

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri Jairam Ramesh to make a statement on deliberations and results of COP-15 UNFCCC, held at Copenhagen on December 18, 2009.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

**Deliberation and results of COP-15 UNFCCC held at Copenhagen
on December 18, 2009**

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, normally I prefer to make spontaneous interventions. But, bound by your procedure, I have prepared a text. It is structured spontaneity in the text. I think, it is being distributed to all the hon. Members. Much against my wishes, I have your permission to read the text.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to make a *suo motu* statement on the 15th Conference of Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change that was held on Copenhagen, Denmark between December 7-18th, 2009.

Before I get into the statement, Sir, let me say that this is the fourth time in the last four weeks that I am speaking in some detail on the issue of climate change reflecting our Government's transparency and keenness to keep the Parliament fully informed at every step. It also reflects, of course, the great interest hon. MPs themselves have taken in this important subject. There was a Calling Attention Motion in the Rajya Sabha on November 24th and a Zero Hour discussion on December 7th The Lok Sabha had a five-hour discussion on December 3rd. Let me reiterate that I am more than prepared to discuss this issue in Parliament at any time, in any form that the House desires and the Chairman directs.

To return to the Copenhagen Conference, there were two segments to it. The first was between December 7th and 15th that involved negotiations at the official level. The second was between the 16 and 18th of December that involved a High-Level Segment at the Ministerial level. In addition, the Danish Presidency of the Conference of Parties had invited Ministers from all countries for informal consultations from the 12th to the 17th of December, 2009. Heads of State or Heads of Government had also been invited to the High-Level Segment or during the 17th and 18th of December, 2009. Over a hundred heads of State/Government participated. Our Prime Minister addressed the Conference on the 18 of December and I had the privilege of speaking on behalf of the Government of India on the 16th of December. Sir, copies of both these speeches are attached to the *suo motu* Statement.

There were two specific outcomes of the Copenhagen Conference. In Bali, hon. Members may recall in December 2007, the Conference of Parties had decided to have negotiations on two

parallel tracks, both of which were expected to be concluded at Copenhagen. The first track relates to the outcome of the Bali Action Plan and the other track pertains to the commitment of the Annex I Parties of the developed countries for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol in the period extending beyond 2012. These negotiations could not be concluded and the Copenhagen Conference therefore, decided to continue these negotiations to be completed at the end of 2010 at the 16th Conference of Parties to be held in Mexico City in December 2010. In this respect, India, South Africa, Brazil, China and other developing countries were entirely successful in ensuring that there was no violation of the mandate for the Bali Action Plan, negotiations on the enhanced implementation of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Despite relentless attempts made by the developed countries, the Conference succeeded in continuing the negotiations under the Kyoto Protocol for the post 2012 period. Undoubtedly, many developed countries want to see an end to the Kyoto Protocol but we have been able to thwart these attempts for the time being. The major outcome of the Conference, therefore, is the fact that the negotiations under the UNFCCC will continue to proceed in two tracks as set out in the Bali Road Map one relating to the long-term cooperative action for enhancing implementation of the Convention and the second relating to the second commitment period of Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol. Another decision taken by the Conference relates to the Copenhagen Accord. India, with over twenty-five other countries that included Bangladesh, Maldives, Indonesia, China, Japan, South Korea, Papua New Guinea, Australia, Russia, Mexico, USA, Brazil, Colombia, Granada, South Africa, Algeria, Sudan, Gabon, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Spain and the European Union, was invited by the host country to assist the President of the Conference in forging a consensus on several outstanding issues. The results of such informal consultations held on December 17th and 18th, 2009, were brought by the COP President, who happens to be the Danish Prime Minister, on his own responsibility, to the Plenary of the Conference for consideration on December 18th, 2009. Some countries that included Cuba, Nicaragua, Venezuela and Bolivia did not join the consensus on the draft Copenhagen Accord presented by the Danish Prime Minister in his capacity as the COP President. Since the Conference works on the principle of consensus, the Copenhagen Accord was not adopted as an outcome of the Conference. It was, however, taken note of. The contents of the Accord are not legally binding nor do they constitute a mandate for a new negotiating process under the UNFCCC.

6. The Copenhagen Accord deals with the various elements of the Bali Action Plan relating to the issues of mitigation, adaptation, financing and technology in the context of climate change. Let me present to you the highlights of the Accord.

7. The Accord recognizes the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities of the Parties in combating climate change. The Accord recognizes the need

to limit the global temperature rise by 2050 to below 2 degree Celsius above pre-industrial levels. While doing so, the Accord clearly sets out the goal in the context of equity and sustainable development. This ensures that in achieving this goal, the right of the developing countries like India to have an equitable share in access to global atmospheric resources cannot be ignored and is ensured. I might add here that this was a point repeatedly made by our hon. Prime Minister in all his interactions.

8. The Copenhagen Accord does speak of "cooperation in achieving the peaking of global and national emissions as soon as possible." However, the Accord explicitly recognises – this is very important – that the time-frame for peaking will be longer in developing countries. It also bears in mind that "social and economic development and poverty eradication are the first and overriding priorities of developing countries." The Accord, therefore, does not speak of a specific year for peaking for developing countries which has incidentally always been on the agenda of the developed countries. This is another area of success for us at Copenhagen. This is also consistent with the position of India as outlined by our Prime Minister over two years ago that our per capita emissions will never exceed the average per capita emissions of the developed countries.

There has been insistence from the Developed Countries to adopt quantified emission reduction targets in the long term by the global community. A global goal of 50 per cent emissions reduction by 2050, with reference to current levels of emissions, has generally been emphasized by the Annex I countries. And, this was reiterated relentlessly by many Heads of State of Annex I countries at Copenhagen also. Reference to such a specific numerical target in terms of emission reduction has been avoided in the Accord because of the insistence of the Developing Countries, particularly India, that a global goal should be expressed only in terms of limit in increase of temperature, and not in terms of a quantified emission reduction targets, Sir, let me repeat this, because of the insistence of the developing countries, particularly India, that a global goal should be expressed only in terms of limit in increase of temperature, and not in terms of a quantified emission reduction target. This is because such a target would impose in a binding commitment, for the Developing Countries which do not have such obligations under the UN Framework Convention on climate change. We can be satisfied that we were able to get our way on this issue as well.

The Accord obliges the Annex I countries to indicate their mid-term emission reduction targets for 2020 by January 31, 2010 to the Secretariat. Their actions in terms of emission reduction and financing support given to developing countries for mitigation actions in developing countries will be subject to measurement, reporting and verification as per the guidelines adopted by the Conference of Parties. The MRV applies to the Developed Countries as well.

1.00 P.M.

The mitigation actions of the Developing Countries – Sir, this is very important, perhaps, the most important paragraph in my statement - are to be supported by the Developed Countries in accordance with article 4.7 of the UNFCCC. Mitigation actions of the Developing Countries will be subject to domestic measurement, domestic reporting and domestic verification as per its internal procedures. Reports of such mitigation actions, supported or unsupported, will be made to the Secretariat through the National Communications which will be made every two years. There is a provision – I expect there will be a debate on this – for international consultations and analysis for implementation of the actions reported through the National Communications. The guidelines for such consultations and analysis will be devised and defined in due course. We have been able – I reiterate, as forcibly as I can-to incorporate a specific provision that these clearly defined guidelines will ensure that the national sovereignty is respected. This is not "an empty sentiment", these are actually words written in the Accord. Hon. Members, who have had an opportunity of reading the Accord would know, and let me just read out to you what the Accord says. It says that non-Annex I parties will communicate information on the implementation of their actions through the National Communications with provision for international consultations and analysis under clearly defined guidelines that will ensure that national sovereignty is protected.

This is not an empty boast. It is respected. It is not an empty boast. You can see who had a hand in drafting of this. This is not an empty boast. but this is actual text that is reflected in the Accord. This is another accomplishment for us at Copenhagen. Of course, as I have stated on earlier occasions, the supported mitigation actions will be open to international measurement, reporting and verification as per guidelines adopted by the Conference of Parties.

Sir, under the Accord, the developed country Parties have agreed to set up a Climate Fund named "Copenhagen Green Climate Fund" to provide resources approaching US \$ 30 billion during the period 2010-2012 to support the adaptation and mitigation actions of the developing country Parties. The funding for adaptation will be focused on the least-developed countries, small-island developing States and Africa. They have also undertaken a commitment to mobilize US \$ 100 billion a year by 2020 for such purposes and a high-level panel will be set up under the guidance of Conference of Parties to review the progress of these commitments.

A Technology Mechanism is also proposed to be established to accelerate technology development and transfer in support of adaptation and mitigation actions in the developing countries.

Negotiations on the precise architecture of this Mechanism are underway in the UNFCCC and, Sir, I am pleased and proud to say that many of the proposals made by India in this regard have found acceptance. Hon. Members may recall that we had a high-level conference in Delhi on this issue on the 23rd and 24th October and following the recommendations of this Conference, a network of technology innovation centres has been proposed by India as a part of this mechanism.

The objectives and the implementation of the Accord will be assessed and the process of assessment will be completed by 2015 in order to consider the possibility of further strengthening the long-term goal of limiting the temperature rise to below 1.5 degree Celsius. Sir, this is in response to a demand made by 43 small island developing States that includes Maldives. Bangladesh and Nepal have also supported this idea.

Sir, a notable feature of this Conference – Sir, this is the second most important paragraph in my Statement—that has been widely commented on is the manner in which the BASIC group of countries coordinated their positions. Sir, the BASIC group comprises of Brazil, South Africa, India and China. Ministers of the BASIC group comprising Brazil, South Africa, India and China had met in Beijing, as part of the pre-Copenhagen preparations, on November 27th and 28th, 2009, to prepare for Copenhagen in a joint manner. I had attended that meeting. The hon. Members may recall that I had briefed them in my earlier interventions on the results of that meeting. The BASIC Group Ministers met virtually on an hourly basis right through the Copenhagen Conference. Within BASIC, India and China worked very, very closely together. I believe that the BASIC group has emerged as a powerful force in climate change negotiations and India should have every reason to feel satisfied on the role that it has played in catalyzing the emergence of this new quartet. Their unity, the unity of Brazil, South Africa, India and China, was instrumental in ensuring that the Accord was finalized in accordance with the negotiating framework as laid out in the UNFCCC, the Bali Action Plan and the Kyoto Protocol. We will continue to work with Brazil, South Africa and China as well as other countries of the G-77 to ensure that the interests of the developing countries, in general, and India, in particular, are protected in course of negotiations during 2010 and beyond. I should also mention here, Sir, that President Obama interacted with the two Prime Ministers, Prime Minister, Wen Jiabao and Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, and the two Presidents, President Lula and President Zuma of the BASIC Group and it was at this meeting of the BASIC Heads of the States and President Obama that the Copenhagen Accord was clinched to the satisfaction of all present. It was at this crucial meeting that the BASIC group was able to get agreement on its proposals on global goals and on monitoring and verification.

It was at this meeting that the formulation, defined guidelines, clearly defined guidelines, that will respect national sovereignty was formulated and accepted by President Obama as well. It was able to ensure that the Copenhagen Accord was not legally binding. It was because of the BASIC group that the Copenhagen Accord was ensured to be not legally binding and that there is no mention of any new legally binding instrument in the Accord. Sir, this is a very, very important achievement. There is no mention whatsoever of a new legally binding instrument because this was clearly the intention of many European countries and it was the intervention of Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, Prime Minister Wen Jiabao, President Zuma, President Lula supported by President Obama that ensured that there is no mention of a new legally binding instrument in the Copenhagen Accord.

Sir, I have been somewhat detailed in this *suo motu* statement. I have never hidden anything from Parliament and I have been very upfront about how our thinking on climate change has to evolve and not remain frozen in time. I have repeatedly sought from both Houses flexibility within a framework of certain non-negotiables. Earlier, I spoke to both Houses on the basis of my intentions and some hon. Members who are shaking their heads may recall that I had said, ultimately actions will speak louder than words. I had assured both Houses that we will negotiate in a manner that the national interest is not only protected but is also enhanced. Copenhagen, Sir, is not a destination but the beginning of a long process. There are indeed many risks. Sir, I would be the first to admit, there are many risks; there are many hazards; there are many threats. We have to be extraordinarily vigilant and careful, negotiating tough but negotiating always from a position of strength. For the moment, I believe that India has come out quite well at Copenhagen and we have been recognized for our constructive approach. We will continue to play such a role. We have to deepen our capacity to pursue proactive climate diplomacy internationally. We have to get down to implementing a comprehensive domestic agenda of both adaptation and mitigation and of moving on the road to cutting our emissions intensity of GDP by 20-25 per cent by 2020 on 2005 levels, an objective that I had announced in the Lok Sabha on the 3rd of December. This objective is not only eminently feasible but it can also be improved upon to the benefit of our own people. We must soon unveil a roadmap, a detailed roadmap, for a low-carbon growth strategy as part of the 12th Five Year Plan. We must also strengthen our own scientific capacity to measure, to monitor and to model the impacts of climate change on different sectors of our economy and in different regions of our country.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I will now be more than glad and willing to clarify any doubts and answer any questions that hon. Members may wish to raise. I see this statement as part of a continuing dialogue between our Government and hon. MPs, as a reflection of our determination to ensure accountability to Parliament. Thank you, Sir.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have heard and gone through the elaborate statement made by the hon. Minister. I cannot, Sir, hide my disappointment under the present circumstances. Even when it became clear that at Copenhagen a multilateral accord or a statement was not going to be possible, what instead has happened is a plurilateral accord with a reasonable prospect of this plurilateral accord eventually slowly but surely, being accepted by others and becoming the fresh basis for the furtherance of the negotiations.

In this detailed statement, Sir, the Minister has elaborately patted himself and the Government on the back for, what he calls, protecting the national interest. I do not know, Sir, whether the Government and the negotiators consciously agreed to the language, as has been framed, or they have been completely outwitted in the drafting of this language. Reports coming from across the world refer to this Accord as a global disappointment. It appears to be a complete betrayal of the poor and the weaker nations, the developing nations, and the more powerful nations have almost been left off the hook. And, after the Accord, what we find is a continuous campaign and spin-doctoring as a substitute for truth. We almost find that facts are being stated and represented, which are not even consistent with the very language of the Accord. Therefore, Sir, instead of referring to the statement while seeking clarifications, I shall refer to the original document, the Accord itself and the language of the Accord.

Sir, there are several questions which arise on the very language of the Accord. The first: If this plurilateral accord becomes a multilateral accord, which it is likely to, can it ever be reasonably argued that the Kyoto Protocol continues to subsist? The Kyoto Protocol had a specific, defined route and obligations. Annexure-1 Parties, the developed countries, had to, within the first specified period, bring down their 1990 emission levels by five per cent. This was subsequently increased and the developed countries themselves felt that the reductions will have to be increased by 25 to 40 per cent.

(THE VICE-CHAIRMAN, PROF. P.J. KURIEN, in the Chair)

Now, what do we find in the present document? It says that the reduction which is promised in the Kyoto Protocol and the subsequent declarations is now substituted. Now the Annexure-1 Parties which are left off the hook by 31st of January, 2010, would file a fresh declaration with the Secretariat and the fresh declaration would be that they would now indicate as to what their rate of emission standards is going to be.

Sir, I had asked, have we been outwitted in the drafting of this document? It is when they file these declarations that the only reference to the Kyoto Protocol comes. And it does not say that they will be bound by what the Kyoto Protocol says and that they will be moving a little ahead of what the

Kyoto Protocol says. Paragraph 4 says that Annexure-I Parties commit to implement, individually or jointly, quantified economy-wise emission targets for 2020, to be submitted in a format given in Appendix-I by Annexure-I Parties to the Secretariat by 31st January, 2010, for compliance in a inf. document. 'Inf.' in the UN parlance, I understand, means information. Annexure-I Parties that are parties to the Kyoto Protocol – so it binds only those who are defined to be parties to the Kyoto Protocol – will thereby further strengthen the emission reductions initiated by the Kyoto Protocol. So, it means, please strengthen what is initiated by the Kyoto Protocol. That is the only reference.

Now, what happens after this arrangement is that you will have fresh kinds of reduction targets and obligations which are laid down. The Kyoto Protocol obliged them to follow route 'A'; the Copenhagen Accord will now oblige them to follow route 'B'. The consequences will be of route 'B' the obligations will be of route 'B'. Now, once they take this track, which is route 'B', which is the Copenhagen track, can it still be argued that the Kyoto Protocol and the obligations therein strictly continue to remain? And yet, we are being told that even though an alternative track has now been formulated, an alternative set of obligations has now come, which may not be as stringent, the Kyoto Protocol continues to exist. Sir, there is something called an 'implied abrogation'. Yes, this Document does not say that Kyoto stand is abrogated. But the moment a route alternative to Kyoto Protocol is discovered and then obliged, there is an implied abrogation as far as the Kyoto Protocol is concerned.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Sir, if the hon. Member can yield for half-a-minute, I just want to clarify. Since he is using the Copenhagen Accord as the basis of his questioning or seeking clarifications, I just draw his attention to the fourth line at the very top of the Copenhagen Accord which recognises that there is a continuing mandate for negotiations under the existing tack of Kyoto Protocol. So, I just want him to realise that there is a mention of Kyoto Protocol separately. I just also want him to recognise that the Copenhagen Accord starts by accepting that negotiations under the Kyoto Protocol will continue and conclude by December 2010.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, I am placing a very simple question today. If fresh set of obligations, less onerous obligations are to be cast under the Copenhagen Accord, you will continue giving lip-sympathy to the Kyoto Protocol which are the obligations which will be applicable in future. It is the onerous obligations under the Kyoto Protocol or it is the fresh set of obligations that have been cast under the Copenhagen Accord. The hon. Minister intervened and said 'read the Preamble'. Please read the Preamble. "Line four of the Preamble", you said. The words are used 'in pursuit of the

ultimate objective of the Convention as stated in the Article'. Now, 'in pursuit of the objective', diluted from the Bali Action Plan language to achieve what is mentioned. So, 'achieve' is now read down to mean 'pursuit'. See the next line. Bali Action Plan said, 'for sustained implementation' that is now substituted by the words, 'being guided by'. Word by word, phrase by phrase the language of all other obligations stands diluted, and this is not only here. Let us for a moment ignore the obligations in the Kyoto Protocol. My question to the hon. Minister is, please be specific on this: Are the Annexure-I Parties today exempted and exonerated from the obligations of the Kyoto Protocol? If there is a repugnancy between the two Documents, which of the two is going to be made applicable – the less onerous one or the more onerous one? After all, you can't have two sets of conflicting obligations occupying the same space. One will have to choose which of the two responsibilities will be applicable. Now the Minister said that he has been very transparent and upfront. He told the Parliament that there will be no peaking here and he is not agreed to a peaking here and the Document, in effect, says so. Let us read the fourth line of paragraph 2 of the document. It says, "We should cooperate in achieving the peaking of global and national emissions as soon as possible, recognising that the timeframe for peaking will be longer for developing countries." Now what happens in the next round of negotiations? My difficulty is that the problem with this Government is the Sharm-el-Sheikh syndrome. The agreed Document says one thing, but the Government always understands it to mean differently. So, paragraph 2 clearly says, "We will cooperate in achieving the peaking of global and national emissions." So, when the peaking of national emissions takes place, that peaking will be fixed. The only concession given is, the peaking will be more stringent for the developed countries, will be a little more liberal as far as the developing countries are concerned.

So, in your next round of negotiations, you will be faced with the clear language which says, "You have agreed to the principle of peaking". All that happens is that if peaking for the developed world, for example, is 2020, the peaking for you will be 2025. The principle of peaking has been accepted; all that remains is the fixation of the specific year, as far as peaking is concerned. An assurance was given to this House that we would never agree to peaking. The principle of peaking is agreed. The peaking will be a little liberal as far as developing countries are concerned. The peaking year is yet to be fixed. That is what the Copenhagen Accord now says. So, I want the Minister to categorically tell us, and that is my specific query, will not the natural consequence of this in the next round of negotiations be that the two categories of peaking years for the developed and the developing countries will be fixed.

My third difficulty with this document is again an assurance given to this Parliament and to the country that unsupported domestic action will never agree for any international verification. I have the Minister's statement made in this House here: "All that will take place is only reporting. There can be a domestic accountability to the Parliament. But, as far as the international community is concerned,

we will only tell them what we have to do." The first thing that this document does, Sir, it completely obliterates the distinction between supported and unsupported actions. There is no distinction between the two. It then specifically says, "as far as Annexure-I Parties are concerned, whatever they do will be subject to some element of international verification." It then comes to what happens to the non-Annexure-1 countries. Now, if the document had said what the Minister assured this House, and what the Minister, in his statement, wants to again assure the House that it will be only reporting and nothing else, I would have nothing to say. But, again the Sharm el-Sheikh syndrome takes place; the document says something else. The document says, and I read paragraph 5, "Mitigation actions by non-Annexure-I Parties will be subject to their domestic measurement, reporting and verification, the results of which will be reported through their national communications every two years." Sir, I stop here for a moment. This is precisely what the Minister told us. This paragraph should have stopped here. There will be domestic measurement; there will be domestic verification. And, every two years, we will tell the international community what we have measured and what we have done. They have no role in the matter. This is what this House was categorically told. But, then, there is a next sentence, "Non-Annexure parties will communicate information on implementation of their actions through national communications with a provision, for international consultation and analysis under defined guidelines that will ensure that national sovereignty is respected." Now, it does not stop with reporting. Your responsibility does not get over with that. After you report, there will be an international consultation. That is the first thing that will happen. Then, there will be an international analysis of whether you have achieved that or not. Both these things will be done by a process – and that is the whole art of outwitting in the process of negotiations – under guidelines which are yet to be framed. So, the Secretariat will frame the guidelines. So, whatever we tell them, there will be consultation; there will be analysis. And, the guidelines will respect our national sovereignty. That is the sense of satisfaction we get. Now, what if the consultation and analysis report is that what we have achieved is only 20 per cent of what we had promised. Today, there is a statement made by the U.S. Administration saying, "We have now got India on hold and we will bind them by what is written therein, and we will make sure it is complied with." And, this is the process by which they will make sure that it is complied with. There will be guidelines framed, whatever we tell the world, there will be analysis, there will be consultations, and once they find that there is something lacking, then, the consequences will follow and you will enter into an era of conflict, an era where even trade sanctions can be imposed upon you. And yet we are being told that we must pat ourselves on the back because the language we have agreed is only reporting and nothing more. It is verification on those cases, it is now consultation and analysis under guidelines and the rest will follow. So, we again enter an era of ambiguity. We will say our understanding is different; their understanding is different. This is exactly what happened in the other

document at Sharm el-Sheikh. After all, negotiation is a process by which you create value for your country; negotiation is a process by which every word has to be measured. In a document, words are not used without any reference. There is no tutelage as far as international agreements are concerned that you use words which have no meaning. Every word has to be given the meaning which is intended to be given therein. Therefore, this analysis, this consultation, the guidelines and the consequences what the U.S. says will now emerge out of this. So, my query to the Minister is: What will be the consequences in his understanding of this consultation and analysis under the guidelines? Is it merely a case that we report and thereafter we don't look at them and they won't bother us? Or, have we travelled much beyond the commitment which we gave to Parliament?

Sir, we are now being told that this Accord was not adopted in the entire multilateral conference, but it is a clear pluralateral agreement between us, look at the language, and, therefore, no legally-binding agreement arises. Sir, it is an argument which cuts both ways. If no legally-binding agreement arises, then, what will be the consequence if the developed countries by 31st of January don't make their submissions in the Schedule in which they are supposed to submit and say we are not bound by this outcome? Was what happened in Copenhagen, the meeting between the developed countries and the basic group, an exercise in futility? Admittedly, it was not. Admittedly, this document now promises to become the centrestage document as far as the climate negotiations are concerned. And, then the national Parliament to be told, "Well, this is not a binding document". Paragraph 5, which is our obligation, starts with non-Annexure 1 parties to the Convention 'will' implement mitigation actions. Not 'may' implement, not 'could' implement, we 'will' implement, and what is it that we 'will' implement? We 'will' implement what we make a declaration by 31st of January to the Secretariat that these are going to be what my emission cuts or energy intensity cuts are going to be. It hardly lies with the Government after entering into an Accord which uses the word 'will' implement, then to come back and say, "Well, what I have signed is not binding; is not worth the paper it is written on. So, what is going to be, I want to ask the Minister, the consequence of this commitment that we 'will' implement.

The Minister said, Sir, that the most important part of this agreement is the one relating to the funding. Sir, an impression has been created and I asked some of my colleagues that we conceded all this because we are all going to get a hundred billion dollars a year. If you see the statement of the Minister, the statement itself is in clear conflict with the language of the Accord. It says, "They have also undertaken a commitment to mobilise US hundred billion dollars by the year 2020 for such

purpose". As though the developed countries are generous that hundred billion dollars will be taken out of the US Treasury and the EU Finances and will be placed on the table for the rest of the world. Please read paragraph 8 which deals with global funding. It clearly says, 'Funding for adaptation will be prioritised for the most vulnerable developing countries such as the least developing countries, small island developing States and Africa, So the 'others' get priority; 'we' are not on the 'priority list.' in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation, the developed world commit to a goal – now comes the most important world of 'mobilising'- they are not going to take it out of their treasury and put it on the table – jointly US 100 billion dollars a year by 2020 to address the needs of developing countries. This funding will come from a wide variety of sources, public and private, bilateral and multilateral, including alternative sources of finance. Now from the language it is clear that the 100 billion dollars does not come out of the US Treasury or the EU funding. This is public funding; this is private funding; this comes under various bilateral arrangements; and this will come under multilateral arrangements. Is the whole gambit of carbon trade going to be covered under this funding? And a very large part of that trade itself, which you would have got even without the Copenhagen Accord, is going to be a part of this amount of 100 billion dollars. So, this figure of 100 billion dollars is dressed up to say that you are making this concession; you are letting them off the hook of the Kyoto obligations; and they are going to pay for it. What is going to happen is that this will be public funding, private funding, multilateral funding, bilateral funding, and carbon trade, everything included is going to be totally accounting to 100 billion dollars a year by 2020.

Sir, when we look at all this, if you go through every word of this clause, and there are several other clauses, the language is completely altered. Now the hon. Minister in his statement said that our compliance will be according to articles 4.1 and 4.7 of the Convention. Why did they put 4.1 and 4.7? What did they miss out here? They missed out 4.3. Please read 4.3 of the Convention. Para 4.3 refers to funding for the purposes of technological development, which is one of the most important things. In paragraph 5, where they referred to what commitments we are going to make subject to the assurance of articles 4.1 and 4.7, what is missed out as a conscious omission is 4.3- -Funding for the purposes of technological development. I recollect when my friend, Mr. Yechury, was debating this issue earlier and he took up the issue of IPRs on technological development. This document is a conscious omission. It is not a reference to what happens to the Intellectual Property Rights of the technology which we are going to get. Again, we will get into an era of ambiguity. You will say that as

far as the IPRs are concerned, it will be covered under some other convention, WIPO or otherwise, and therefore, we need not look at this particular document for it. And the others will contend, 'No, we have to really look at this document alone, and there is no reference as far as IPRs are concerned.'

Sir, these are some legitimate questions in relation to the issues which have arisen and which have created doubts in our minds. Sir, I think that in the Minister's statements, both in Copenhagen and here, there was a lot of concern that we should not be considered the fall guys. And, therefore, we were either hiding behind somebody or we were out to please somebody. Sir, it is true that we should not be seen as the fall guys. But, at the same time, we should not allow our own interest to fall. And I am afraid in our entire attempt to please some and avoid being seen as the fall guys we have decided to let our own interests to fall as far as this Copenhagen Accord is concerned. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, Shri D. Raja. ...*(Interruptions)*... We call by the names.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY (West Bengal): Sir, what is the procedure you are following?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): First received is first. We call according to that order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT (West Bengal): Sir, we had given his name yesterday. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Your name is not here. Have you given the name?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, the Deputy Chairman was in the Chair and he noted my name.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Okay, I will add. It was not here. ...*(Interruptions)*... Anyhow, I will call you. Now, Mr. Raja.

SHRI D. RAJA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, the Copenhagen Conference-created great expectations but ended in great disappointment. It was not the case of 'one step forward, two steps back'. Actually, it was 'no step forward, several steps backward'. Negotiations are kept alive. That is the only positive development at Copenhagen. The negotiations will remain till the next conference in Mexico. That is the only positive thing I find.

Sir, the so-called Copenhagen Accord, on which the Minister, our beloved Shri Jairam Ramesh, made a very long statement, does not lay down any binding target for the rich industrialised countries beyond 2012, as demanded by the Kyoto Protocol which the U.S. had all along refused to

ratify. Their attempt now is to kill the Kyoto Protocol. Sir, no wonder the accord could not be adopted by consensus. It was only taken note of. Sir, whether it is George W. Bush or whether it is Barack Obama, narrow self-interest of America must prevail over the interests of world community. The apprehension entertained by all the -poor nations that ultimately a deal will be imposed by the U.S. has proved to be correct. It was very sorry spectacle of succumbing to the U.S. pressure at Copenhagen.

Sir, the voluntary actions announced by countries like China, India and others to cut emissions will now be subject to 'international consultation and analysis', euphemism for review and international scrutiny. Sir, as pointed out by the Leader of Opposition also, a statement by a senior White House Adviser, David Axelrod that the U.S. will be able to "challenge India if it fails to meet the climate change goals". Having said that, Sir, I must ask the Minister about one particular issue. This issue was raised when we discussed during Zero Hour also, as mentioned by the Minister. That is about the REDD-Plus. I am coming to that. In the Copenhagen Accord that India and other countries agreed upon, repeated references are made to the scheme called 'REDD-Plus'. Paragraph 6 of the Accord says: "We recognize the crucial role of reducing emission from deforestation and forest degradation and the need to enhance removals of greenhouse gas emission by forests and agree on the need to provide positive incentives to such actions through the immediate establishment of a mechanism including REDD-plus, to enable the mobilization of financial resources from developed countries." "REDD-plus has been left undefined. In fact, the negotiations have left the question of what kind of forest protection will be financed." Let me finish. "And how this financing will be done, open for further discussions."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Put your questions.

SHRI D. RAJA: I am asking the Minister because the Minister has not said about it. The point here is that it is part of the Accord. The Minister has not made any reference in his statement on this REDD-plus. That is why I am asking the Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You see, we have to close this by 2 o' clock.

SHRI D. RAJA: I understand. On the one side, we talk about climate change as a serious issue.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Put your question.

SHRI D. RAJA: I am asking the question only. You are interrupting. Then how can I ask the question? The Chair should be considerate enough. Otherwise, I will stop.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You are expected only to ask questions. I am not interrupting. Don't say that. Don't make such comments.

SHRI D. RAJA: Yes, Sir. My question is, the negotiations have left the question of what kind of forest protection will be financed and how this financing will be done, open for further discussions. As per Government's earlier submissions, the Government of India wants to include afforestation and plantation programmes in this scheme, so that they are eligible for receiving money, and also make it possible to earn "carbon credits" (i.e. tradable permits to emit greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide) on the basis of carbon supposedly stored in forests. Now, I am asking the Minister one question. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Don't interrupt. There is no time. We have to bind up this debate by 2 PM.

SHRI D. RAJA: At present, it is impossible for the Government of India to take some steps internationally as well as domestically. Internationally, the Government of India should withdraw its submission of June 2009 supporting the inclusion of afforestation programmes in REDD and stop supporting carbon trading as a mode of financing REDD. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, please conclude.

SHRI D. RAJA: I am asking whether the Government of India agree to it or not. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You ask so many questions. Mr. Raja, please take your seat. See, I will request hon. Members one thing. The problem is that there is shortage of time. By 2 PM, we have to conclude. That is the closing Session. That is the problem.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Shall I get some time?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Yes. You will be given time so that everybody will put questions only. No explanation, only questions.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: No, no. You see, the point is when the process began. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): You should not raise any question.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Mr. Narayanasamy forgets that he is a Minister also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): He may be supporting the Minister. Why do you presume that he is opposing?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, let me put the record straight. I was part of the Indian Parliamentary Delegation. Okay. And I am going to speak only those parts to complete the report that the Minister has given, and speak of those issues where he has not spoken. I am completing the report.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Clarifications!

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Yes, clarification. But unfortunately, the whole tenor in which this discussion began with the Leader of the Opposition making his comments, and therefore, I think, you must be a little flexible in this matter. Sir, we will try to be as short as possible. But the fact of the matter is that we went to Copenhagen at a point when there was a very intense fight going on in order to jettison the Kyoto Protocol and the entire United Nations' framework and the Bali Plan of Action. This attempt to jettison was made, and continues to be made, by the developed countries, and the Copenhagen Accord, as it is called, is, actually, a compromise document that has emerged from here. Yes, to a certain extent, we have resisted in not letting the framework be completely jettisoned, but, at the same time, we have opened windows. We have opened windows for the possible jettisoning of the entire United Nations' framework, and that is a serious matter which we want the Minister to clarify that in the one year to come before Mexico, we will not allow this process to be jettisoned with the windows that are opened. I will just tell you the windows; that is why the clarifications are required.

The first window which we have to, really, recognise is that there is a window that is being left open for the jettisoning of the Kyoto Protocol itself. Now, if you take para 4 of the Copenhagen Accord, it says, for the first time: "Annex I parties that are party to the Kyoto Protocol will, thereby, further strengthen the emission targets which were, actually, initiated by the Kyoto Protocol." Okay. "Delivery of reductions and financing by developed countries will be measured, reported and verified in accordance with existing and any—underline 'further' further guidelines adopted by the Conference of Parties." Now, this is the window that is being opened up for jettisoning the Kyoto Protocol and bringing in any further protocol. Now, that is a matter of grave concern, and this is what we have to ensure, and the Minister has to assure us that it is not going to be allowed.

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair)

And this framework of the three milestones—the United Nations' framework, the Kyoto Protocol and the Bali Action Plan – is something that will not be disturbed, and that cannot be allowed. So, that is my first clarification. That needs to be ensured.

Sir, the second redline that we have drawn for ourselves is the line which the Minister himself pointed out. But before I come to that, Sir, the Kyoto Protocol's jettisoning is also very interesting. This is the original Protocol that I have brought from Copenhagen. It comes with two Appendix pages – No. I and No. II. Number I talks of Annex I Parties who will voluntarily quantify their emissions and

who will voluntarily declare the date of the base year. By doing this, you have virtually accepted the negation of the Kyoto Protocol itself. Kyoto Protocol talks of binding, legally binding, emission-cuts by Annex- I countries. Now, by circulating a form like this, you are negating the Kyoto Protocol itself, and this is something which is not acceptable. This is number one.

Number two, Sir, that here, 'Kyoto' was a legally binding Agreement which talks of not only reduction of emissions but also of penalties for not reducing. Now, there are countries—they are developed countries; I do not want to name them because we have friendly relations with them – who have transgressed their commitment to the tune of 40 per cent; there are some who have transgressed to the tune of 18 per cent. And all of them we saw, in Copenhagen, working together and jettisoning the Kyoto Protocol! Now, what is it that we are doing to ensure the legally binding penalties on these countries? So, the first point, here, we must understand is that Copenhagen actually allowed them to get away scot free; on this entire issue, while they wanted to get away completely legally, that did not happen. Good. This process is kept alive. But in the one year that is going to take place before Mexico, we have got to ensure that it comes back to its original rails, and this cannot be allowed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I request the Members to be brief because we have fixed 2 o'clock for the valedictory address.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: I wish such request came earlier, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you are brief, everybody else will also be brief.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: I agree to that, but please give me a little flexibility. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, give me a only a little flexibility because I was present there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know, I know.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: That is why I want to bring it to the awareness of this House, of this country and of the hon. Minister, and all of us together have to ensure that this does not happen; the windows that have been opened should not remain open; they must be closed.

The second window that has been opened up is with regard to the question of pressures coming on us for peaking in our emissions. Para 2 says here very clearly that "we agree that deep cuts in global emissions are required according to science." Okay. Good. Then what does it say? It says that we should cooperate in achieving the peaking of global and national emissions as soon as possible, recognising that the time frame for developing countries will be larger bearing in mind that social and economic development and poverty eradication are the first and overriding priorities of developing countries and that a low-emission development strategy is indispensable for sustainable

development. It says that we must announce a year. Okay, they may say 2020 and we may say 2050. But the point is that we have ourselves said in this Parliament, "No, we will not announce a year". So, we have to be very careful about this. This window has been opened up where there is a pressure on us, "You define your year. You tell us by which year". So, we have to be very careful in saying that we will not accept any year, but you will have to accept a year. What have we, the Prime Minister, said? We all stood by that. "Yes, our emissions level will not rise above their emissions level". But that doesn't mean that we commit ourselves to any year. That is something which we can't accept. That is the second window.

Sir, the third window that has been opened up is on the question of what has been discussed here also, consultation and analysis, which is, in my opinion, rephrasing of the term called, "measurement, reporting and verification" or MRV. Here what does it say? For the first time, again, as I have said, the binding commitments to Annexure-1 have been converted into voluntary commitments. It is so for Annexure-1 also, Here it says, in para 5, and I quote:

"Non-Annex I Parties will communicate information on the implementation of their actions through National Communications – I underline the following—with provisions for international consultations and analysis under clearly defined guidelines that will ensure that national sovereignty is respected".

All right, the national sovereignty is respected. Now these clearly defined guidelines are yet to come. What these clearly defined guidelines are going to be is very crucially important for us to realise that this consultation and analysis is not a pseudonym for MRV, namely, measurement, reporting and verification. Now, we want to ensure that they are not for MRV. Why I am raising this issue, which is very important, is that, according to the existing US laws, the moment there are clearly defined guidelines which are internationally acceptable, any country which they claim is violating these guidelines, sanctions can be imposed on that country. This is the existing US laws. That is why they want this. If this happens and there is an international agreement on these clearly defined guidelines – Sir, this is very important for us – then you are opened to sanctions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, you are converting it into a debate.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, why I am saying this is because their own spokesman, Mr. Axelrod, today has gone on record saying, Yes, we now have India and China by their collar and now we can verify what they are doing. What they are saying is that they will reduce. This is a very clear-cut window, a very large window, which we opened up so that we can be pressurised.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think that we can have a detailed discussion on this in the Budget session.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: There will be no budget for this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. We will discuss it in the Budget session. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: I have to respond. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to respond. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, there are three points. Three windows have been opened up. One is to jettison the Kyoto Protocol and the entire framework of the UNFCCC and the Bali Declaration. The second window that has been opened up is on the question of MRV. The third window that has been opened up is on the question of what we talk of "4.7" of the Framework where our emission reductions will be contingent upon transfer of funding and technology by the developed countries. The "4.7" that you are talking of has been given a go-by whereby here the commitment is woolly commitment for financing, whereby they are not committing from their State exchequer. This is important. Please understand this. This is important because the entire climate change framework began by talking of a historical responsibility of the developed world which pillaged global climate and brought us to this situation. By not committing State finances, they are escaping from their historical responsibility. They are now talking of market forces and at a time of global recession market forces raising a 100 billion dollars annually is something that is absolutely impossible and we can't accept. Therefore, this window that has also been opened up, they can violate.

Sir, the fourth window is on the question of IPR regime. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How many windows are there?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: There are four windows, north, south, east and west. The fourth window is the window of technology transfers without the IPR regimen. The Commerce Minister is here. He should also support us on this ground. Technology transfers without the IPR regimen was the demand that we have been putting, that has also been effectively negated in this Accord. Therefore, Sir, my only point is that we must be careful in the coming year. The effort by the West is to convert common but differentiated responsibility into common and undifferentiated responsibility. That is something which is not acceptable and India will have to work closer with the basic and the G-77 countries which the Minister has promised, which he has assured in his own statement for which I am glad. But that is the route that we will have to follow in order to ensure that these four windows that have been opened up to undermine the global climate change, will not be allowed to be undermined. That is the assurance we want from the Minister. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now Shri Yechuri has talked about it in detail, I would request you to seek only clarifications. Shri Tiruchi Siva.

2.00 P.M.

SHRI TIRUCHI SIVA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, this is a very serious issue which is being discussed with utmost concern. Let me start with the words of the Prime Minister that 'the worst affected by climate change are the least responsible for it'. The statement of the hon. Minister says, "Copenhagen is not a destination, it is only a beginning of a long process". As far as India is concerned, it has played a vital role in the Copenhagen Conference. I am afraid, the magnitude, the urgency and the challenges of the climate change have not been realised by the other participating countries in the Conference. But for India, the basic countries and the US Accord, the Conference would have ended as a complete failure. Now that this Accord is being discussed, at least, giving us a hope that the future course of action will be based on that. India has established itself in two ways. To ensure its responsibility, India has agreed to take on a voluntary target of reducing the emission intensity of our GDP growth by around 20 per cent by 2020 in comparison to 2005. This shows the responsibility of our Government. At the same time, this unilateral commitment is not internationally binding. In our efforts to uphold our sovereignty, India has made efforts to incorporate a specific provision that these clearly defined guidelines will ensure that the national sovereignty is respected, which applies to all the countries. Sir, this breakthrough lays the foundation for international action in the years to come. My questions are very pointed. For a supporting global climate change regime to put in place which is difficult one, and, at the same time, very urgent, what are the plans the Government is having? Sir, Mr. Ban Ki-Moon, the UN Secretary-General has observed, is reported to have said, "It must be transformed into a legally binding treaty". As far as I am concerned the Accord, by way of its definition means that the parties to it should act in certain areas or should desist from acting in certain areas. Why hasn't this Accord been agreed to by the other participant countries? I want to know this from the hon. Minister. There are two other things. Are not the financial tranches promised sketchy? Will it kill the Kyoto Protocol? What strategy is the Government of India having to transform this Copenhagen Accord, which has been initiated by our total involvement, into a legally binding treaty within a year as expected by all other people. Thank you.

श्री उपसभापति : श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी जी, आप क्या बोलेंगे? यहां पर आपका नाम है, क्या आपको कुछ क्लैरिफिकेशन पूछना है?

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी (बिहार) : नहीं-नहीं, हम तो इस मुद्दे पर बोलना चाहते हैं।

श्री उपसभापति : नहीं, आप केवल क्लैरिफिकेशन पूछिए।

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी : उपसभापति महोदय, यह इतना संवेदनशील मामला है। इसको इस तरह से टेक्निकली टाइम-फ्रेम में बांधने पर हम लोग अपनी बात पूरी नहीं कर पाएंगे।

श्री उपसभापति : तिवारी जी, आप जरा समझिए, यह डिबेट नहीं है। हमने यहां पर चार मर्तबा इस पर डिसकस किया है। अब इन्होंने जो एक स्टेटमेंट दी है, उस पर आप सिर्फ क्लैरिफिकेशन पूछिए। इसमें और कुछ नहीं बोलना है।

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी : सर, एक अति महत्वपूर्ण मामले पर सरकार ने एक समझौता कोपेनहेगन में किया। पहले सरकार का जो स्टैंड था, उस स्टैंड में बहुत ही मौनिक ढंग से सरकार ने परिवर्तन लाया, बदलाव लाया। हम लोग कोपेनहेगन से पहले क्योटो प्रोटोकाल की बात सुनते रहे थे। उसमें जो इकरार किया गया था, उस के प्रति बाई एंड लार्ज सारे देश की और सारी दुनिया की सहमति बन रही थी। खास तौर पर दुनिया के जो गरीब देश हैं, जो छोटे-छोटे द्वीपों वाले देश हैं, वे हमारी ओर आशा भरी निगाहों से देख रहे थे कि उनके अस्तित्व पर जो खतरा है, उसकी लड़ाई हम लोग लड़ेंगे। हमारे बगल में ही मालदीव है। वहां समुद्र के भीतर उनकी सरकार के साथ मीटिंग सिर्फ इस बात की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करने के लिए हुई कि हिन्दुस्तान हमारा पड़ोसी देश है, मज़बूत देश है और हमारे एग्जिस्टेंस की वह रक्षा वह करेगा। लेकिन कोपेनहेगन में जो हुआ, उससे बड़ी भारी निराशा हुई।

वहां ग्रीनपीस का जो ब्रिटिश चैप्टर है, उसके एक्टिंग डायरेक्टर ने बयान दिया कि 18 दिसम्बर की रात को ऐसा लग रहा था कि कोपेनहेगन में एक अपराध हुआ है और अपराधी हवाई अड्डे की ओर भाग रहे हैं। इस तरह हालत यह रही है। इसमें हिन्दुस्तान की भी बहुत बड़ी भूमिका रही है। क्योटो प्रोटोकाल में यह कहा गया था कि कार्बन एमिशन के उत्सर्जन में जो जितना ज्यादा दोषी है, उसको उतना ही ज्यादा उसका खामियाजा भुगतना पड़ेगा। यह न्याय पर आधारित सिद्धांत था। इसके लिए हिन्दुस्तान ने भी बहुत संघर्ष किया था, लेकिन क्या हो गया? हम लोग इससे पलट गए और इसी सदन में इसकी चर्चा हुई थी। माननीय मंत्री जी की जो चिट्ठी लीक हुई थी, उसी से यह पता लग रहा था कि हम लोग अमरीका का दामन थामने वाले हैं। वही नतीजा सामने आया। जितने भी धनी देश हैं, जलवायु संकट के प्रति उनके यहां जनमत इतना सचेत है कि उनको अपना चेहरा बचाना था और उनका चेहरा बचाने में हम लोग भी मददगार हुए। पिछले दिनों हमारे देश में जो...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : आप सवाल पूछिए न भई।

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी : उससे बहुत आश्चर्यजनक परिणाम नहीं आया है। अमरीका की आज क्या हालत है? अभी जून में वहां House of Representatives में बहस हो रही थी। डेमोक्रेटिक पार्टी का वहां बहुत बड़ा बहुमत है और वहां 119 के मुकाबले 112 से प्रस्ताव पास हुआ। वहां पर जार्जिया के एक रिप्रेजेंटेटिव पॉल ब्राउन ने भाषण दिया कि वैज्ञानिक लोग जलवायु परिवर्तन का धोखा दे रहे हैं और यह सब बिल्कुल झूठ और फरेब है।

श्री उपसभापति : तिवारी जी, आप सवाल पूछिए न।

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी : बस दो मिनट में हम अपनी बात खत्म कर रहे हैं। अमरीका में जो बहस हुई, उसे सुन करके दुनिया के विख्यात नोबल प्राइज़ विजेता, इकोनॉमिक पॉल क्रुगमैन ने कहा कि जलवायु संकट से इंकार की बात सुन करके मैं सोचता हूं कि यह धरती के साथ गद्दारी है। जलवायु संकट से इंकार करना कितना गैर-जिम्मेदाराना और अनैतिक है, इसका अंदाजा हाल ही में हुए अनुसंधानों से लगाया जा सकता है। यह बात क्रुगमैन ने कही। आज दुनिया पर यह जो संकट आया है, इसके बारे में 100 बरस पहले महात्मा गांधी ने अपनी किताब "हिन्द स्वराज" में लिख दिया था। अब उनका शताब्दी बरस है। उन्होंने यह कहा था कि...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : तिवारी जी, आप जानते हैं कि इस पर क्लैरिफिकेशन...(व्यवधान)...

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी : यह शैतानी सभ्यता है, अंधे आदमी को भी यह दिखाई देगा। अगर हम इस रास्ते पर बढ़ेंगे...(समय की घंटी)... तो दुनिया विनाश की ओर जाएगी। यह बात उन्होंने कही थी। हमारे देश के पास मौका था। कोपेनहेगन में हम दुनिया के तमाम गरीब मुल्कों का नेतृत्व कर सकते थे, जिन्होंने हम पर भरोसा किया था...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : नेक्स्ट, श्री बृजभूषण तिवारी ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी : उनको हमने धोखा देने का काम किया है। इससे भारत का जो चेहरा है, हमको लगता है कि उस पर धब्बा लगा है ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : अब आप बस कीजिए ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी : आगे हमको लगता है कि सरकार को और माननीय मंत्री जी को ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : वह जवाब दे देंगे ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी : आगे हमें क्योटो प्रोटोकॉल पर कायम रहना चाहिए।

श्री उपसभापति : श्री बृजभूषण तिवारी। आप सिर्फ सवाल पूछिए।

श्री बृजभूषण तिवारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं सिर्फ सवाल ही पूछूंगा। मैं ज्यादा नहीं बोलूंगा।

सर, मंत्री जी ने सदन में जो बयान दिया, उससे कई आशंकाएं पैदा होती हैं। इन्होंने तो अपने को बहुत ही कामयाब बताते हुए अपनी पीठ थपथपाई है, परन्तु समाचार पत्रों में जो खबरें छपी हैं, उनसे यह लगता है कि दुनिया के तमाम गरीब और अविकसित देशों ने यह आपत्ति जताई कि यह जो पूरा समझौता हुआ या जो बातचीत हुई, यह पूरे सम्मेलन को अंधेरे में रख कर किया गया। इस समझौते के बारे में तुवालु के प्रतिनिधि इयन फ्राई ने कहा है कि "अगर बाइबल का संदर्भ देते हुए कहूं तो यह ऐसा लगता है जैसे हमें अपना भविष्य बेच देने के बदले चांदी के 30 टुकड़े किए गए हैं।"

मैं मंत्री जी से एक बात पूछना चाहता हूं। इसकी चर्चा भी हुई कि Kyoto Protocol में जो समझौता हुआ था, जो सहमति हुई थी, उसमें यह माना गया था कि प्रदूषण फैलाने के लिए सभी दोषी हैं, परन्तु जिन्होंने प्रदूषण ज्यादा फैलाया, उनका दोष इसमें ज्यादा है। इसमें एक बात यह कही गई थी कि हर देश को कार्बन के उत्सर्जन में एक सीमा तय करनी होगी, एक फौरी सीमा तय करनी होगी। परन्तु, आपने अमेरिका और अन्य देशों के बीच यह जो accord किया है, इसमें इस बात का कोई उल्लेख नहीं है कि आखिर कौन देश, विशेष कर वे विकसित देश, अपने कार्बन-उत्सर्जन की क्या सीमा तय करेंगे? कृषि वैज्ञानिकों ने माना है कि अगर जलवायु-परिवर्तन में तापमान एक डिग्री सेल्सियस तक रहता है तो गेहूं के उत्पादन में 14 फीसदी की कमी आएगी और बहुत से ऐसे देश हैं जिनका अस्तित्व ही समाप्त हो जाएगा। मैं माननीय मंत्री से पूछना चाहता हूं कि आपने यह जो वार्ता की है, इस पर क्या आप वैज्ञानिकों की इस राय को दृष्टि में रख कर और देश के अन्न-उत्पादन के भविष्य को दृष्टि में रख कर आगे बढ़ेंगे? इसके लिए आप क्या कदम उठाएंगे?

इसके साथ-ही-साथ 100 billion dollar की बात भी कही गई है। अभी माननीय नेता, प्रतिपक्ष ने कहा कि जिस प्रकार की एजेंसी बनेगी और तमाम लोग उसमें पैसा देंगे, यह कोई बाध्यकारी नहीं है कि यह पैसा कहां से आएगा और इसमें किन-किन देशों को कितना हिस्सा मिलेगा। इसलिए मुझे यह लगता है कि जो आश्वासन आपने सदन को दिया, उसके अनुसार जो Kyoto Protocol है, वह चलता है पूरब और आप फैसला पश्चिम का कर के आए हैं। ये जो आशंकाएं हैं, इनको आप कैसे दूर करेंगे? यही मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं।

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman Sir, I compliment the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister for effective participation. I shall straightaway come to my clarifications.

Sir, the hon. Minister has said in his statement, "It is not a legally binding treaty". I would like to know if the Government has taken note of the recent statement by President Obama's Adviser, David Axelrod, that the US is going to review India's performance regarding the outcome of the Copenhagen Summit. Secondly, has the Government also taken into cognizance the reported statement by UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki Moon, that the Copenhagen Accord has to become legally binding by next year. If 'yes', what are the consequences of such a statement and what is the Government's reaction? Thirdly, the text recognises the need to limit global temperatures rising not more than two centigrade above pre-industrial levels. What is the benchmark for pre-industrial level temperature? Is the 2C cap legally binding? Next, the countries have been asked to spell out by 1st February their pledges for reducing carbon emissions by 2020. Is it different from our unilateral commitment of reducing Carbon intensity by 2020? Is India entitled to the financial aid of thirty billion US dollars in the next three years? If 'yes', what are the conditionalities regarding verifications? Then, who will contribute to the Green Climate Fund and how will that be utilised? Can India borrow from that Fund? If 'yes', under what conditionalities? The developing countries are required to submit national reports on their emission pledges. Pledges on climate mitigations are to be recorded in the Registry. What are the pledges that India is going to make? ...*(Time-bell rings)*... Sir, I am just seeking clarifications.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you ask so many questions, then, the hon. Minister will take a lot of time in answering them. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Sir, I have just two more clarifications. A recent World Bank Report has suggested that India's commitment for 20-25 per cent, reduction in carbon emission is going to be extremely capital intensive. Has the Government estimated the capital required to meet this commitment? Has the Government taken cognizance of the said World Bank Report? If so, what are the details of that Report? Finally, Sir, what I would like to know from the hon. Minister is this. It has been suggested that the global climate change estimates are projected on the basis of the Western computation models, which, often, tend to exaggerate the projections. I want to know whether India is taking up a series of national ...*(Interruptions)*... laboratories to collect climatic and pollution data to give realistic projections. Thank you, Sir.

श्री जनार्दन द्विवेदी (राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र, दिल्ली) : महोदय, मेरा बहुत छोटा-सा स्पष्टीकरण है। "I believe that the BASIC Group has emerged as a powerful force in climate change negotiations and India should have every reason to be satisfied," बहुत कुछ मंत्री जी ने कहा है। प्रधान मंत्री के जाने से भारतीय प्रतिनिधि मंडल की गरिमा निश्चय ही बढ़ी है। मंत्री जी ने बहुत कुछ बताया है, लेकिन उन्होंने एक चीज़ नहीं बताया कि BASIC Group की एक बैठक में ओबामा साहब अचानक बिना schedule के आ गये, तो उस meeting में क्या हुआ? ...*(व्यवधान)*...

में उनसे दूसरा स्पष्टीकरण यह चाहता हूँ कि emission के मामले में एक पेचीदा सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि भारत जैसे देश में यह हिसाब लगाना चाहिए कि विकसित देशों की जो कम्पनियाँ हैं, उनके कारखाने हैं और उनके establishments हैं, उनका emission कितना है और अपनी जो भारतीय कम्पनियाँ हैं, उनका कितना है तथा उसके बारे में सरकार की क्या strategy है? मुझे ये दो ही बातें पूछनी थीं।

SHRI RAJEEV SHUKLA (Maharashtra): Sir, irrespective of what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, I would like to congratulate the Government for taking a tough posture at Copenhagen. My question is in relation to paragraph 17. I want to know from the hon. Minister as to how far China will go with us. How much confident is he about Chinese support to Indian cause? ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Prof. Saif-ud-din Soz. Only one question. ...*(Interruptions)*... He is the former Environment Minister. ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, my understanding is that we could not have done better and India's achievement is spectacular, and the Prime Minister's presence in Copenhagen had a salutary effect, as we got news through media. And the emergence of the BASIC Group is a great idea and together with Brazil, China and South Africa we can do better. India is already considered to be leader in this arena of climate change discussions. But with China, Brazil and South Africa, India will be far stronger than earlier. And the objectives set by the hon. Minister for this country are acceptable, and we can have a discussion next time in the House. Those objectives, cutting-across-party lines, are acceptable in this country. But, we have to be a little alert. Sir, I would like to seek a clarification from the hon. Minister. But, before that, for half-a-minute, I would say this. The Leader of the Opposition made certain brilliant remarks from the level of a knowledgeable person. But, with due deference to him, I would say that India in Copenhagen struck very ably to the basic tenet of the Framework Convention on Climate Change. It is a common but a differentiated responsibility, and India in no way diluted that concept. That is a great achievement. But, India has to have constructive cooperation with the international community. Climate change is a disaster for human kind. Therefore, we have to be a responsible partner in the discussions. So, what we have achieved is very great because Copenhagen will show the way forward. But, I would still seek a clarification from Jairam Rameshji. As I said, the hon. Prime Minister's presence in Copenhagen had a salutary effect. While the hon. Prime Minister in the informal plenary made it clear on the Kyoto Protocol that we cannot be a party to any dilution of the Kyoto Protocol, a bird in hand is worth two in the bush. I would quote only one sentence of what the hon. Prime Minister said, 'It would go against the international public opinion if we acquiesce in its replacement by a new and a

weaker set of commitments.' So, we continue to accept Kyoto Protocol till we have a better protocol. But, Mr. Ramesh's statement has a phrase which, I think, should be deleted. He must consider that. While he was talking about the Kyoto Protocol, he said, 'But we have been able to thwart these attempts for the time being.' Please do not say 'for the time being'. Till we have a stronger protocol in hand, we shall be party to that. We cannot say that for the time being we have accepted a kind of dictation. This may please be considered.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, a large number of specific queries have been raised, ...*(Interruptions)*... I will be very short and crisp in my reply.

(MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair)

I will respond to some of the specific queries of individual Members in writing. Mr. Bagrodia has asked me 8 or 9 questions which I will respond to in writing. A number of other Members have raised specific questions which I will respond to individually. But, there are some common concerns that have been expressed. Firstly, by the Leader of the Opposition and then by my colleague, Shri Yechury and many others. So, I would rather address these common issues very, very pointedly.

Sir, the first issue that has been raised is, have we agreed to the abandonment of the Kyoto Protocol. Sir, with the greatest of respect to the Leader of the Opposition, I would reiterate the point I made in my speech and when I interrupted him that the Copenhagen Accord in no way spells the demise of the Kyoto Protocol. It accepts that the negotiations on the Kyoto Protocol will continue in 2010; but, I cannot disagree with him, that it provides an alternative alignment as well. But, we are committed, I want to reassure the House, to taking the negotiations forward in 2012 and which will culminate in Mexico.

But, the fact is, Sir, there are attempts to thwart the Kyoto Protocol. That is what I meant that there are attempts being made. The U.S. has not ratified the Kyoto Protocol. The entire problem on the Kyoto Protocol has been caused by the fact that there is a common and differentiated responsibility within the developed countries. The Europeans do not want to say, 'we want to take obligations different than the Americans.' So, we have to bring the U.S. into the mainstream of international environmental negotiations because they are the world's number two emitter, accounting for almost 22 per cent of the Greenhouse gases and emissions. Many countries want to leave the Kyoto Protocol. It is no secret that the country in which Kyoto is situated itself wants to leave the Kyoto Protocol, namely Japan. But, we are committed; the developing world is committed, the BASIC countries are committed. India is committed to completing these negotiations on this track and we are going to do our utmost to ensure that the emission reduction targets for the second commitment period, which is post-2012 period, will be negotiated with as much force as we can

muster individually as well as collectively. This much I want to reassure the House. And, I want to reassure the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Yechury that, as I have repeatedly said, the troika for us – the UNFCCC, the Bali Action Plan, and the Kyoto Protocol are sacrosanct. And, we are not moving away from it in any manner.

Sir, the second issue which is perhaps the most contentious issue today relates to the world international consultations and analysis. Sir, may I just spend a couple of minutes on this because I want to assuage the concerns and fears of the Leader of the Opposition and many other Members. Sir, before we went to Copenhagen, I did say that we will accept international information reporting as far as our unsupported actions are concerned. But, Sir, the fact of the matter is that when the negotiations on the Copenhagen Accord started, the issue was that it was not anything to do with India, Sir, I have to be very careful because I am now talking about decisions and statements made by heads of states and of countries with whom we have excellent relations. We want to continue with these relations. But the fact of the matter is, Sir, this issue was not directed on India. This issue was really directed on China because today China has 23 per cent of the world greenhouse gas emissions and the world wants to bring China into the mainstream and they want to have confidence that the Chinese numbers, Chinese systems have some credibility. I can reassure this House, Sir, at no point of time, has any Government raised any doubt on our data, no Government; no head of State negotiator has raised doubts on our transparency. Never. Nobody has said that we are non-transparent. In fact, Sir, we should be showing the world the direction on transparency. There is no system as transparent as ours and I have said before in many statements that as far as MRV is concerned, the best domestic MRV in the world is in India. Between the Parliament, between the media, between civil society groups there can be no better MRV. Sir, the fact of the matter is that when it came to the crunch, it looked as if the entire negotiations involving 28 heads of State would break down on the issue that the United States wanted to use the word, 'scrutiny'. They wanted to use the word, 'review'. They wanted to use the word, 'verification'. Sir, we resisted that. We resisted it for almost 36 hours. China, India, Brazil and South Africa collectively resisted it. We said under no circumstances will we accept the words, 'review', 'scrutiny' or 'verification'. Then, we said, why not 'dialogue', why not 'discussion'? That was rejected. Then an alternative was posed to us. How about 'assessment'? We rejected it, We did not want 'assessment' and after this process of dialogues which took a lot of time, the four countries arrived at a common phraseology which said, 'international consultations and analysis but with clearly defined guidelines that will respect national sovereignty'. Sir, this formulation was accepted by the United States of America. Sir may I say that the word 'consultations' is not new in international diplomacy. We have under the article four of the International Monetary Fund consultations that are held between the IMF and the Indian Government every year. It has been going on for decades. No sovereignty has been eroded as a result of those

consultations. Sir, the Leader of the Opposition has been a distinguished Commerce Minister. He knows that consultations take place between the WTO and the Indian Government on trade policy. No sovereignty has been eroded. In fact, unilaterally in trade policy we have been more aggressive liberalisers than we have been under the WTO framework. So, we should not fear the word, 'consultations'. It is there in the IMF, it is there in the WTO and if it is there as far as climate change is concerned, I see no great sell out as far as India is concerned. We have protected ourselves by saying, 'it is within clearly defined guidelines'. Those guidelines will be defined by us. It will be defined by 194 countries who are party to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the most important paragraph there which China, India, Brazil and South Africa insisted on is that the clearly defined guidelines should be within the framework of respecting national sovereignty. Sir, I can understand not having consultations on nuclear power plants. There is sovereignty involved. But all the information on our emissions is already in the public domain. Sir, 40 per cent of our carbon dioxide emissions is from our power stations. Now, I have here, Sir, a document that was brought out last year by the Ministry of Power which gives you information on the carbon dioxide emissions from every single power plant in India. This is in the public domain. This is on their website. This project was funded by the German Government, We are having consultations on this. There are no foreign inspectors running around our power plants. All this information is in the public domain. We are having consultations. People are analysing our data. In fact, we have got encomiums for the data that we have presented. So, I think, Sir, that we should be careful. I agree. We should ensure that these guidelines do not lead to a proliferation of inspectors coming and seeing what we are doing and what we are not doing. But, the fact of the matter is, 'consultations' and 'analysis' does not mean review, scrutiny, verification or assessment. Let me give you one more example, because this is a very important issue that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised and I want to address this directly. Sir, eighteen years ago, in 1990, the USA – I had mentioned this example in Lok Sabha and I want to mention this here as well since this is an important point – put out a Report which said that Methane emissions from wet paddy cultivation in India is 38 million tonnes per year and it said that wet paddy cultivation in India is a major contributor to global Methane emissions. There was an Indian scientist who challenged this data. Unfortunately, the person is no more. He was a very distinguished scientist and a Fellow of the Royal Society of London, Dr. A.P. Mitra. He was the Director General of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research. He put together a team of scientists. They, actually, measured the Methane emission from wet paddy cultivation. And, their conclusion was that the annual level of Methane emissions from wet paddy cultivation in India was between 2 to 6 million tonnes per year, with a median value of 4 million tonnes per year. Sir, do you know that, today, the accepted international figure, including the USA, is not 38 million tonnes per year for Methane emission from wet paddy cultivation, but it is 4 million tonnes from wet paddy

cultivation. So, I don't see why we should be defensive. We have the capacity to challenge the best scientists in the world. We have the capacity to do our own analysis. We have the capacity to do our own measurement and, as I have given you this example, our own example can become an international standard. Today, the numbers that we are quoting has become the internationally accepted norm as far as emissions from wet paddy cultivation are concerned. So, Sir, I agree that there is a difference between 'information' which I had committed to in this House and 'consultations' and 'analysis.' So, I plead guilty. Yes, I have moved from the word 'information' to 'consultations' and 'analysis.' I am not going to argue on that. I am not going to get into an argument on that. There has been a shift. But, Sir, that is what I meant by flexibility. When you are negotiating with these countries, when you are faced with conflicting poles and counter poles and the thing that I can assure the House that this was not a unilateral decision of India, this was a decision taken collectively by China, Brazil, South Africa and India. We decided that we will not be held responsible for the failure of Copenhagen. We decided that we will not be made the blame boys as far as the failure is concerned. A number of comments have been made on the USA. Let me also say that there was a statement made by the USA delegation during the negotiations. It said, 'we will not give money to countries like Bangladesh and Maldives if the issue of transparency is not settled.' The Bangladeshi delegates asked me, 'why are you not settling the issue of transparency?' The Maldives delegation asked me, 'why are you not setting the issue of transparency?' So, the issue of transparency had become a big stumbling block and, Sir, frankly, of all the countries in the world, India should not feel defensive of transparency. We should be, on the other hand, in the forefront of demanding transparency from all parties, including the BASIC parties, if I may add. So, I assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Shri Yechury and all other hon. Members that 'consultations' and 'analysis' means precisely consultations and analysis. We have years of experience on consultations and analysis with the IMF and the WTO, We have nothing to fear. Our sovereignty has not been eroded. On the other hand, those organisation have gained, we have also gained in the process and I want to reassure the House that when we frame these guidelines that will respect our national sovereignty. We will take the House into confidence. After all, this is going to be an exercise that is going to involve 194 countries which are members of the UNFCCC. It will take some time. But, I want to reassure the House that it will not be an intrusive consultations, it will not be an intrusive analysis. This much assurance I can give you on behalf of the Government of India.

Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition and many hon. Members have referred to a statement made by Mr. Axelrod...who is President Obama's close adviser. If I may be permitted, Sir, a small light-hearted comment, Mr. Axelrod is the Arun Jaitley of the Obama Administration. He is their top spin doctor. He has tried to give a spin to this Agreement. He has tried to say that in this Agreement we will hold China and India accountable. I don't want to get into Mr. Axelrod's statement. I will quote Mr. Axelrod's boss, Mr. Obama. Mr. Obama had said in a Press Conference, "It will not be legally binding, but what it will do is to allow each country to show to the world what they are doing, and there will be a sense in the part of each country that we are, in this, together; and who will know who is meeting and who is not meeting the mutual obligations that have been set forth." He gave this statement in Copenhagen after the Accord had been finalised. He just, then, went on to say, "These commitments will be subject to international consultations and analysis similar to that, for example, what takes place at WTO, etc., etc., etc. Mr. Axelrod's statement was meant for domestic consumption. He has to convince the Congress that China and India have been brought in. He has to convince the trade unions that China and India have been controlled. I don't want to get into the statement of Mr. Axelrod that has been made for purely domestic consumption. I go by what President Obama has himself said. And, nowhere has President Obama said that this record is meant to control or strangulate China and India.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: I hope you are not saying this for domestic consumption.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: No; no, I am saying this for parliamentary consumption. I don't make any distinction, Mr. Yechury, unlike many other distinguished Members of this House, in what I say in this House and what I say outside the House. It is always same. I don't make any changes.

I am sorry, Sir, I am taking a little bit more time because it is a very important issue. I will conclude very shortly. I was criticised for violating a commitment that I made on the floor of the House that we will not accept peaking year. On 16th November, the prospect was for an international agreement that would mention 2020-2025 as the peaking year for Developing Countries, like, India. This Accord does not mention a single year for peaking. That is a major accomplishment for us. It talks of global peaking, agreed. But it also talks of longer timeframe for Developing Countries, as the Leader of the Opposition read out. It also talks about the peaking in the context of the first and overriding priority being given to poverty eradication and livelihood security. This is not a new language. This was there in the L'aquila Declaration. This is a language that is repeated from the L'aquila Declaration. What I want to convey to the hon. Members is that the concept of peaking, when the hon. Prime Minister made his commitment two years ago that all of you had applauded,

which all of Indian media had applauded, which all of Indian NGOs had applauded, is that India's per capita emission will never exceed the per capita emission of the Developed World. We are implicitly accepting peaking. What we are saying is that we will peak once you peak. We are not giving a specific year for peaking. What we are saying is if you reach at a certain level of average per capita emission, we will ensure that we will never exceed that per capita emission. That, Sir, is an implicit peaking. What we have not done in this document is to mention a specific year for peaking. So, I do not plead guilty to this charge. I have not violated any commitment that I had made. I have not accepted, the Government of India has not accepted any peaking year for Developing Countries. We are not going to accept it as a part of the negotiations. We will continue to insist on the longer time frame. But, I am sure, and hon. Members will agree with me, that we should peak in the 21st century. Now, in which year in the 21st century, time alone will tell. But it should not be anybody's case that we should peak only in the 22nd century. We should peak sometime in the 21st century. If we don't peak in the 21st century, I think, then, we are having a very serious problem for us. ...*(Interruptions)*... There may not be a 22nd Century as the hon. Home Minister reminds us. Sir, many other issues have been raised on climate fund and many other issues have been raised on technology. Sir, I also want to say one point on funding. Sir, a country like India, I believe, this is my belief, this is the belief of many people, does not need any international aid. We do not want international aid. We can stand on our own feet. Green technology is an area where India can emerge as a world leader. Ten years from now, Sir, India should be selling Green Technology to the world. Let us not always keep talking of technology transfer, technology transfer, technology transfer. Nobody is going to transfer technology to you. Technology has to be negotiated, technology has to be bought, technology has to be bought on commercial terms. I want to say that many Indian companies have already seen business opportunities in this. China has moved ahead. Today, of the top 10 solar companies in the world, four are Chinese. Let us see this as a business opportunity. This is an opportunity for Indian technology to move ahead and I am sure that in the next couple of years, we will, actually, be selling technology rather than keep repeating the stale mantra of technology transfer all the time. Yes, we require international financial assistance. I am not for one who is suggesting we do not require international financial assistance. But, Sir, we are not in the same category as Bangladesh or Maldives or Ethiopia or Saint Lucia or Granada. There are countries in Africa, countries in small island States, countries in Asia which require this more urgently than us for adaptation and mitigation. A country like India should be able to stand on its own feet and say we will do what we have to do on our own. Why are we getting into this syndrome of always looking for international finance and international technology? This is something that we should be autonomously engaged in. Sir, I know that we are running out of time, but I want to summarise by thanking the Leader of the opposition and all other hon. Members for raising what I think are very

legitimate and valid queries. I think what I will do is, I will address each of them in a written form, a frequently-asked questions form, I will circulate it to all the Members of Parliament and I hope in the next Session of Parliament, we will have another debate on this issue because these negotiations will continue all of 2010. I will not hesitate from any discussion of any kind at any point of time simply because we have nothing to hide as far as our negotiating strategy is concerned. Thank you.

VALEDICTORY REMARKS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, the Two Hundred and Eighteenth Session of Rajya Sabha comes to a close today. It commenced on 19th November, 2009. A fair amount of legislative business was transacted and useful discussions were held on questions of public concern. Some of the matters discussed at great length in the course of Calling Attention notices as well as Short Duration Discussions related to internal security, rise in prices of essential commodities, the Report of Liberhan Commission, climate change, disinvestment, WTO negotiations, etc. On the other hand, 17 Government Bills were also passed during this period. Members were also provided regular opportunities to raise matters with permission, and to make Special Mentions on matters of public importance.

Despite the above, the Question Hour was lost on five days due to disruptions. Hon'ble Members do need to think about this because Questions in the House are an important instrumentality through which information is elicited and the Government's accountability ensured.

A significant achievement of this Session was the decision of the Rules Committee to streamline the Question Hour procedure in order to ensure a greater coverage of the Questions with wider opportunities to Members to raise Supplementaries.

I have directed the Secretary-General to make available statistical information regarding this Session.

Three new Members joined the House during the Session. I am sure they would make rich and valuable contributions to the House in the days to come.

I thank the Leader of the House, the Leader of the Opposition, the leaders of various parties and groups and the hon. Members for the cooperation extended by them to facilitate smooth functioning of the House.

I also thank the Deputy Chairman, the Members on the Panel of Vice-Chairmen and the officers and staff of the Secretariat for their help and cooperation.

Now, before we adjourn the House *sine die*, we will have the National Song.

(The National Song, "Vande Mataram", was then played.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned *sine die*.

The House then adjourned *sine die* at forty one minutes past two of the clock.