। यह जो तटकर कम करने की कोशिशें की जा रही हैं, यह तटकर तभी कम हो सकता है जब घरेलू उद्योगों पर इसका असर न पड़े। इस संबंध में हमारी सरकार ने या हमारे मंत्री जी ने मंत्री स्तरीय बैठक में क्या किया?

मेरा पांचवा सवाल बौद्धिक सम्पदा अधिकार समझौते में सुधार करने की बात पर क्या फैसला हुआ है? जिसमें सार्वजनिक स्वास्थ्य संबंधी संकट और जरुरत के समय दवाओं के पेटेंट को किनारे करने का मुद्दा अहम है। इसमें क्या हुआ? पेटेंट कानून के संबंध में क्या वार्ता हुई? उस पर कब फैसला होगा? माननीय मंत्री जी कृपया बतायें।

मेरा छठा सवाल डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के घोषणा पत्र की प्रस्तावना के अनुसार विकासशील और पिछड़े देशों का ध्यान रखने के विषय में ठोस रुप में क्या निर्णय हुआ है? यह बात तो सही है, यह तो मैंने पहले ही कहा है कि इसमें सदिच्छाएं तो दिखाई गई हैं और यह भी है कि वार्ता भी होगी, लेकिन उसका ठोस परिणाम क्या है? ठोस फैसला क्या हुआ? एक या दो दो भी फैसले हुये हों, कृपया माननीय मंत्री जी उन्हें बताने का कष्ट करें। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं, धन्यवाद

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN, (SHRI NILOTPAL BASU) in the Chain]

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI (Kerala): Sir, I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister, Shri Murasoli Maran, for putting up a strong resistance at the Ministerial Conference at Doha. I would also like to congratulate him for calling meetings of various political parties, groups and individuals for sharpening the positions and also the tactics to be taken up at the Doha Ministerial Conference.

Sir, the hon. Minister In his statement makes two important assertions about the outcome of the D<5ha Ministerial Conference. In' paragraph 2, he says and I quote: "We made major strides towards realising our goals and the Ministerial Declaration contains significant achievements for India." in the last but one paragraph, he again asserts. I quote: 'The Doha outcome is in conformity with the shared stakeholders' interests - the interests of agriculture, industry and most importantly our development. In sum, the Doha mandate will not, in any way, harm us; on the contrary, we have substantial gains."

Sir, I am not in full agreement with these assertions. I do agree that we made certain gains, but the major gains were made by the developed countries.

Sir, we need a realistic assessment of the outcome of the Doha Conference, if we do not have a realistic assessment of the outcome of the Doha Conference, we may not be abfe to pursue and protect our interests.

Dr. Sharma here explained the overall character of the WTO Agreement. I agree with him. It is also absolutely necessary to find out what, In essence, is the outcome of the Doha Conference. If we make any exaggeration, if we believe in illusions, we will be certainly led to very disastrous consequences. I am for a realistic assessment of the outcome of the Doha Conference. Sir, this is a multi-lateral dialogue and the developing countries are in majority in this Conference. Of course, on certain issues the developed countries were forced to give us some concessions, but the main issue is: who collected the major gains, and what are those major gains collected by the developed countries? That is absolutely necessary in the work of the work groups, the trade negotiations committee and also the coming Ministerial Conference and the subsequent negotiations.

Sir, I would like to know one thing from the hon. Minister: Is it the case of the Commerce Minister that the United States of America, the European Union and Japan have failed to collect the major gains and we

collected all the major gains? I do remember a statement made by the hon. Commerce Minister in Doha. He was referring to the Draft Declaration prepared on 27,h October, 2001. I would like to quote him. "I am constrained to point out that the draft Ministerial Declaration is neither fair nor just to the view-point of the many developing countries, including my own on certain key issues. It is negation of all that was said by a significant number of developing countries and the least-developing countries."

Again I quote, "The only conclusion that could be drawn is that the developing countries have little say in the agenda setting of the WTO. It appears that the whole process was a mere formality and we are being coerced against our will. Is it not then meaningless for the draft declaration to claim that the needs and the interests of the developing countries have been placed at the heart of the Works Programme.' I fully agree with you. I stand by you on these issues.

Sir, India took three important positions. One of the important positions we took was, we opposed any new round of trade negotiations. If we engage in a new round of trade negotiations, in the present international situation, it is possible for the developed countries to exert pressure on us and extract more from us. So, we should oppose any new round of trade negotiations. The second position we took was, we will concentrate on mpiementation issues; and we will not allow this implementation issues to oe linked with any other issue. If that is linked with any other issue, then, there is every possibility that they will try to extract more concessions on these implementation issues. The third position was, we will oppose all non-trade related issues like investment policy, competition policy, environmental issues, transparency in Government procurement and the so-called global coherent architecture, the coming together of the WTO, IMF and the World Bank, on this issue of new round of negotiations. Of course, they forced us to agree to a Work Programme. It is not possible. I don't say, it was because our lack of negotiations skill; we tried our best, but the developed countries forced us to agree to a new round in a quite different nomenclature, "Work Programme".

Sir, the Ministerial Declaration says, I quote "In view ot these considerations, we hereby agree to undertake the broad and balanced Work Programme set out below. .."

Again, I quote from paragraph 45, "The negotiations to be pursued

under the terms of this Declaration, shall be concluded not later than 1" January, 2005." It is agreed that the new round of trade negotiations would be completed before the 1st January, 2005. It is also stated here, as in the case of the earlier negotiations, the mechanism for conducting these negotiations is the Trade Negotiations Committee. The very same Declaration says about the constitution of a Trade Negotiation Committee.

Paragraph 46 says, "The overall conduct of negotiations shall be supervised by a Trade Negotiation Committee under the authority of the General Council." It is also stated, "The Trade Negotiation Committee shall hold its first meeting not later than 31" January, 2002." So, it is a fact that they were able to extract this concession of a new round of discussions, in the nomenclature of a work programme, at the Doha Ministerial Conference,

Sir, let us see how far we have been able to resist not to link these implementation issues with others and to take up these implementation issues. Why are we stressing on these implementation issues? It is we who performed, we lifted the quantitative restrictions. We have reduced the tariff rates. But they have not reduced the subsidies. The agreement was that the developed countries would reduce their subsidies. But, what did they do? Instead of reducing the subsidies, they increased the subsidies. The OECD countries increased their subsidies from 308 billion dollars to 361 billion dollars in 1999. Because of the over-subsidies, the prices of the agricultural crops crashed. And we, the developing countries, the peasants and agricultural workers and the common men, are suffering. We complied with the conditions. They have not complied with the conditions. They are keeping their tariff rates high. Not only that. They are making use of the sanitary and phyto-sanitary measures to restrict the imports from developing countries to developed countries. So, we are interested in the implementation issues. But these implementation issues are now linked with the new round of work programme. That is the trap, that is the danger. Of course, paragraph 12 of this Draft Declaration starts with. "We attach the utmost importance to the implementation-related issues." But it states, "We agree that negotiations on outstanding implementation issues shall be an integral part of the work programme we are establishing and the agreements reached at an earlier state in these negotiations will be treated in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 47 below." So, the implementation issues have become an integral part of the work programme. So, there is every possibility, every danger. On implementation issues, they may try to extract. What I am submitting is, let us be realistic

about it. Then only will we be abte to pursue the correct tactics, will we be able to understand the gravity of the situation and the need for rallying more and more allies to protect our interests. If we do not have that realistic assessment of the whole outcome, there is every possibility of a danger.

Sir, the third issue is, we decided that we should oppose all non-trade-related issues, issues not related with trade-the investment issue, the competition policy, the transparency in government procurement, the global coherent architecture and other issues. Sir, there also, the developed countries forced us and extracted many gains.

I am reading out the Trade and Investment relationship. I am referring to para 20. I quote. " We are taking a policy acceptance. This is part of the multilateral negotiations." So, paragraph 20 starts with these words: "Recognising the case for multilateral framework." With regard to the Competition Policy also, paragraph 23 starts with that: "Recognising the case for a multilateral framework." And with regard to the transparency in Government procurement, it also starts with the very same words. Not only this, Sir, they have also been able to extract concession as to what are the issues are which are to be considered by this Work Programme. In paragraph 22, a mention has been made about the investment Policy. What will be the focus on the clarification? "Scope and definition, transparency, non-discrimination, modalities for pre-establishment commitments based on a GATS- -type positive list approach, development provisions, exceptions and Balance of Payments safeguards, consultation and the settlement of disputes between the members." Almost all issues are mentioned there. And even with regard to the Competition Policy, what was the focus of the discussion of this Work Programme? Paragraph 25 explains that. I quote. " Will focus on the clarification of core principles, including transparency, nondiscrimination and procedural fairness and provisions on hardcore cartels, modalities for voluntary cooperation; and support for progressive reinforcement of competition institutions in developing countries through capacity building." So, most of the issues are included in the focus of the Work Programme. Why are we opposing this Competition Policy? Why are we opposing this Investment Policy? Why are we opposing the transparency in Government procurement? Why are we opposing the global coherent architecture? It is because of the fact that all these conditionalities will put restrictions on us, on the part of the Government in these areas, and the multinational companies will dictate terms. They will decide the whole set of policy, and we will be losing our power in formulating our investment

policies, we will be losing our power in formulating our programmes policies, and all such measures. That is why we decided to oppose them. But they were able to extract many gains in all these areas.

There is another danger. Now, the problem of debt and finance for development, as mentioned in paragraph 36, is linked with the issue of coherence of trade, finance and monetary policy. In effect, already the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO are coordinating their activities, and trying to pressurize us, and extract concessions and put all conditionalities on us. Now, on the basis of this agreement, there is every danger. This combined effect will be further strengthened. And we have also not made any substantial progress in addressing the problems of inadequacies and inappropriateness in the decision-making process of the WTO. Sir, I do not blame the Commerce Minister; he fought well. It is intimately connected with the overall international situation and, also, with the policies pursued by the Government. I do agree with Dr. Sharma that we should make a realistic assessment of the 1994 Agreement and the WTO. No doubt, it is loaded against the interests of the developing countries. Without rallying with the developing countries, and with every step, without putting up a strong fight, it is not possible in the present world to protect the interests of the developing countries. So, in every respect, we should fight with them. We need the support of the developing countries. Of course, we gained certain concessions in the TRIPS. Why did we gain them? It was because we stood with Pakistan, we stood with Sri Lanka, we stood with the South African countries, we stood with the Latin American countries, we have been able to rally with all these countries and put up a fight, and we have been able to extract some concessions. So, the lesson we have learnt is, we have to rally with these developing countries and fight for our interests. That position is also intimately linked with the entire foreign policy approach. Here, against whom did we fight? Against the United States of America, against the European Union, against Japan! They are making use of the entire institutional system as an instrument of exploitation, as an instrument of pressure, and are trying to extract more gains from us. So, Sir, we should be consistent. On the one side, if we go with America, if we declare America our strategic partner, we cannot earn the confidence of the developing countries. Sir, this is also intimately connected with our foreign policy positions. And the nuclear policy, of course, to a certain extent, puts a lot of suspicion into the minds of the developing countries. During one

period, we opposed that. But when we got the capacity, we exploded it. So, some of the developing countries are afraid. We should emerge as the champion of the developing countries; we should earn their confidence; we should consistently fight the imposition of these conditionalities by the imperialist countries. So, that confidence should continue. Why did we fail? It was because of that, We have got, no doubt, two years till the next Ministerial Conference takes place. Let us make a realistic assessment, and on that realistic assessment, let us formulate our tactics and try to interact with the third world countries. I do not say we should walk out of the WTO; it is not possible in the present international situation, but along with other countries, the multilateral body, the developing countries got the majority. No doubt, each country has its own interests. There will be a conflict of interests. But against the developed countries, there is every possibility of evolving some sort of consensus. Try to evolve that. We tried at Doha, and we should continue to do that. Only then will it be possible for us to protect our interests.

There are certain other domestic issues. With regard to our domestic policies also, we need to take certain steps. Subsidies are to be increased to increase the productivity and production. Tariff rates should be increased to protect our domestic market. Whatever positions are available on the basis of the WTO Agreement itself, try to make use of them to protect our interests because the peasants are suffering, the agricultural workers are suffering and the common men are suffering. So, in this position, outside and inside, we need a change in the domestic policy. Then only we will be able to protect the interests of the people and also the interests of the country. With these words, I conclude. Thank you.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is very heartening to note that on such an important matter, there seems to be a total unanimity in the House. Dr. Sharma has gone to the extent of saying, if I understood him correctly, that the policy of Swadeshi Jagran Manch seems to have succeeded. I feel, everyone should not go by the statements that the developed countries have been making right from the beginning. At the Uruguay Round, we had an in-depth discussion with them. They had expressed noble sentiments that the international market would be available to all the developing countries; that the developing countries would get a huge amount of money for the poverty alleviation programme that they have; and that those who are below the poverty line would be brought on par with those who belong to the developed countries.

I think there is a basic mistake--! am sorry to use the word "mistake"--in the approach that we have adopted. We should have adopted a different approach, instead of suggesting amendments to the drafts prepared by the developed countries. Pressures are bound to be there in that regard. If you were in their position, you would have played the same game. So, I would not like to blame them. Actually, the developing countries are in a majority. Let me, at the outset, congratulate Mr. Murasoli Maran for, at least, getting some kind of support from a few of the developing countries. They extended their support to you. But that is not the end of it. You have just made a beginning of reversing the process. If the process has to be completed, I feel, you have to take all factors into account. Let us not allow ourselves to be cowed down by the pressures that are bound to be brought on us by the World Bank, the IMF or any other institution. The basic philosophy is to create conditions where we will be able to succeed in the approach that we have adopted. They have some kind of veto power in different institutions. In the WTO there is not any kind of Veto Power. They feel sorry about it. What Dr. Sharma has stated is correct. This 301 is an indirect way by which they can definitely exercise some kind of veto. But, I am sure, if all the developing countries come together, in spite of the power at the disposal of the developed countries, I don't think they will be able to reverse the process. That is why the then President, Clinton, who wanted everybody to sign on the dotted lines, could not succeed, in spite of his personal intervention. What did all the developing countries say? They said, "We have been exploited. We have been totally misled. Now we are not going to believe what you say. Let us have a different proposition". This is the proper opportunity for us to take the initiative in the matter and I congratulate you for taking that step. You have reversed the process; and now you have to go ahead.

It is not sufficient. Let us prepare our own alternative draft. Let all the developing countries come together and prepare their own draft and let the developed countries suggest if they have any amendment. If you adopt this approach -- it is going to be consistent with the noble ideas that they had expressed - you can then ask, "Whatever you had expressed, was it genuine or were you trying to mislead all the developing countries? Now you have been totally exposed by them." If you adopt this kind of an approach, I am sure, there is a good case for all the developing countries to come together. But, at the same time, we have to take into account the interests of all the developing countries. We cannot think only in terms of our own interests. We cannot adopt this policy that we will take care of our

own interests and the rest of the developing countries will take care of their own interests. Even the developed countries are bound to create this kind of a situation. They would like to give all kinds of allurements to them and see to it that a rift is created among the developing countries. This kind of a situation has to be avoided. That is why we have to make a common cause and all the developing countries should come together and prepare their own draft and see how do they behave. I am in full agreement with my friend. We should not talk in terms of getting away from the WTO. In fact, they will be very much interested in doing so. We will be totally isolated. If India, as an isolated country, negotiates with the developed countries, we can never succeed, So the collective bargaining strength is very necessary, if the WTO in the real sense, has to succeed.

Sir, I would like to mention some more things in this connection. I do not know what role China is going to play. Now China has also become its member. Our markets are totally flooded with Chinese goods; other international markets are also flooded with Chinese goods. They are doing it in a very big way. I would like to understand what exactly is the Government's understanding of the China's policy and how far we are going to succeed. China being our neighbour, it becomes very vital for our interests. We would like to understand what exactly is the view of the Government of India in this regard.

Sir, I will confine myself only to agricultural products. It is a fact that both America and Europe are subsidizing agriculture to such an extent that it is almost becoming impossible for the farmers in India to withstand the conditions which are being created. We have offered wheat to Afghanistan. We have huge stocks of wheat available with us. We have enough sugar. Our farmers are also prepared to produce all the oil seeds that you require. You published a list of things which were allowed to be imported and thereafter you added certain more things. Now even after so much wheat being available here, you have allowed them to import wheat. There are people who are interested in having licences under the OGL. They are very clever people. They will see to it that if anti-dumping measures are resorted to, it is done when the whole thing is over. That has been our experience. I have been fighting a case for sugar. When Shri Barnala was a Minister, I pleaded this case with him. We were getting sugar from Pakistan. He agreed on the floor of the House that the excise duty should be increased to a minimum of 50 per cent. Ultimately, what happened? When he went to the Cabinet, it was the Prime Minister who

prevailed upon him not to increase it, because it seemed that the sugar that we were getting was from the Pakistani Prime Minister's area. I do not know how far it is true; but this is what I have heard. So, if these considerations are going to weigh with you. not taking into account the interests of all the farmers who. in fact, are suffering very badly, how can we help our farmers? This year also, you will find that the entire cotton crop has been destroyed. There is a new kind of variety which \s coming into the market, and it seems that all those who are manufacturing spurious drugs have combined together and they are now resisting with the Agriculture Ministry in the Centre in order to see that that variety, which is resistant to bollworm, is not introduced. That is why in Gujarat, the entire crop had to be plucked out. Orders were issued saying, we have to destroy the crops. These are conditions which are being created by interested parties. Similarly, in the case of these imports, when we opposed this idea, we were given to understand that they would, definitely, take measures immediately to see to it that the anti-dumping measures are applied here. Our experience has been that we have been delaying the entire process in such a manner that after the entire season is over, we take anti-dumping measures knowing fully well the amount of subsidy that these countries have been paying their farmers in the case of sugar. In Pakistan, America and the Mexican countries, they have been giving, as a kind of subsidy, more than two or three times the entire price of production, whereas our farmers are being told, "No subsidy; we have to reduce your subsidy". You have agreed in the Conference that you would reduce your subsidy. So, we have not been able to do anything in the matter. And, the farmers are suffering all kinds of atrocities in the name of liberalisation and globalisation. A number of farmers are committing suicide. One of the reasons is that they are not in a position to pay back the amount of loan that they have borrowed either from the banks or from the money-tenders. So. these are the things where a re-thinking has to be resorted to and we have to protect the interests of the local manufacturers. Shri Kaushik was very right when he suggested that the small scale industries are now being totally closed down. And the major industries are also waiting for their turn. So, this is the kind of situation that we are in. Unemployment has tremendously increased in agriculture, in industry, everywhere, because of the talk of globalisation. In fact, we are putting our country in a very bad shape. How we are going to reverse the entire process. It is going to be a Herculean task; it is not going to be so easy. But efforts have to be made to see to it that the people understand that you are taking necessary

measures to protect the interests of both the agriculturists and the industrialists so that we can show a better performance. And, in the real sense of the term, the Jagran or the Swadeshi Jagran Manch that you are talking about; it should not be only in the manifesto but it should come into actual practice. But, in actual practice, it has been the total reverse of what you have enunciated in your manifesto. That is why ! would like to appeal to the hon. Minister: Create conditions; don't stop with this first success. This is not the end of it. You have to go ahead and go ahead with full confidence. If you take up this line, we will, definitely, support you. Thank you very much.

SHRI SOLIPETA RAMACHANDRA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for allowing me to participate in the discussions on the decisions adopted at the 4th Ministerial Meeting in connection with WTO negotiations, recently concluded at Doha, which have far-reaching implications on the agriculture, textile, pharmaceutical and chemical sectors etc. of the country.

Sir, the World Trade Organisation's Doha Conference of its 142 members has been gainful for India. The last conference at Seattle in USA was not successful because the developing countries and the NGOs blocked any progress there. In Doha, India's voice was heard and it was considered to be the voice of the developing countries. I, on behalf of my party, congratulate our Commerce Minister, Shri Murasoli Maran, for the victory he has scored in Doha. He was not only present at the summit from the beginning to the end, but he also made his presence felt there. His aggressive negotiating style and effective expression of the interests of India as well as many other developing countries is highly appreciable.

In the conference, Mr, Vice-Chairman, Sir, agriculture has been given due attention; with additional flexibility being given for providing domestic support and protection from imports on grounds of food security, livelihood concerns and rural development. India's demand in this regard has been agreed to. It was good that India highlighted the concerns of the developing countries, and fears of non-trade issues being brought into the working of the WTO have now been put to rest. Our Commerce Minister held successful negotiations with the European Union, the United States and the Director General of WTO, and India's concerns in the key areas of agriculture, implementation, trade, transfer of technology and WTO rules were thoroughly focussed. On phasing out export subsidy and domestic support for products, the WTO declaration has conceded the demand of

India. Aboul public health concerns, WTO agreed to India's demand. As for geographical indication, India wants this to be expanded beyond wines and spirits to items like Basmati. WTO agreed to negotiations on this in future. In the matter of environment, WTO has proposed negotiations. It is a matter of concern for India because it is an extraneous issue to trade. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, India wanted no linkage of labour standards to trade. The biggest gain for India in Doha Declaration is public health. WTO has accepted that patents will not stand in the way of public health. Now onwards, patents can be overlooked in the case of epidemics like malaria and TB. This is very important for India. The myth that India was isolated was wrong. China and Taiwan have been admitted as members of WTO. It is hoped that in future WTO negotiations, they will contribute substantially for the interests of developing countries in the next meetings of WTO.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I need not mention what the national and foreign media has commented upon the Doha Meeting and the role of India in safeguarding the interests of India and other developing countries. The hon. Member, Dr. Sharma, has already mentioned it, I can only say that the outcome of the Doha Ministerial Meeting is definitely satisfactory. Once again, I congratulate Shri Maran,

Sir, it has been mentioned by many of our hon. Members that we cannot come out of WTO. I entirely agree with them. But, of course, people are becoming unemployed. People are facing several problems because of WTO. It is a fact. It is seen at the lower level. The worst sufferers of WTO in India are the farmers. As has been mentioned by Kaushikji also, the farmers are the worst sufferers. They have to compete with farmers of other countries. I am sorry to say that because of various conditions and circumstances in our country and because of the policies of our Government, our farmers are not capable of competing with the farmers of the developed countries. I earnestly request the Government to make our farmers more capable to compete with other farmers. For that, measures have to be taken by the Union Government as well as the State Governments. Sir, we are giving loans to farmers. The rate of interest is 13, 14 or 15 per cent. We are giving loans to large industries also at the same rate of interest at which we are giving loans to the poor farmer who has no guarantee of his crop, no future for his crop.

The farmers are also given loan at the same rate of interest at which it is given to the industrialists. Our farmers produce a tot of goods. For example, cotton is produced in Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and

4.00 P.M.

Punjab. I think, in Punjab, production of cotton is not so much successful. Even though production of cotton is very less in our country, its price is very low. It is because, previously, our Government used to import very less cotton. But, in the last two-three years, they have started importing cotton in huge quantities. As a result of that, our farmers are not getting a remunerative price for cotton. So is the case with sugar. I feel, our Government is not keen on solving their problems. I have to say this with sorrow, that the Government is not interested in helping our farmers to compete with the farmers of other countries. I urge upon the Government to take certain measures so that the worst sufferers of the WTO, namely, the farmers, are saved from their sufferings. Sir, with these words, I conclude.

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल (राजस्थान): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय'दोहा' में 9 से 14 नवम्बर तक जो मंत्री-स्तरीय बातचीत हुई उसके संबंध में वाणिज्य मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य यहां दिया, उसके समर्थन के लिए और उन्हें बधाई देने के लिए मैं खड़ा हुआ हूं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक): पीठासीन हुए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, 'दोहा' में जो मीटिंग हुई, उसके ऊपर काले बादल मंडरा रहे थे, वे टल गए। कई शंकाओं के बीच 'दोहा' में मीटिंग हुई, इसकी सफलता के संबंध में बहुत अधिक शंकाएं व्यक्त हो रही थीं। एक तरफ विकसित राष्ट्र और दूसरी तरफ अविकसित और विकासमान देश इकटठा हो रहे थे। 'सिएटल' में जो कुछ हुआ उसकी पुनरावृत्ति यदि 'दोहा' में होती तो शायद सारे विश्व व्यापार संगंठन पर संकट के बादल छा जाते और संभवत: जो 142 राष्ट्र डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के सदस्य हैं, उनमें से कोई यह नहीं चाहता था कि वर्तमान आर्थिक परिस्थितियों में, दुनियाभर में मंदी के दौर में विश्व व्यापार संगठन संकट के दौर में चला जाए और इसीलिए वहां पर हमारे देश का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले हमारी वाणिज्य मंत्री जी ने जिस प्रकार की सूझ-बूझ दिखाई और जिस प्रकार से भारत का नेतृत्व किया और न केवल भारत का बल्कि उनको बधाई इस बात की दी जानी चाहिए कि उन्होंने अविकसित और विकासमान राष्ट्रों का जो नेतृत्व किया और उसके कारण जो विश्व संगठन पर हावी शक्तियां थीं, जो उसे किसी भी प्रकार से अपने चंगुल में फंसाए रखना चाहती थीं, उनको एक बार यह दिखा दिया कि यदि भारत नेतृत्व करता है तो वह सफलतापूर्वक उन विकासशील देशों का भी मुकाबला कर सकता है और सब लोगों को साथ लेकर उनको भी झुका सकता है।

मैं इस अवसर पर आदरणीय मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य वहां पर दिया था उसका एक छोटा सा पैराग्राफ उद्वत करना चाहता हूं और वह इसलिए उद्वत करना चाहता हूं कि मुझे उस पैराग्राफ को पढ़कर यह लगा कि हम विश्व संगठन के मंच पर भारत की बात को कितनी दृढ़ता से, कितनी मज़बूती से और कितने प्रभावपूर्ण ढंग से रख सकते हैं, उसका यह प्रतीक है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री मारन जी ने जो वक्तव्य वहां पर दिया, उसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि "Unless the development deficit in this current WTO rules is met through

meaningful decisions on Implementation issues, it would be difficult to convince people that WTO Is a just and equitable system."

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, उन्होंने दूसरी बात यह कही कि" India is not isolated. But if it comes to that, we are not afraid of isolation. We will defend our national interests."

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह 100 करोड़ लोगों की आवाज़ थी जो उनके दिल से उस मंच पर निकली। इसके आगे उन्होंने यह कहा कि " Some people want to please the U.S. Why should we? The U.S. and the E.U. are allies. But they too have serious differences on trade policy. I accept, we should have friendly relations with the U.S., but not at the cost of our national interest."

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे वणिज्य मंत्री महोदय ने जो कुछ वहां कहा, उससे एक बात साफ हो जाती है कि भारत किसी के दबाव में नहीं था, किसी के प्रभाव में नहीं था और किसी के सामने झुकने को तैयार नहीं था। मैं माननीय वाणिज्य मंत्री जी को इसके लिए हार्दिक बधाई और धन्यवाद देता हूं कि उन्होंने हमारे देश का सही प्रतिनिधित्व किया।

महोदय, दूसरी बात जो महत्वपूर्ण थी, वह यह थी कि जब दुनिया के लोग एक मंच पर इकट्ठा हुए तो वे कोई दान-पुण्य करने के लिए इकट्ठा नहीं हुए। वह तो व्यापार का एक मंच है, सौदा और व्यापार करने का मंच है, बारगेनिंग करने का मंच है। लोग वहां पर अपने-अपने देश के हित-अहित की बात करने के लिए इकट्ठा हुए थे। उनके सामने एक समस्या पैदा हो गई कि क्या डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. को हम कमज़ोर कर दें? लेकिन फिर भी एक सवाल हमारे मारन जी के मन में था कि क्या हम अपने देश के इंट्रस्ट की कीमत पर इस संगठन में शामिल रहें?

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बड़ी सूझबूझ का काम था कि वहां पर ठीक प्रकार से बारगेन किया जाए। हमने ठीक प्रकार से वहां दबाव पैदा किया, ठीक प्रकार से प्रतिनिधित्व किया लेकिन उसके बाद जब हमने देखा कि तार जितना खिंचना चाहिए था, उतना खिंच चुका है, जितना हम दुनिया के दूसरे देशों को अपनी ओर घुमाना चाहते थे, उतना हम घुमा चुके हैं, उसके बाद यह एक दूरदर्शी राजनेता का काम होना चाहिए, एक दूरदर्शी देश का काम होना चाहिए कि वह उस तार को तोड़े नहीं, बल्कि उसको जोड़े रखे और उससे अपने देश का और अविकसित राष्ट्रों का जो कुछ भी हित हो सकता है, वह करे।

इसलिए मैं दूसरे काउंट पर भी श्री मारन जी को बधाई देना चाहता हूं कि उन्होंने हमारे देश का नेतृत्व किया और पूरी क्षमता के साथ नेतृत्व करते हुए दूसरे विकासशील देशों को भी आगे बढ़ने का मौका दिया। अभी-अभी माननीय चव्हाण साहब ने बिल्कुल ठीक बात कही कि यह एक शुरुआत थी। अब हमें इस शुरुआत को आगे बढ़ाना है। यह सर्वविदित है कि भारत में नेतृत्व की क्षमता है और भारत नेतृत्व कर सकता है। दुनिया के जो छोटे-छोटे देश भारत के साथ रहना चाहते हैं, वे इस बात की प्रतीक्षा करते हैं कि भारत क्या रुख अपनाता है, भारत कितनी मज़बूती से उनके हितों की चर्चा करता है और यदि हम इस प्रोसेस को ठीक प्रकार से अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर आगे बढ़ाएं तो न केवल डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. बल्कि और क्षेत्रों में भी, राजनीतिक क्षेत्रों में भी इसका लाभ हमारे देश को मिल सकता है। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हमने दूरदर्शिता

पूर्ण निर्णय किया और हमने इस मामले को टूटने नहीं दिया। मुझे इस बात की बड़ी खुशी है कि आज इस सदन में हमारे सभी पक्षों के माननीय संसद सदस्यों ने इस संबंध में बड़ी गंभीर चर्चा की है और उन्होंने इस बात को माना है कि "हां" जो कुछ भी हमने दोहा में प्राप्त किया है वह हमारे देश के लिए यद्यपि काफी नहीं है, लेकिन उस प्रोसेस को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए आगे कदम उठाना आवश्यक है। मैं इस बात को मानता हूं कि आगे बढ़ने के लिए बहुत कुछ करना हमारे लिए जरुरी है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं दो बातें और कहना चाहता हूं। सिएटल के बाद दोहा में जो मीटिंग हुई और दोहा की मीटिंग के बाद वहां कुछ लोगों ने हालांकि मैं इस बात का पक्षपाती नहीं हूं, शायद माननीय चव्हाण साहब और हमारे बाकी साथी भी सहमत होंगे कि हम इस वक्त जय-पराजय या विन-विन की बात नहीं कर रहे हैं, हम इस समय कितना लाभ हुआ और कितना नुकसान हुआ उसकी बात नहीं कर रहे हैं। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय पंचाट में जब हम बैठते हैं तो कुछ देना होता है, कुछ लेना होता है। यह तो नहीं हो सकता कि हम सारा अपने घर भर कर ले आयें और बाकी लोगों को भूखा छोड़कर आ जायें, फिर तो दुनियां में कोई हमारी सराहना नहीं करेगा। देना-लेना विश्व मंचों पर स्वाभाविक है और देने-लेने की प्रकृति के कारण ही शायद भारत वर्ष ने अपना स्थान बनाया है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि दोहा सम्मेलन के अध्यक्ष ने खुद कहा कि भारत ने जो विषय उठाया था कि जो पिछले समय में निर्णय हुए, तीन मंत्री स्तरीय बैठकें हुई, तीन बार निर्णय हुये, उरुग्वे में निर्णय लिया गया, बाद में निर्णय लिया गया पहले उसका इम्पलीमेंटेशन होना चाहिए। भारत की यह जायज मांग थी। भारत ने इस मांग को आगे बढ़ाया और दुनिया के सामने रखा कि केवल निर्णय करने से कुछ नहीं होगा, केवल बातें करने से नहीं होगा, अगर बातें कही जाती हैं, निर्णय किये जाते हैं तो उन पर प्रभावी रुप से इम्पलीमेंटेशन होना चाहिए। यदि उनका इम्पलीमेंटशन नहीं होगा तो ये सब बातें बेकार होंगी और केवल कुछ लोग अपनी दादागीरी करेंगे और कुछ लोग इस पर हावी हो जायेंगे। ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है। इसलिए भारत ने अपने पक्ष को बड़ी मज़बूती के साथ रखा कि जब तक इम्पलीमेंटेशन की बातें नहीं की जाती हैं तब तक डब्ल्यू टी.ओ. के आगे की बातें निरर्थक हैं। हमने इस बात को पुरजोर शब्दों में रखा है। इसीलिए दोहा सम्मेलन के अध्यक्ष युसूफ कमाल साहब ने ये शब्द कहे। उन्होंने कहा कि सिंगापुर घोषणा पत्र से संबंधित चार मुद्दों को विश्व व्यापार संगठन को दो वर्ष बाद होने वाली पांचवी मंत्री मंड़लीय बैठक में आम सहमति बनाने की ही चर्चाएं शुरु करनी चाहिए। आम सहमति बनने के बाद ही, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, ये शब्द बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण है, हमारी उपलब्धि है कि जब आम सहमति बनेगी, जो कुछ भी निर्णय किए गए या जो कुछ निर्णय चतुर्थ बैठक में किए गए, इसमें जो निर्णय किए गए हैं, उनके ऊपर इम्पलीमेंटेशन की स्कीम को लागू किया जायेगा। इम्पलीमेंटेशन करने के लिए प्रयास किया जायेगा तब जाकर के आगे बात बढ़ेगी। भारत के पास समय है। वह अपनी बात को फिर आगे बढ़वाने के लिए, आगे मनवाने के लिए अभी हम ऐसा नहीं सोचते, केवल एक सिएटल बैठक असफल हुई, दोहा की बैठक असफल न हो इस बात की जिम्मेदारी शायद हमारे देश के ऊपर भी थी और हमने इसमें कामयाबी हासिल की और आगे और भी जो बैठकें होंगी। स्वाभाविक है कि एक बैठक में हम सारा मतलब अपना, जो कुछ हम चाहते हैं शायद प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते हैं। लेकिन आगे की बैठकों में हम और भी देश हित की बातें कर सकते हैं। जैसा कि अभी हमारे माननीय सांसदों ने कहा कि कृषि के क्षेत्र में हमारी बडी समस्या है। यह बात सही है। हमारे कृषक जिनके बारे में मैं समझता हूं, जो मुझे दिखाई देता है आज का दृश्य, मुझे नहीं लगता है कि आने वाले 10-20 साल में भी भारत का कृषक अमेरिका के

किसान के साथ मुकाबला कर सकता है। आखिर भारत में कृषकों को उतना मजबूत बनाने की स्थिति हम कब लायेंगे, कैसे लायेंगे, यह सवाल हमारे सामने है। दुनिया के लोग कुछ भी निर्णय कर लें, लेकिन अपने देश के किसान को हम दुनिया के किसानों के बराबर में लाकर खडा कर दें तभी हम उनसे मुकाबला करने की बात कर सकते हैं। भारत का किसान तो एक टाइम की रोटी कमा सकता है, दूसरे टाइम की रोटी कमाने के लिए उसे ज़ोर लगाना पडता है। ऐसे किसानों को हम अमेरिकी किसान के मुकाबले में खडा नहीं कर सकते हैं। स्वाभाविक रुप से हमारे देश की सरकार, हमारे देश के मंत्री या जो भी उस बैठक में जाने वाले हैं उनके सामने यह प्रथम दायित्व होगा कि भारत के किसान के हित को हम किसी भी प्रकार से अनदेखा न कर सकें। जब तक लेवल फील्ड प्ले नहीं मिलता है, प्ले ग्राउंड़ नहीं मिलता है तब तक भारत के किसान को सब प्रकार से सुरक्षित रखना होगा। सब प्रकार से उन्हें मदद देते रहना पड़ेगा और अपने पांव पर खडे रहने के लिए उन्हें हमारी सहायता की जो जरुरत है, दुनिया के सारे कायदे-कानूनों को ध्यान में रखने के बावजूद भी उनको मदद की आवश्यकता इस देश में अभी आने वाले कई वर्षों में पड़ेगी- मैं समझता हूं कि हमारे मारन महोदय इस बात को अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। वे इस बात को भी अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं- एक बार यहां पर एक प्रस्ताव आया था, उस प्रस्ताव पर बोलते समय मैंने- क्योंकि मैं स्टैंडिंग कमेटी का भी चेयर मैन भी हूं, उद्योग समिति का, मैं जानता हूं कि लद्यु उद्योग इस समय बडे संकट के द्वार से गुजर रहा है, केवल लद्यु उद्योग संकट के द्वार से नहीं गुजर रहा बल्कि मीड़ियम और जैसा हमारे माननीय सासद ने कहा, सारे देश के उद्योग धंधे एक प्रकार से मंदी की चपेट में हैं। दुनिया के और देशों में भी इस प्रकार की स्थिति है लेकिन हम अपने देश में अपने उद्योगों को कैसे बचाएं, उनका किस प्रकार संरक्षण पोषण करें, यह हमारा दायित्व है, दुनिया के देशों का दायित्व नहीं है कि वह हमारा पोषण करने आएंगे। (**समय की घंटी**) इन उद्योगों को बचाने का, इनका संरक्षण करने का, पोषण करने का, उनको आगे बढ़ने का मौका देने का, टैक्नोलॉजी में उनको आगे बढ़ने के लिए सब प्रकार के रास्ते उपलब्ध कराने का दायित्व हमारा है, अपने देश का है, अपने देश की सरकार का है। इसलिए मैं हमारे माननीय मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहूंगा कि आगे भी बैठकें होंगी, हम आपको शुभ कामना देना चाहते हैं। आपने जिस तरह इस बार नेतृत्व किया है, जिस प्रकार से आपने दृढ़ता से भारत के पक्ष को रखकर दुनिया को संदेश दिया है, विकसित राष्ट्रों को संदेश दिया है, आगे भी भारत के किसानों का संदेश, भारत के लघु उघोगपतियों का संदेश आप दुनिया तक पहुंचाएंगे कि जब तक हम और वह बराबर के लैवल फील्ड में नहीं आते हैं तब तक किसी प्रकार के प्रतिबंध हमारे ऊपर लागू नहीं किये जाएं। यह हमारे लिए आवश्यकता होगी। इसलिए मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूं कि वह आगे भविष्य में- जिस प्रकार से भारत सरकार की नीति है, उस नीति के आधार पर विश्व संगठन में- क्योंकि विश्व संगठन का जो ऐग्रीमेंट था, यह मारन साहब को तो लिखा-लिखाया प्राप्त हुआ था, अब लिखा लिखाया जब प्राप्त हो गया है तो यह हमारा दायित्व है, हमारी सरकार का दायित्व है कि हम दुनिया में यह संदेश न दें कि हमने अंतर्राष्ट्रीय पंचाट में जो ऐग्रीमेंट किए हैं, हम उनको तोड़ना चाहते हैं या उनसे दूर भागना चाहते हैं, उनसे दूर हटना चाहते हैं लेकिन हमारी कुशलता इसमें है कि हम ऐग्रीमेंट तोड़ने की भावना लोगों तक न जाने दें, ऐसा संदेश न जाने दें, हमारी यह भावना लोगों तक पहुंचनी चाहिए कि हम अंतर्राष्ट्रीय करारों का पालन करने वाले लोग हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (**श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक**): कृपया समाप्त करें।

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल: साथ ही मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय करारों के साथ साथ हमारे देश का हित देखना भी हमारा और हमारी सरकार का दायित्व है। मुझे विश्वास है कि हमारी सरकार इन दायित्वों को पूरा करने के लिए डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में अपनी भूमिका को सही और प्रभावी ढ़ंग से जैसे अभी निभाया है, आगे भी निभाएगी। धन्यवाद।

श्री आर.पी.गोयनका (राजस्थान): धन्यवाद महोदय, करीब-करीब सभी वक्ता आज दोपहर को यह बात कर रहे थे कि डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के नेगोसिएशंस और ऐग्रीमेंट बहुत ही लम्बा रास्ता है, बहुत ही डरावना रास्ता है, बहुत ही भयानक रास्ता है। कुछ लोगों का कहना था कि मारन जी ने बहुत अच्छा काम किया है। यह तो आगे चल कर मैं आपको बताउंगा कि मेरे अनुसार उन्होंने अच्छा काम किया है या नहीं। दोहा के पहले हम लोगों ने क्वांटीटेटिव रिस्ट्रिक्शंस को हटा दिया। इससे क्या हुआ कि हज़ारों-लाखों व्यक्ति अनइम्लॉयड हो गये और सैंकडों रोज़गार बंद हो गये। एक पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री आज से एक हफ्ता पहले मुझसे पूछ रहे थे, भाई, डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. का सारा एग्रीमेंट मैंने आप लोगों से बात करके किया था। अब आप लोग क्यों इसके खिलाफ बात कर रहे हैं?

(**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी**) पीठासीन हुए।)

सर, मैं आपको भी नमस्कार कर लेता हूं।...(**व्यवधान**)... वह तो मुझे याद भी नहीं है कि क्या बोला है। पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री ने पूछा तो यह सारी विड़म्बना है, जो डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में सेफगार्ड थे उनको नहीं अपनाया। डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. गलत नहीं है। हम लोग अपने घर में काम नहीं करते हैं। आप जरा सोचें कि एन्टी-डम्पिंग के दफ्तर में पहले चाह आफिसर्स रहते थे, अब कितने हैं मुझे मालूम नहीं है। अमेरिका में एन्टी-डम्पिंग दफ्तर में 1100 आफिसर्स बैठकर काम करते रहते हैं। वहां पर 15 दिन में डिसिजन मिल जाता है कि एन्टी-ड़म्पिंग लॉ लागू होगा कि नहीं होगा अगर होगा तो कितनी दूर तक होगा। यहां बरसों निकल जाते हैं, छः छः महीने निकल जाते हैं और तब तक सारा काम चौपट हो जाता है। चौपट होने के बाद यदि आपने कोई एक्शन लिया तो फिर क्या, मरीज तो मर जाएगा। उसके बाद हार्ट स्पेशलिस्ट को बुलाकर क्या करना? सर, मंत्री जी ने दोहा जाने से पहले यह कहा था, 'There will not be any new round of trade negotiations." अब अखबारों और मैग्जीन्स में पढ़ते हैं कि न्यू राउंड़ आएगा। यह मैं मानने के लिए तैयार हूं कि वहां इनके ऊपर प्रैशर रहा होगा। अगर प्रैशर में हम दब जाएंगे तो हम मंत्रित्व क्या करेंगे? हां, यह बात ठीक है कि दोहा में हमें तीन चीजों में तीन साल का समय मिल गया है, हमारी उपलब्धि है। मैं देख रहा हूं, आप घडी की तरफ देख रहे हैं। हमें डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. को बचाने के लिए अपने देश में क्या करना चाहिए। इस पर सवाल उठता है तो मेरे अनुसार सबसे पहले, बहुत से आइटम्स पर हम लोगों ने मैक्सिमम इम्पोर्ट ड्यूटी नहीं लगाई है और जो तकलीफ में हैं तो इम्पोर्ट ड्यूटी पूरी हद तक लगा दीजिए। उसमें डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ.की तरफ से कोई आब्जेक्शन नहीं होगा। दूसरे हिन्दुस्तान की बनी हुई चीजों की पैकेजिंग और लेबलिंग अपने ढंग की होती है। जो बाहर से आता है वह कुछ अच्छा आता है। दोनों में समता होनी चाहिए। आप देखेंगे कि कोका कोला और पेप्सी कोला वाले एडवरटाइजमेंट करके छा गए हैं। छोटे बच्चे से लेकर बूढ़े तक में वे छाए हुए हैं। लेकिन हमारे यहां कोल्ड ड्रिंक बनाने वालों के पास इतना पैसा नहीं है। अपनी सारे साल की आय तो वे एडवरटाइजमेंट में खर्च कर देते हैं। इसके लिए हमें कुछ प्रोटेक्शन लेनी पड़ेगी। मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं कि नेपाल से बहुत स्मगलिंग होती है। बहुत सा माल तो कोलकाता पोर्ट से जाता है और नेपाल से वापस घूमकर आ जाता है। इस

प्रकार हम इम्पोर्ट आइम्स में कहां से कम्पीट करेंगे? चाइनीज़ माल आता है। मैं चाइनीज वर्ड यूज नहीं करना चाह रहा था इसलिए उस वर्ड को खा गया...(**व्यवधान**)... सर, जो इच्छा है बोल लीजिए, अभी तो मैं बोल रहा हूं इसलिए सुन लीजिए। एक फ्रंट लाइन मैगजीन है, यह मुझे कल मिली है। है तो पुरानी लेकिन कल मिली है। उसमें कहते हैं: "The Doha Declaration is a clear gain for the developed capitalist world.* This is the summary of the Doha outcome. Doha was a difficult round of discussions. वहां हम लोगों को बहुत सी मुसीबतें सहनी पड़ी। मारन जी ने बड़ी वीरता, शूरता और साहस से उसका सामान भी किया लेकिन फिर शहीद हो गए। थैंक यू।

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA (Karnataka): Sir, first of all, I must congratulate Mr. Maran for having taken a stand to fight for the cause of the country.

He has made a sincere effort for the cause of the Indian farmers. As pointed out by Mr. Goenka, the capitalist and developed countries have exhibited their skill in protecting their interests, at the cost of the developing countries. It is a well-known theory. And Shri Chavan has rightly pointed out that India is not in a position to come out of the WTO, and it is very difficult to persuade the developed countries to give a helping hand or a sort of encouragement to the developing countries. Though a programme of fundamental reforms, in the name of fair market, is there; the experience of ministerial-conferences that took place over the past 5 to 6 years, and the scenario of economic development and the problems faced by the farmers of this country, has shown that our agricultural produce is not getting a cost-based price.

Sir, the farmers are suffering. Though we have discussed this issue many times in both the Houses of Parliament and in the State Assemblies, neither the Central Government nor the State Government, has been able to safeguard the interests of our farmers. Now the main thing I am going to highlight is that the elite class of our country -when they are asked as to whether they are going to give subsidy to the farmers or not, they say, "we are already giving a lot of subsidy". Look at the indirect ways in which subsidy is being provided by the developed countries. That is why, our farmers are not in a position to compete in the world market. If you look at the percentage of people engaged in agriculture, you will find that, in developed countries, it is, at the most, 7-8%; while, in India, it is 68-70%. The percentage is like that. Besides, there are no proper inputs. In spite of all this, we are forcing them to compete with the world market. I will give you an example. About four years back and in 1986-87, the price of a coconut was Rs.6/-, but in 2001, it is Rs.2.00 or Rs.2.50 per coconut.

Keeping this in view, how can we make our farmers compete in the world market? How will they develop? Take another example. During 1986-1990, the price of manure was about Rs.150/- or Rs.200A per quintal, but now it is Rs.500/- per quintal. So. on the one hand, the prices of agricultural inputs are going up; on the other hand, the markets are going down. And, our farmers are compelled to compete in the world market even under these circumstances. They will not be able to withstand this competition and their condition will worsen further. At the Doha Conference, some new aspects, such as environment, labour laws and competitive markets, were highlighted. These are the new standards or theories that have been set up by the developed countries so that the development of the developed countries is curbed. Therefore, I urge upon the hon. Minister of Commerce to safeguard the interests of our country, particularly, the farmers. Thank you.

SHRI J. CHITHA.RANJAN (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. I thank you for having called me to speak on this issue. First of all, I would like to thank Shri Murasoli Maran for having consulted all the political parties about the stand to be taken by the Government of India at the Doha Conference. While discussing with the political parties, he had also expressed his views before the leaders of various political parties. In my case. I offered whole-hearted support to the stand taken by him, and I requested him to stick to that position. Of course, at that time, I was against it because it depends on several factors; whether you can stand till the last with the same position or not. Anyhow, he did his best, and I would like to congratulate him for having very effectively presented our case, argued our case and put up a fight up till the Green Room process started.

Sir, as far as I know, Mr. Murasoli Maran, in one of his articles, had written about the W.T.O. He had stated that the W.T.O is weighted in favour of the developed countries, and, at the same time, it very much adversely affects the developing countries. He had also stated in that article that 'the developing countries should make use of the earliest opportunity to amend the various clauses in the Marrakesh Agreement so that those clauses which are adverse to us may be amended,' At the same time, along with that, he said, 'but, there is a difficulty here; if the capitalist countries, the developed countries, smell the facts that these developing countries are thinking of putting up a fight and trying to amend the clauses of the Marrakesh Treaty, the developed capitalist countries will immediately mobilise their support. With their strong muscles, they will squeeze us; that

danger is there.' He has pointed out about that. In the same way, he had also used the term that the W.T.O. is an 'inevitable evil' - the W.T.O. is an inevitable evil. I know that he is also of the opinion that the W.T.O functions in a very undemocratic manner. The majority of the members of the W.T.O. would not have any participation in preparing the Declaration, even when there are serious differences among various members, All those things are there, and the Green Room is a notorious process. Sir, in that situation, we had put up a very strong case, But, unfortunately, the final result is not that satisfactory. Of course, he is not responsible for that, because the conditions are like this. And also, it depends on the political will of the Government of India. For the international situation to be favourable, the developing countries will have to stand together, and our Government should also have the political will to take certain positions. Then only we can succeed. Sir, whether it is a success or not is to be looked at, not on the basis of some gains that we have got. Of course, some gains are there. One is, that the various States are temporarily given the right to produce medicines either by giving compulsory licences or by importing. when certain natural emergencies or epidemics are there. That much is a gain. But, there also, I would like to point that there is a time limit for this. The second limitation is that this is not according to this condition; the TRIPS Agreement is not amended. Therefore, it will again become a problem in later days. This is one thing which I have to point out. Then, what are the positions that we took? Firstly, we took the stand that we will not allow to take up the new four items for a new round of negotiations. The second one w&s, the implementation issues will have to be discussed and settled, to the maximum extent possible. And the third was, the TRIPS Agreement has to be reviewed. These were the conditions. But, in the first case, we have finally agreed to include these new four items which are not at all trade-related issues, but, even then, we had to agree to that. And, while agreeing to that, the only satisfaction that we have got is that this will be negotiated at the Fifth Ministerial Conference and, that too, after the modalities have been agreed to completely by all the parties concerned. Of course, our consent should also be there.

But, Sir, you see how the European Union representatives look at this. Mr. Pascal Lamy, the Trade Commissioner of the European Union had said that the Members of the WTO had agreed to launch negotiations on investments, competition policy, trade facilitation and Government procurements. On that an explicit consensus was needed only to decide on the modalities. This discussion on the modalities will take place at the next

Ministerial meeting. As far as the four items are concerned, the compromise was that they are part of the negotiations and they belong to the programme we wanted. 'This is the thing which we wanted'. That is what they say.

Then, at the same time, the Indian officials have stated to the Press, and they maintained that the working group will continue with the study programme on the issues till the next Ministerial meeting. Sir, the Ministerial meeting will take place after two years, but during the two years' period, the working group will continue with the study programme.

Sir, the condition, the modality is that we have to come to an agreement. But, at the same time, Mr. Pascal himself has said that there is nothing new in this; this is a normal procedure. Therefore, even though we take credit by saying that this clause was agreed to, what is being said by the European Union representative is that 'these are normal procedures which we resort to'.

Finally, what I have to say is this. Of course, we have got two years' time. During this period, we have to prepare ourselves thoroughly. Firstly, I would say that our Government should make a thorough study about the results which have taken place in our economy after the Marrakesh Treaty was agreed to. Whether it was favourable or not is another matter. On that basis we should formulate our policy.

Then comes another attitude. Since we cannot go out and we have to continue there, while continuing there, we may bargain, but finally we will have to agree. If you are going to continue with this position, how can you conduct an effective bargaining? Therefore, our Government itself will have to take a decision on its approach.

The next point Is that we have to make efforts to unite the developing countries. Of course, I am happy to hear Mr. Maran saying that this time most of the developing countries had stood along with us. Of course, to a great extent they stood along, with us and whatever gains we have attained are mainly due to that unity.

Thirdly, when we are proceeding with our policies which are being pursued now in various fields, naturally the developing coutries will have a suspicion over our credentials. We have also to take note of that. I am not going into details, but that point should also be taken care of.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN {Tamil Nadu): Sir, the Doha Declaration approved by 142 countries at the Fourth Ministerial meeting of the WTO comes at a time when the world can ill-afford collapse in the multi-lateral global trading system. Even after the signing of three major declarations on the negotiating agenda for the new WTO round, on the implementation concerns of the developing countries and on the political statement dealing with patents and public health, the concerns expressed by India on these issues were not addressed in a substantive measure.

Admittedly, larger challenges remain for India's negotiators in the years to come. With the negotiations under the Work Programme supposed to conclude by 1st January, 2005, the clock has already started ticking. Moreover. China's entry into the WTO throws up a new dimension in the possible line up of countries in the future negotiations.

The Government has lifted the Quantitative Restrictions much ahead of the schedule and failed to prevent the WTO-propelled integration of Indian agriculture and industry with the global market, which should be halted and rolled back, at any cost.

The plight of the vast masses of poor working people on farms and factories, agriculturists and peasants, and people working in small and cottage industries, is miserable. If the problem is not addressed immediately, it can result in revolution. Thousands of people who are working in factories and farms are losing their jobs.

The Government has failed to oppose the proposed new round of trade negotiations on issues such as global investment regime, global competition policy, environment and trade linkages, open and zero tariff trade in e-commerce and a multilateral discipline on Government procurement.

Sir, the aim of the developed countries is to enlarge the WTO agenda, as far as possible. The Government has failed to resist the enlargement of the WTO agenda and strategically failed to focus attention on correcting the imbalances in the existing WTO agreement like high tariffs on export products of interest, financial difficulties in enacting and enforcing new trade legislation and the likely negative impact on the TRIPS Agreement.

The Government has failed to oppose the proposed new WTO round negotiations effectively. We are opposed to negotiations on the new

issues, foreign investment, competition, trade facilitation and competition because the decision we took in 1996 was to take up negotiations only if there was an "explicit consensus", We need to reinforce out stand very effectively to address the implementation issues of the developing countries and stick to the mandated negotiations on agriculture and services.

Sir, the Government has failed to alter the present position, which will lead to further deterioration in the export of textiles. Through the 1995 Singapore Declaration, it was restored back, the status quo was maintained. Regarding issues on investment, competition, trade facilitation and Government procurement, we should work towards explicit consensus so as to compensate the concessions given on "Environment and Textiles."

We should present our case to extend protection to the Darjeeiing tea and to the basmati rice during negotiations very effectively and efficiently. At the mini-Ministerial meeting of the WTO, India's insistence that the existing trade Agreements needed close attention before a new round of negotiations began, apparently failed to gather enough support. These should be taken care of in the near future.

Needless to say, the task will be very difficult given the plethora of issues that have to be effectively addressed. Moreover, it is also important to take care of the fact that the Singapore issues, linking trade to foreign investment, competition policies, transparency in government procurements and trade facilitation, which were the main concerns of India, have now come to the centre stage. As much as India opposes these, there are countries that would like to link the future of the WTO to the accommodation of these issues. If the country does not take concerted steps to improve its economic bargaining power and prepare internally for change, we will lose substantially.

Sir, any international agreement without Parliament's approval will be anti-democratic in nature. So, I submit that no international agreement that would bind our generations could be entered into by the Government without prior Parliament consent. Thank you.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): श्री मूल चन्द मीणा। मीणा जी, आप की पार्टी के लिए इस विषय पर जो निर्धारित समय था, वह समाप्त हो गया है। इसलिए मेरा आप से अनुरोध है कि आप बहुत संक्षेप में अपनी बात कह दें।

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा (राजस्थान)**:** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, विश्व व्यापार संगठन का दोहा में जो मंत्रिस्तरीय सम्मेलन हुआ, उस के बारे में हमारे वाणिज्य मंत्री भले ही लंबे-चौडे दावे करें,

भारत दोहा में महत्वपूर्ण सफलता अर्जित नहीं कर पाया है। क्या मिला, क्या नहीं मिला के हिसाब से अहम बात यह है कि पूरी दोहा वार्ता पर पानी फिर गया हालांकि यहां बड़े-बड़े दावे किए जाते हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इस सम्मेलन की सफलता के बारे में मारन साहब की बातों से ही संदेह पैदा हो जाता है। इन्होंने दोहा सम्मेलन के बाद अपने पहले वक्तव्य में चार बातें कही थीं। पहली बात तो यह कि दोहा मंत्रिस्तरीय सम्मेलन में भारत के हित को कोई नुकसान नहीं हुआ। दूसरी बात भारत को कृषि और सम्पदा के अधिकार क्षेत्र में कुल मिलाकर कुछ लाभ ही होगा। तीसरी बात, बदले में भारत को पर्यावरण जैसे मुद्दों पर कुछ नुकसान भी हुआ है और चौथी बात उन्होंने यह कही कि दोहा का असल सबक यही है कि हमारे देश में आर्थिक सुधारों को और तेज किया जाय ताकि हमारा अपना उत्पादन क्षेत्र विश्व व्यापार व्यवस्था में आगामी चुनौतियों का सामना कर सके। तो वाणिज्य मंत्री जी द्वारा कही बातों का निष्कर्ष निकाला जाए तो आने वाले वर्षों में भारत के व्यापार की संभावनाओं पर गंभीर असर पड़ेगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, विश्व व्यापार संगठन के सम्मेलन में भारत ने अपनी बात गंभीरता से उठायी, लेकिन वह बात उठाने के बाद भी आप के दृष्टिकोण का सम्मेलन पर प्रभाव नहीं पड़ा। आप ने जो दृष्टिकोण अपनाया, पर्यावरण निवेश, सरकारी खरीद, श्रम मानकों जैसी बातों का विरोध किया, उन्हें माना नहीं गया बल्कि उन्हें कार्यक्रम में जोड़ लिया गया। इस तरह आपकी बात का असर नहीं हुआ। महोदय, इस सम्मेलन में एक बात जरुर सामने आई कि विकसित और विकासशील देशों के मतभेद खुलकर सामने आए। लेकिन आप विकासशील देशों को संगठित नहीं कर पाए। हालांकि आप ने आकर कहा कि संगठित करना चाहिए ताकि अमेरिका और यूरोप जैसे विकसित देशों के द्वारा विकासशील देशों पर जो प्रभाव डाला जाता है, उसको रोका जा सके। उसको रोका जा सके। विकसित देश बड़ी चालाकी से काम करते हैं, कृषि के मामले को साफ बचा लेंगे, चर्चा ही नहीं होने देंगे। हमसे कहते हैं, विकासशील देशों से, कि आप कृषि पर सब्सिड़ी खत्म करो, कम करो और उधर अमरीका और यूरोप के किसानों की हालत देखिए, उनको कितनी सब्सिड़ी दी जाती है। इस संबंध में कोई तुलना ही नहीं की जा सकती। इस मुद्दे पर चर्चा ही नहीं होने दी।

महोदय, भारत ने एक बात कही थी कि विश्व व्यापार संगठन के जो पिछले फैसले हैं उनको लागू किया जाए। आपने यह बात कही थी, नए प्रस्तावों पर विचार नहीं किया जाता, लेकिन उसका असर क्या हुआ? आपकी बात को नहीं माना गया, आपकी बात को कोई तरजीह नहीं दी गई। भारत का प्रयास रहा था कि वस्त्र समझौते से जुड़े मामले सुलटा लिए जाएं, लेकिन इस बात को भी नहीं माना गया। इस्पात और सेमी कंडक्टरों को अमरीकी एंटी डंपिंग कानून के आधार पर कुछ नहीं किया जा सकता, वह बरकरार हैं। श्रमिकों के मुद्दे पर घोषणाओं में साफ नहीं किया गया। अकसर सामाजिक मुद्दे के तौर पर गिनाए जाने वाले श्रमिक श्रम मानको के मुद्दे पर घोषणा में यह साफ नहीं किया गया कि श्रम अधिकारों पर गहन बातचीत के लिए अंतर्राष्ट्रीय श्रम संगठन ही समुचित मंच है। इसका मतलब यह निकलता है कि डब्ल्यू.टी,ओ, इस मुद्दे को बाद में उठा सकता है। श्रम मानकों के प्रश्न पर कोई भी विरोधी नहीं है, लेकिन समस्या यह है कि विकसित देश इस मुद्दे पर अपनी बात मना रहे हैं। इलेक्ट्रोनिक व्यापार पर अमरीका ने पहले ही अन्य सभी देशों से कर न लगाने का वायदा करवा लिया था। वाणिज्य मंत्री जी, केन्द्र के और राज्य के अपने अलग अलग विषय हैं और आपने कई ऐसे मुद्दों पर हस्ताक्षर कर दिए हैं, जो राज्य से संबंधित हैं, आपसे, केन्द्र से संबंधित ही नहीं हैं और इसका विरोध देश के अंदर देखने

में आ रहा है। पंजाब राज्य के अंदर इसका विरोध सामने आया है, गुजरात में विरोध सामने आया है, राजस्थान में विरोध सामने आया है। इसके लिए आपको एक बड़ा दृष्टिकोण अपनाना पड़ेगा, तभी जाकर हम सही रुप से डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में अपना पक्ष रख सकते हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत बहुत बड़ी बातें बोलते हुए दोहा गया था, लेकिन खाली हाथ लौटा है। बस उतना कुछ ही इसे मिला है, जो उन्होंने झोली में ड़ाल दिया, लेकिन आपकी ओर से की गई कोशिश से कुछ नहीं मिला। मैं आपको कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब आप अगली बार वार्ता में जाएं तो पूरी तैयारी के साथ जाएं। इस संदर्भ में मैं अपने कुछ सुझाव आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ, जिन पर ध्यान दिया जाए ताकि अगली बार जाकर आप अपना पक्ष मजबूती से रखा जा सके। भारत तो केवल इन पर मुद्राए बनाता है, कुछ करता नहीं है। नंबर एक, विश्व व्यापार के साथ देश के विकास के अधिकार को भी जोङा जाए। दूसरा, अगली वार्ता के लिए अभी से एक तीसरी ताकत का मोर्चा गठित किया जाए। तीसरा, देश की संसद या देश की जनता को सभी मुद्दे बताएं जाएं ताकि लोग पूरी दुनियां में भारत का समर्थन कर सकें। चौथा, आर्थिक विशेषज्ञों और राजनैतिक दलों से एक कोर ग्रुप बनाया जाए, जिसको सर्वानुमति हासिल हो और जिनको सचमुच पता हो कि क्या करना है। अपनी बात कहने का एक जोरदार तरीका होना चाहिए। भारत के पास इस चीज की सबसे ज्यादा कमी है और इस कमी को पूरा करने के लिए आप जब किसी सम्मेलन में जाएं तो पूरी तैयारी करके जाएं, सभी राजनैतिक दलों, देश के बुद्धिजीवियों, सब की राय लेकर जाएं और अपना पक्ष मजबूती से रखें। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (**श्री सुरेश पचौरी**): बिजनेस एड़वायजरी कमेटी का निर्णय है कि सदन की कार्यवाही पांच बजे तक चलेगी। अगर सदन की राय हो तो मंत्री जी का पूरा उत्तर हो जाने दिया जाए।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य: जी, जवाब कंपलीट हो जाने दीजिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (**श्री सुरेश पचौरी**): मंत्री जी, बोलिए।

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): Mr, Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to the hon. Leaders of this House for taking part in this important discussion, and, especially, I should thank Pranab Da, for his illuminating and constructive speech. Madam Deputy Chairman has said, "Instead of bringing a motion, they have brought a Short Duration Discussion'. For that, I should, first, thank him and his party. There is almost a kind of unanimity in the House on the approach towards the WTO. That is what it should be because, at least, on international issues, we should cut across party lines because Government is a continuing process. We can't blame the earlier Government because, tomorrow, some other people may come here. I would, at the outset, tell the hon. Members that I feel hesitant to speak before the House because the House is full of negotiators, past, present and future.

Therefore, first, I would speak about the word "round". Some hon.

5.00 P.M.

Members have pointed out: "India never accepted a new round. Now, you have accepted a new round!" I want to clear this, in the first instance, because in the whole of the WTO Doha Declaration, there is no word such as 'round". It is only mentioned as "a broad and balanced Work Programme". In Mexico itself, Tanzania Minister said, "Please do not use the word 'round' because it is allergic to us." The hon. Singapore Prime Minister also said In the Singapore meeting, "Let us not use the word 'round' because it has some kind of a pejorative meaning." Technically, the word "round" has come to an end with the Uruguay Round. Now, they have created a WTO which is a permanent forum for negotiations. Tomorrow, somebody may call it 'a round' or 'a Doha round'; we may also calf it 'a Doha round' or 'a development round'. What is important is the issues and the contents, and, therefore, let us not stand on semantics.

Another reason for this is as follows. The hon. Prime Minister, while making a speech in the United Nations, made it very clear: "In the Uruguay Round, you have given us a cheque which has bounced. Therefore, we will not sign a blank cheque!" That means, they should first address the question of implementation issues, the asymmetries and other injustices that have been created by the Uruguay Round. Not only that; we all signed-hon. Pranab Da is there—in good faith, but the so-called developed countries misused them, misinterpreted the rules and took advantage of it. Therefore, the developing countries suffered a lot. Therefore, we said, "First, address the implementation issues. What is the use of signing new agreements without honouring the old agreement?" That was why, the implementation issues had come, and India played a leading role, along with the so-called LMG (Like Minded Group} and the developing countries, in categorising the implementation issues. Pranab Da has said, "What is this? The same words are used!" I am happy to say that there is a distinction, there Is a difference because some issues have been addressed at Doha; the outstanding issues would be addressed by the Council in Trade, and then, they would go for negotiations. That is the advantage; there is a difference. I would say, "We have got a separate declaration at Doha for the first time.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN In The Chair]

Para 12 says, "Negotiations on outstanding implementation issues shall be an integral part of the Work Programme." The negotiations will start. It

has specified the time-limit. The time-limit is given in the paragraph by the General Council Decisions of 3 May and 15 December 2000. "The agreed negotiations on outstanding issues shall be an integral part of the Work Programme we are establishing, and that agreements reached at an early stage in these negotiations shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 4? below."

"The other outstanding implementation issues shall be addressed by the relevant WTO bodies, which shall report to the Trade Negotiating Committee, established under paragraph 46 below, by the end of 2002, for appropriate action". A timeframe has been fixed. The entire Declaration has to come into effect by 2005. A timeframe has been fixed for that. I would like to say that, as regards the implementation issues, though they are not to our full satisfaction, at least, within a timeframe, they will find some kind of a solution. Therefore, it is an acknowledgement or accreditation of our concerns. Drawing a future road map for the resolution of implementation issues and concerns is a gain, a victory, for us. What do our adversaries say? That is very important. Our hon. friend has quoted Mr. Pascal Lamy, the European Union Commissioner, and I quote:

> "A valuable implementation package, which the developing countries rightly made such a priority, has forced this issue on to the agenda and, though you must ask them, I am sure, they have far exceeded their expectations".

They refused to accept it in the initial stage. They closed their eyes. Later, because of'the unity of the developing countries, because of like-minded group, they were compelled to accept it; the WTO had to accept it. Therefore, I think this is some kind of a victory, a significant achievement, for India and the developing countries. We don't claim that we have climbed the Everest like Tensing and Hillary. We did not conquer the WTO. We have achieved some significant victory, some significant things. The acid test for any policy is whether any harm has been done. I would like to say that no harm has been done. Regarding the implementation issues, some of the issues have been addressed at Doha itself. I would like to seek your permission, Madam, just to illustrate one or two examples or salient features of what has been approved at Doha, Firstly, a period of less than six months has been given for compliance in cases of phased introduction of sanitary and phytosanitary measures, that

is, food and hygiene standards. Our marine exports are suffering. They will increase their standards suddenly. There is protectionism. They will say. "You are not up to the standard". They will reject our exports. Therefore, in the original agreement, a reasonable time period was mentioned. Now, it has been defined as six months. So, this is an advantage to us. Secondly. Suppose, after six months, they change their standards; they change their sanitary and phytosanitary measures. We cannot do it immediately. Therefore, a period of another six moths has been given for adopting the procedures and methods, after the publication of the sanitary and phytosanitary measures. A period of not less than six months has to be given to the exporters in the developing countries to adopt the procedures and methods, after publication of the SPS measures. That is an advantage to us.

Now, let us come to the technical barriers to trade. For example, a period of less than six months has been given to exporters in the developing countries to adopt the procedures and methods, after publication of their technical specifications and entry into force. These are some of the gains. I can go on giving examples like this. You know that under-invoicing is the biggest problem for India. Earlier, the position was like this. If you go to Singapore or any other country and ask, "Okay, we want to consult you. What is the real value?". We cannot get any information from them. Now, there is cooperation and assistance from the customs administration of an exporting Member, and you can get the value of the goods imported, when there are reasonable grounds to doubt the accuracy of the value declared. This is another advantage that we have gained just now. Regarding the TRIPS Agreement, there is non-vioJation complaints. So, a moratorium of two years has been given. These are the immediate gains. Then, there is the TRQs, that is, Tariff Rate Quotas.

We have been given to transparency. They have been on their whims and fancies. Take the case of Poland. In the case of mushroom, they have allotted a particular quota to Poland at a lesser rate which is called Tariff Rate Quotas. Poland may not be in a position to fulfil the quota, But they would not give it to India. Our quota has been fixed at a lower level. If Poland is not implementing it, why don't you give that quota to us? They would not give it. How are they fixing the Tariff Rate Quotas? There is no answer. Now there will be transparency. We can question them legally. These are the immediate gains in the area of implementation issues and our concerns, i would say that this is the first victory.

Now let me talk about agriculture. The agreement on agriculture is under implementation for the last six years. But nothing has happened. Madam, 121 countries have given negotiating proposals. The European countries are saying that they would insist on continuing protectionism. They say that is their open intent. There is no mention that negotiations on agreement on agriculture would come to an end at a particular point of time. That is Article 20. ^.Now liberalisation of agriculture has been promised. The mandates of Declaration 13 is much more favourable than article 20. It forms a basis for the ongoing negotiations. It talks about countries which are giving extraordinary subsidies. Many hon. Members have referred to it. For example, the domestic subsidy in OECD countries has risen from 275 billion dollars to 326 biHion dollars. Within the OECD countries, the annua! State payments to the agricultural sector have exceeded the combined GDP of all the African countries. Domestic support in America, Europe and Japan accounts for 80 per cent of the world's total. That is why we cannot compete. Since the international price is low, our Indian agricultural products cannot compete. Now some kind of a decision has been taken. They say, "Reductions of, with a view to phasing out, all forms of export subsidies." They have to do it. Modalities for the commitments, including provisions for special and differential treatment shall be established no later than 31* March, 2003. The final agreements in the negotiations will come into effect in 2005. This is one of the advantages we have gained. It has been hailed by many countries. It is a great advantage for the developing countries. Madam, I would like to quote from the Asian Wall Street Journal. It says, "Developing nations did win important concessions at Qatar, including pledges to phase out farm subsidies and limit the use of anti-dumping laws." This is what they have said. Now this is the statement made by the President of the European Council. He said, "This Declaration would mean that the rich countries will no longer be able to use export subsidies to push the agricultural products from the developing countries out of the market." The famous magazine "The Economist' says, "The European Union, the sole champion of comprehensive trade role, was forced to accept a stronger commitment to ending trade-distorting farm export subsidies than its members, notably France, would have iiked." What have we gained? We have gained in the sense that on our side, we have agreed that special and differential treatment for developing countries shall be an integral part of all elements of the negotiations. That means we will be given a special and differential treatment. Not only that. Our interests are food security and rural

development, which will be taken care of.

Perhaps, for the first time, the words 'food security' find a place in the Lexicon of WTO. I think, it is a great advancement to our country. Now what we have to do Is, we have to link our Indian agriculture with international trade.

Then, Pranabda raised the issue about AMS. During the periods 1986-87. 1987-88 and 1988-89, according to Shri A.V. Ganesan, our AMS was negative to the extent of Rs. 19,000 crores. It means that we could give subsidy, provided we have surplus revenue. According to a rough calculation, which is negative by Rs.42,000 crores, if the Government of India has money, then, they can give subsidy to the farmers to the extent of Rs.42,000 crores. But the question is whether we have revenue or not, or, whom to tax. That is another matter. Therefore, I think, this is a significant movement forward, t won't say, we are getting it tomorrow. But, Madam, t can assure you and the House - Pranabda knows it very well - thai the PDS will never be disturbed. Not only that, the poor farmers have already been excluded from the calculation of AMS, and we will not support any measure against them. Not only that, India, in its original submission about AMS, has stated, "WTO has taken all farmers having land below 10 hectares as low income, resource poor farmers." That covers almost 80 per cent of our farmers. So, I can assure you that they will never be disturbed. And we are also saying that the developing countries should be exempt from any obligation to provide minimum market access commitment, After all, the European Union and other developed countries are having; Just three to five per cent of their population engaged in agriculture. So, agriculture has become a bone of contention for them. And, because they are having elections in France and later in Belgium, they were insisting on it. But we told them, "No, we will not yield to it." All the problems have arisen because the European countries, the Cairns Group of countries and the United Stated have joined together. Actually, I would say, this is a great advantage to us. When they said, 'We are having elections in France; we have to do something", I told them, "We are also having elections in Uttar Pradesh, tf Uttar Pradesh were to be a sovereign, independent, State, it will be the sixth or seventh most populous country in the world. So, don't ignore us. We are also having electorates." That is how we fought the issue. It is a fact that no Government -- leave alone this Government - can ignore the farmers. Seventy per cent of the population is engaged in agriculture-related activities. We remember, the PL- 480 days where we

lived from ship to mouth. No Government will continue if they agree to any kind of malpractice. I would say that the entire farming community would rise in revolt. Therefore, it is a must for any Government, which is in power, to take care of them.

Then, Madam, as regards TRIPS on Public Health, the major achievement for India and the developing countries was the Declaration of TRIPS on Public Health. It is a landmark declaration. We know how the TRIPS has entered into. Pranabda knows that in 1978, at Tokyo Round the European Union and the U.S., in particular, wanted some anti-counterfeiting measure. We also agreed to it. What happened was that it took *Vishwaroopam* in the form of TRIPS. And what happened was, it became a paradise for the multinationals. I want to quote what Prof. Jagdish Bhagwati , Advisor to the GATT, and Arthur Dunkel have said, "We are turning WTO, thanks to the powerful lobbies, into a royalty- collecting agency." This is the position. Prof. Bhagwati and Mr. Srinivasan of the Yale University have said, "The unrequited mass transfer of rent alone is 8.3 billion dollars to four developed countries from the rest of the world." Of these 8.3 billion dollars, 5.3 billion dollars will accrue to the US alone. So. we got some thing from them. In Tamil we say that the sugarcane that enters the mouth of an elephant can never be taken out, We have to take, at least, some pieces. 36 million people around the world are living with HIV /AIDS virus. It is not only a kind of African disease; in Asia alone, 6.4 million people carry this virus, second only to the sub-Saharan African region. So, the Nobel laureate, Joseph Stiglitz, probably a great friend of our former Finance Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, recently said -- of course, he did not open his mouth when he was in the World Bank -- that he likens free trade WTO-style to the Opium Wars because it allows the MNCs to fleece people in the poor countries by charging usurious prices for branded medicines and other services. Therefore, there is a separate declaration. Just look at paragraph 1 of this Declaration. It clearly mentions health problems'; we are not rewriting TRIPS. It is not possible. At least, we got some concessions, some flexibilities, certain clarifications. It does not mention AIDS alone, but also tuberculosis, malaria and other epidemics, They wanted to use the word pandemic, which means "continent to continent'. I told them India is a sub-continent. Our team fought on this. I said, a disease which may be an epidemic in the south may not be there in the North-East. So, we argued. We changed the word 'pandemic' to 'epidemic'. Another great victory was that we got them agreed that the TRIPS agreement does not and should not prevent the members from

taking measures for protecting public health, and that the agreement can and should be interpreted and implemented in a manner that is supportive of WTO members' right to protect public health and, in particular, to promote access to medicine. That is a signal to the national governments; we can implement it in such a way. Then, the expression 'should be interpreted' is a message to the dispute settlement body in Geneva. So, it is a clear signal and we have got several flexibilities. Now, they have put public health above the MNC's profits. There is a great advantage. Not only that, during national emergency or extreme emergency, who will implement it? This question was hanging fire. Now the sovereign Governments will decide. If the Government decides that this is a case of emergency, or this is an extreme urgency, we can jump into the field. Therefore, I would say that this is a great advantage which we have gained And I think there is full praise for all these things. 777© *Economist* says, "They" -- 'they* means the developing countries - "scored a coup with a declaration that intellectual property rules should not stop poor countries from gaining access to cheap medicines..." and this is the thing they go on saying like that. It goes on to say, "It is a sign of their increasing clout" --'their' means developing countries'. "Poor countries scored a clear victory over health matters. As one activist admitted, two years ago you would have never got anything like this through the WTO". We have got it now. So, I think it is a feather in the cap of India because the proposal was submitted by India and Brazil, along with 55 African countries. The public opinion was on our side. And you know the scare of Anthrax also which has created such a kind of feeling all over the world that the WTO was compelled to show its human face; otherwise, it would be considered as inhuman. Now, affordability and availability of medicines are universal rights and that right has been recognised. I think we are finding fault with it. Here is a Brizilian paper which says Brazil claims drug patents victory. But, inside, they say that the developing countries like Brazil and India have got it. So, they are praising it. But, I think, we are not praising ourselves. So. it is a great victory for India.

Then, the *Asian Wall Street* Journal says. "Most significantly, for India, developed countries also agreed to alleviate the rights of poor countries seeking cheap medicines above the rights of international drug companies seeking to protect their rights." These are all American papers; they themselves have accepted it. The *Guardian,* which is much respected, says, "The most significant story to emerge from the talks in the Gulf, *i.e..,* from Doha, is the coming of political age of the developing countries' lobby

within the WTO. Gone are the days when the developed countries could bully and manipulate to extract maximum advantage." In fact, they can bully no more, because 55 African countries and developing countries like India and Brazil took the lead. We were in the Drafting Committee. 'At Doha, developing countries led by large economies such as India and Brazil, have proved far more effective in forming alliances to push through concessions. They have finally begun to exercise their numerical superiority in the 140-plus member body, and they have significant victories to celebrate." These are the words used by the *Guardian.* "They won an important concession, and one of the issues at the top of the Doha agenda was the clarification of the WTO's TRIPS Agreement on intellectual property and its recognition that drugs' patent could be suspended in a public health emergency." So, this is the appreciation we have got. I think, it is a clear victory for us. Not only that...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think, Mr. Minister, we should give this credit to Cipla, because when they offered the drug on HIV/ AIDS at 3000 dollars, for 300 dollars--they offered it to the Doctors without Boundaries, you know, Doctors sans Boundaries-there was a case in South Africa against them by all the multinational drug companies. There were many articles in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post,* but not a single word came about India and the Indian drug company which came out with that drug. So, we should also mention this.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: You know it better, Madam. You are perfectly right. Anthrax also contributed to this; otherwise, it would not have created fear in those people's mind. So, I totally agree with you.

Now, Madam, as far as geographical indications were concerned, wines and spirits were given additional protection. You cannot say it is a 'Scotch Whiskey'; you cannot say it is 'champagne' or 'brandy' grown in the Champagne District of France. We have been fighting that our *basmati* rice, our Darjeeling tea, and other commodities should be given that kind of a higher protection. Why have you selected only two items? What about our Darjeeling tea? What about our *Nphonso* mango? We have been saying this. Paragraph 18 says, "The issues related to the extension of the protection of geographical indications provided for in Article 23 to products, other than wines and spirits, will be addressed in TRIPS Council, pursuant to paragraph 12 of this Declaration." Therefore, it is going before the TRIPS Council. We are keeping the TRIPS Council fully engaged. I think, it will go a long way. This is the position on these things. What about others? Are they

recognising it? Here, the European Union's Farm Commissioner, Mr. Fisehler, has issued a statement on 14th November, .2001. ! quote it. "Another positive aspect of the deal is that we will now negotiate on geographical indications, with a view to protecting quality products ranging from Indian *basmati* rice to Italian parmigiano cheese, from being pirated in the WTO countries." So, Madam, in geographic indications also, which was a long felt need and demand of countries like India and other developing countries, we have scored well.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Moca coffee; Moca is a place in Yemen, but Colombians are using it for them.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: They have now opened the window and we can simply expand the window. We have to open a register. The procedures could be laid down for that. When they agree for coffee, then we have to introduce our coffee; when they agree for tea, we have to introduce our Darjeeling tea. They would not mention about our Darjeeling tea. They would simply say on wines, spirits, tea, coffee, fruits, or something like this. This is under the consideration of the TRIPS Council.

Madam, I have already dealt with agriculture, which is very important for us. There are several other issues. On market access, we are going in for negotiations. The market access issue is very important, in the sense that it has been there right from the GATT days. Article 28 contains these things. Our concern is on tariff peaks and tariff escalation. What is a tariff peak? The US, Japan and the EU would say that their average is 5%. But, for certain products, which are of interest to developing countries, the tariff will be 50% or 60%, Not only that; regarding agricultural products like rice, Japan, for a variety of rice, has a tariff of 500% or 1000%. They call it dirty tariffication. We want them to reduce it.

I now come to the second aspect, tariff escalation. What is tariff escalation? If you send any hand-processed leather, the tariff on it would be very tow. If you export it to America or the EU, after processing it, then the tariff is higher. If you send it as a value-added product like shoe or something else, then the tariff would be stilt higher. That is tariff escalation. They are all hiding under 'average tariff'. Therefore, we have to revise that. It ts a great advantage. Otherwise, we would not get an opportunity to address tariff peaks and tariff escalations, At the same time, we want no reciprocity. In the sense, if they reduce the tariff by 5%, we need not reduce it by 5%. We can reduce it by 1%. If they reduce it by 10%, since there is

no reciprocity, we can reduce it by 2 or 3%. This is all subject to negotiations. Not only that, this is all subject to special and differential treatment. If you fully take into account the special needs and interests of the developing and the least developed countries, then it would be less than full reciprocity. This is another advantage which we have got. Madam, I can go on talking on this.

Let me come to the Singapore issue, which had been raised by Pranabda. He wanted me to clarify on that. Hon. Shri Pillai also spoke on it. So, I will take up the Singapore issue. It contains four issues-trade and investment, trade and competition, trade facilitation and. finally, transparency in Government procurements. These issues have entered the WTO not now. They entered in 1996, at Singapore. In the recently-held meeting, we didn't want any negotiations to be carried on. Therefore, we insisted that we are not for carrying on the negotiations. It would be of interest to the hon. Members, if I share it with the House. Why were we discussing the Green Room process? Of course, the room was yellow. 20 countries are participating and discussing and finalizing." We said, "No, it should not be taken up for negotiation because the explicit consensus is already there on two issues." We should not be taken for granted. Then they said, "Okay, we will consider" and jumped to the next agenda. Finally, Madam, as you know, a 36 hours non-stop meeting was held. We did not have time even to have a nap; it went on continuously for 36 hours. But at the end of 35 hours and 45 minutes, they produced a document and said, "This is the draft." We were seeing all members leaving. So, we were all taken for a ride, I thought. We said, "No, we cannot. We do not know who prepared the draft and who prepared the change." I can understand what Mr. S.B. Chavan has said He says we have no role to play in the WTO in setting the agenda. We had the first draft on 26th September, we had the second draft on 27.h October, we had the third draft at Doha on l3.h November and we had the fourth draft on 14.h November after whole night, that is, after 36 hours. Finally, what is now here is this kind of declaration. That is why, as I said, I refused to participate in the consensus. So every country seemed to be at a standstill. That is the penultimate stage, Suppose, I continued there, the next stage was to block it. I could have blocked it and got the appreciation of my friends. But what will be the consequences? The implementation issues will go, the ACP countries, 77 ACP countries which are getting a new type of deal, for example, waiver of MFN treatment wHI also go. The Latin American countries that are getting some kind of a special concession in their subsidies, that will also go. More than anything

else, whatever we got in TRIPS in the matter of public health, that will also go. Therefore, for almost 18 hours they bargained with India. The Director-General came to us. Many of them came to us. I do not want to mention the names. Our other colleagues from developing countries said, "We will lose everything. We are with you and our hearts and minds are with you, but we do not want to lose these kinds of advantages." Naturally, I had no other way. Finally, I wanted a compromise. I said clearly, "Look, I have to go back and face the Parliament. So, this is our position and this is my mandate. You do something.* What they ultimately did was that they suggested a compromise. The Chairman in his speech said, "Explicit consensus is needed not only for negotiations on the four issues, but explicit consensus is necessary for modalities also." That is what we have gained. I would read out the Chairman's speech. The Chairman says, *! would like to note that some delegates have requested for clarifications concerning paragraphs 20, 23, 26 and 27 of the draft declaration. These are the Singapore issues. Let me say that with respect to the reference of an explicit consensus we needed in these paragraphs for a decision to be taken at the 5th Session of the Ministerial Conference, that is, two years later. My understanding is that at that Session, a decision would indeed need to be taken by an explicit consensus, before negotiations on trade and investment, trade and competition policy, transparency in Government procurement and trade facilitation could proceed." In Singapore, we have got this explicit consensus only in regard two issues, trade and investment and trade and competition. Now we have got this explicit consensus in regard to all the four issues. Now again I quote the speech of the Chairman. It further says, "In my view, this would also give each member a right to take a position on modalities that would prevent negotiations from proceeding, after the 5^{m} Session of the Ministerial Conference until the member is prepared to join in this explicit consensus." The word also is in our own handwriting, India's delegation members' handwriting. It has been accepted after 18 hours of bargaining. Finally. I did not want to break my ranks with developing countries, we did not want to break our ranks with Latin American countries especially Cuba. Barbados and Jamaica. They said "We agree with you." They agreed with India's position. But they were not willing to block because blocking means everything will go. Therefore, after this assurance - in fact, it is a gain we could not do anything. Therefore, this is our position.

I would like to say that Doha is a turning point. I can very well summarise that we have succeeded in: (1) Keeping out of negotiations

issues that are harmful to India such as labour. (2) Bringing to the centre of the WTO's Work Programme issues of interest to India, such as implementation issues, TRIPS and transfer of technology. For transfer of technology, a Special Study Group has been appointed. This is another gain. So far, everybody used the word 'transfer of technology.' But nothing has been done. Now, a Special Study Group is to be appointed. (3) Scoring major gains in TRIPS and public health. (4) Postponing negotiations on the four Singapore issues to the Fifth Ministerial Conference to be held after two years. You may say that we have postponed. Yes. We have maintained the *status quo.* But we have gained on the other two issues -- transparency in Government procurement and trade facilitation -and got the explicit consensus. (5) Protecting our fundamental interests in agriculture, services and industrial tariffs. (6) Significantly reducing the potential which harm India's interests, by incorporating strong safeguards in the mandate for negotiations as well as in the Work Programme, relating to the area of environment. And. finally, agreeing to a balanced and manageable agenda, emphasising not only trade, but also developmental goals on the priorities of the developing countries like India, mainstreaming special and differential treatment and capacity-building. So, in every negotiation, we have a special and differential treatment. What is this special and differential treatment? In a sense, the developing countries like India will have a fewer disciplines. Disciplines will be less, and the transformation period may be more. This is what we have gained. It has been mainstreamed into all negotiations. This is a great advantage. The Guardian says, I quote, "Doha is a turning point for all developing countries..." Because, for the first time, we were all united. In a sense, at least, at the last moment, we were ail united. I will, with your permission, read it. It says, "The most dramatic demonstration of the new power of the developing countries came on the last day when India succeeded in leading a rebellion against the European Union's insistence on widening the Doha Round to include new issues such as investment, competition and Government procurement. India's stand effectively shelved all the new issues..." — They agreed to it because the Chairman's speech is part of the record of the WTO "...until the next Ministerial talks in two years. A triumph which left the E.U. cast as the villain of the piece, arrogantly running the risk of wrecking Doha because of its intransigence." So, we were not atone. This is the proof. Listen, there was a rebellion created by India and -- I cannot say about the E.U -- arrogance was put in its proper place. This is what they say. Madam, I would like to read out another sentence;

the House may like to know this. It says, "This time it was India, supported by other developing countries, who played a dramatic game of brinkmanship, threatening to walk out, after six days of negotiations. The advantage shifted back and forth between the North and the South in the final hours." So, this is the position.

Now, I am coming to the conclusion. I have always maintained that the WTO is not a global Government. It should not become a global Government, because - they want to usurp the powers of the national Parliaments, which is not good. Why are we saying this? Because it is not possible. There will be a rebellion. You cannot subsidise. You cannot do this. You cannot give jobs. If W.T.O. is issuing commands like these, then, there will be unrest, not only in India, but all over the world. This feeling is gaining ground even in America. Many people may ask as to why am I using such harsh words and why am I so blunt. I would like to read out some sentences. "The WTO is a forum where Governments can negotiate to reduce barriers to trade, and agree to rules to try to resolve disputes." Okay. We cannot make the WTO an organization that will deal with all the problems that an elected national Government faces. Let us be honest, This is an important point. It further says, "The WTO is not a global Government, with a power to order new environment or labour laws - or for that matter - better tax regimes, pension plans, health programmes, civilian control of militaries or a host of other meritorious outcomes." Who said this? Not me; not an Indian. These are the words of a no less a person than Mr. Roberts Zoellick, the US Trade Representative. The point is, at that time he was commenting in the Washington Post, after the Seattle fiasco. Sometimes, we feel different dimensions, if the places are changed. I am very grateful to Pranabda when he said, "Places may be changed, but the policy is the same." I am very grateful to him. I, am beholden to that kind of attitude. Doha is behind us. According to schedule, the negotiations will start very soon and end by five years. We know the Tokyo Round lasted for six years. I think, the Uruguay Round lasted for eight years. For how many years it will go, I don't know; but the schedule is by five years. What we have to do is - as many of the hon. Members have suggested, as Mr. S.B. Chavan has suggested — we should build a development alliance with all the developing countries. Now, they have tasted the blood. They have achieved what they wanted. They know that if we are united till the last moment, if 50-55 countries join with India and other countries, then they would achieve what they had achieved in the TRIPS. So, we have to plan for some kind of a coalition or partnership,

which may be called 'Development Coalition'. Somebody was suggesting that India should take the lead. If we say, "We are the leader of the developing countries", everybody will run away from us. So, it should be on a fraternal basis to achieve commonality of purpose, commonality amongst us. But the position of India is something different. Nobody bothers about investment. The Latin American countries say, "We want an agreement. You are a big country. You can dictate terms." Colombia says, "What can we do? We want an agreement." Sir, nobody wants to- sign a bilateral agreement. India has about 40-60 bilateral Investment Protect Agreements. You know, we are the leader in software, in knowledge-based industries. This is modern India. But we have another India, There is another India, that is, the traditional India. That is a developing country. They say, "You are a big country." When we went for canvassing to all these countries, some countries - I don't want to mention names - went to the African countries. They said, "Why is India bothering about AIDS and other things. Do you think it is for altruistic purposes? Just because of sympathy for the Africans? No, they will be the gainers." One way, it is true also. In a sense, India and Brazil will be the gainers because we have built up an industry of generic medicines. We have this capacity. So, this is the problem. But I have told the African countries, "No, we will give it in writing. We don't want our trade to flourish. We are worried about fundamental, basic, human rights, the hearth of the common man." That is the position. I would say, multilateral trade agreement is not a one-sided affair. So, we have to continue. Before building a development alliance, we have to build some kind of a consensus amongst ourselves, at least, on this international issue -- regarding WTO. We have to evolve a consensus. I think, today is a good sign. We will continue to do so. We will continue to consult. We will get all your advice. We will share with you all the documents we are going to get from now onwards. At the same time, I would say — I have already said -- we did not conquer the Everest, we did not conquer the WTO. But, at this moment, I have to say this - so many people talking and spreading rumours, "so and so called", t was pressured by so and so, that is why I withdrew, t said, "No." I am sharing with you the reality. I may tell you, when the Cabinet Committee gave its mandate on the WTO, the Prime Minister asked me, "Keep the flag flying." Again, at that critical moment, in Doha, I contacted him, "This is the position. What shall I do?" He said, "Be firm." Therefore, we were firm. We kept the flag flying.

I would not say it is my victory. It is not a victory of any Party. It

»s a victory for India; it is a victory for all of us. We will continue to cooperate. But, first, we will have to create a local coalition for these kinds of affairs. Thank you very much, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you think. Mr. Minister, by the next time, that is, after two years, when you are to go there, Mr. Supachai, who is from Thailand, will take over?

SHRI MURASOU MARAN: Maybe.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The term of Mike Moore is ending.

SHRI MURASOU MARAN: But, Madam, WTO is WTO. The developing countries have no rote at all. Whoever comes, we will have to assert ourselves. Even if India is there, it will be they who will be setting the goals; who will be setting the Agenda. I am not finding fault with anybody. Of course, he is a friend of ail the developing countries. Mr. Mike also claims that he is a friend of all the developing countries.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope so. But, I think, Mr. Supachai would be better. So, now, with this reply...

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: You have the freedom to say that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is from Thailand, and Thailand is a developing country and they have their own problems. I am not an economist. I had to study the entire gamut of WTO because of my conference, which I was organising. Thank you very much. We discussed it for a much longer time than we had envisaged. I thank all of you for your contribution. We will meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock. The House is now adjourned.

The House then adjourned at forty-seven minutes
past five of the clock, till eleven of the clock on
Thursday, the 29th November, 2001.

MGI P(PLU)MRND—4642RS—30-5-2002.