

"That the Bill to repeal the Union Duties of Excise (Electricity) Distribution Act, 1980, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we shall take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title added to the Bill.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir, I beg to move:

That the Bill be returned.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSIONS—Contd.

Foreign Direct Investment in retail sector

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we take up Short Duration Discussion on Foreign Direct Investment in retail sector. Shri Murli Manohar Joshi. Not here. Shri Praveen Rashtrapal.

SHRI PRAVEEN RASHTRAPAL (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I must thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this very important subject. Sir, before I deal with the subject in particular, I would like to inform this august House that as per the recent independent survey conducted, the finance affairs in this country are well managed, and, among the Cabinet Ministers, the Finance Minister has been given very good marks. Sir, the inflation in this country is well below the dangerous mark and foreign exchange position is also quite satisfactory.

What I am concerned about is the double standards of certain political parties. I am talking about the NDA, in particular. When they were in power, they have supported the FDI in retail sector. I would like to quote from the election agenda of the NDA. I quote:

"Organized retail trade on the international pattern will be promoted as a new engine of growth for trade and employment through appropriate legal and fiscal measures. Twenty six per cent FDI in retailing will be allowed. Sourcing of Indian products by foreign retail chains will be

encouraged. India's vast market has potential for generating high growth and thereby reducing poverty and economic inequalities. Internal trade barriers hamper growth. They will be identified and removed."

I may also prove and produce a news item, where a statement by the then Finance Minister of the NDA, Shri Jaswant Singh has gone on record to say that FDI in retail is required; it will be there, and, the heading of the Press says, 'Jaswant firm on FDI'. Now, what was admitted by the NDA regime was appreciated very recently, that is, in the beginning of 2004, then, why the same partners are now criticising when this Government is likely to introduce the FDI in retail after proper study, after proper thinking, for which a Group of Ministers has also been appointed. You will kindly appreciate that all over the country—you must look at the population figures—below-25 population in this country is on the higher side. We have also got the figures about the middle class. Approximately 300 million people belong to the middle class. Urbanisation in the country has increased. And, for that, the trading community, the industrialists and every other people who are interested in business, particularly, in retail business, have constructed very big-sized complexes. At the same time, metropolitan cities have malls where you can get all sundry retail items under the same roof. That is catering to the needs of urban population in metropolitan cities of Bangalore, Hyderabad, Chennai, Mumbai, Delhi, Kolkata, Ahmedabad, etc. At the same time, you may go all over the world. There may be malls; there may be very big complexes. But, the small shops, the corner shops are not losing their business. There is a vast population in this country which is catering to the needs of the people belonging to the poor strata, the people residing in the towns, the people residing in the villages. Hence, there is no threat. One thing we must criticise. We must have our self-criticism. Once you have entered global economy, once you have signed various agreements under the WTO, you can't run away from the responsibilities which you are going to have. I am extremely sorry to admit, with due respect to the industrialists in this country, that we were not able to maintain international standards of quality, international standards of management, international standards of processing and international standards of managing the affairs of the trade. We were also compromising with regard to pollution and all other environmental problems. By entering the WTO, by entering the global economy, our retailers will also be asked to follow the rules which are

[23 May, 2006]

RAJYA SABHA

2.00 P.M.

there in other cities. When we go to foreign countries, we praise everything there—cleanliness, mechanisation and computerisation. And, when we come back to our country, we again criticise that we have got population. It is true that we have population. China also have got huge population. In fact, our country must compete with a country like China which is known for mass production. At the same time, our country must also compete with western countries which are known for quality, which are known for brands, which are known for management. You will kindly appreciate that now if you enter a very big complex and purchase anything, whether you ask for a bill or not, the bills are always prepared. This will help the country; this will help the Revenue Department from the evasion which used to take place in the past when the goods were sold without bills. Super markets, along with corner shops, will remain exempt. These are the advantages. There will be competition. We have got Indian retail magnates also. We have got Reliance; we have got Tata; we have got L&T. They are not foreigners. So, our retailers are going to have competition within Indian big giants who are entering the various fields of retail trade. When they are having competition with Indian giants, our retailers should also be organised. I will give you one example. We have got vast production of fruit. Our country is producing many varieties of fruits. But, we don't have processing industry in this country. As a result, we are losing. I can give examples of Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Uttaranchal, various parts of Uttar Pradesh, even a place like Gujarat, where we are manufacturing Isabgol. But, we are not able to export Isabgol to foreign countries. We are exporting Isabgol for processing only, because we don't have that machinery. The small farmers in our country cannot afford to acquire the processing machinery; for that, there should be a chain of retailers who organise. As a result, when FDI comes to retail market, it is not going to have disadvantage to the country. It will definitely help. But, at the same time, I do agree that we must give a level-playing field to the retailers. Retailers are not going to be annihilated. Retailers should not be annihilated. Retailers need not be removed from the market. At the same time, we must take care of the interests of the retailers, and also take care of the employment opportunities. I am sure about it. When a very big mall is opened, hundreds of people get employment inside that mall. So, employment is provided. In one shop, only the owner himself does the business. He maintains the account and takes care of *taraju*, weighing scale. Everything is done by one *seth*, who is the owner, and

his one servant. When the same shop is converted into a very big departmental store, a number of people get employment. So, it is employment-oriented. When you go to a big shop, it is employment-oriented. At the same time, it is well managed, and we are able to compete with the larger group within our country as well as the larger group coming all the way from foreign countries. FDI is already there. Our own brothers, the NRIs, are settled in other countries. Educated people from our country are going to foreign universities, doing MBA there, and coming back. We welcome them.

At the same time, in the field of market, once we have entered the WTO, we cannot object, we cannot oppose and we cannot protest the entry of the FDI in the retail market. There are many advantages. The UPA Government is fully aware of the issues involved. According to my information, it has decided that no FDI will be allowed in the retail sector except in single brand product retailing. I am sure about it. In this very House, the hon. Minister of Commerce has given a detailed reply on this very subject and, right now also, the Government of India is discussing the whole issue of FDI in the retail sector. I request those who are criticising the entry of FDI in the retail sector only on the political ground that let us be very responsible. Certain policy matters of economy should not be changed with the change of Government. It was during 1991—95 that the Government of India became party to the global economy. The WTO and other agreements were signed by the then Government of India. It was followed, for another six years, by the NDA Government. They were part and parcel of the said economy. Now, the UPA Government has come. They are also continuing it. So, there should be consistency, and there should be continuation. In this august House, we have had a discussion on VAT. Some State Governments which belong to different political parties — I would not like to quote their names to create any controversy—have not implemented VAT. We were informed that except two States, Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, all have implemented VAT. Only two States have not implemented it. All other States have appreciated and implemented VAT. The Central Government has given an assurance that any loss on account of introduction of VAT will be compensated. This is the assurance given by the Central Government. Similarly, on the issue of the FDI in retail, one need not worry. The Government is fully aware of the risk to the domestic retailer, and it will see that they are

not annihilated from the market. With these words, I conclude my speech and request my friends, who are opposing FDI into retail for the sake of opposition, to be more responsible. Thank you, Sir.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी (उत्तर प्रदेश): धन्यवाद उपसभापति महोदय। मुझे पहले यह सूचना थी कि इस विषय पर बहस ढाई बजे शुरू होगी।

श्री उपसभापति: समय फिक्स नहीं किया था, it had to be taken up immediately after it.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: मैं पूछकर गया था कि ढाई बजे शुरू होगी। लेकिन एकदम पता नहीं इसका कैसे समय बदल दिया गया, यह मैं नहीं जानता। श्रीमन्, हो सकता है कि मंत्री महोदय की और कोई लंच मीटिंग या कोई और बैठक हो गई हो, जिसकी वजह से यह बदलाव हो गया हो।

वाणिज्य और उद्योग मंत्री (श्री कमल नाथ): मैं आपका इंतजार कर रहा था, आप नहीं थे।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: बड़ी प्रसन्नता की बात थी। लेकिन मैं आ गया हूँ।

श्री कमल नाथ: इसीलिए तो मैं मुस्करा रहा हूँ।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: श्रीमन्, यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विषय है और मुझे जानकर प्रसन्नता हुई कि आज इस पर बहस हो रही है। बहुत समय से हम इस पर बहस की मांग करते आ रहे हैं क्योंकि हमारी निगाह में यह मसला सामान्य मसला नहीं है, कुछ थोड़े से दुकानदारों का या कुछ थोड़े से आदमियों से संबंधित सवाल नहीं है। यह सवाल देश के आम आदमी की ज़िंदगी से जुड़ा हुआ सवाल है, इसलिए इस पर बहुत गहराई के साथ विचार होना चाहिए और उस विचार के बाद ही कोई नीति निर्धारण सरकार को करनी चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० पी.जे. कुरियन) पीठासीन हुए।

साथ ही यह भी देखना चाहिए कि जिन देशों में यह व्यवस्था लागू हुई है, उनके क्या परिणाम आए हैं, उनके क्या नतीजे मिले हैं और उनमें क्या तजुर्बे हुए हैं। सबसे पहले तो मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि आज से दो-तीन साल पहले तक कोई ऐसी मांग या चर्चा इस पर देश में नहीं होती थी कि एफडीआई इन रिटेल - यह कोई बड़ा भारी या अहम मसला है। लेकिन दो-तीन सालों से यह बात ज़रा ज़ोर पकड़ी है। उससे पहले हमने देखा है कि हमारे सम्माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी जब वित्त मंत्री थे, तब उन्होंने एफडीआई इन रिटेल की अनुमति दी थी। लेकिन उसके बाद हमारे सम्माननीय वित्त मंत्री, जो आज वित्त मंत्री हैं, वे वित्त मंत्री हुए, तब उन्होंने एफडीआई इन रिटेल के कानून को समाप्त कर दिया था। अब फिर से, यह बड़े आश्चर्य की बात है कि इस बारे में ज़ोर लगाया जा रहा है और वर्तमान वाणिज्य मंत्री, वित्त मंत्री, माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी बहुत ज़ोर के साथ इस पर लगे हुए हैं कि रिटेल में एफडीआई जरूर आनी चाहिए। माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी

ने तो यहाँ तक कहा था कि 100 प्रतिशत आनी चाहिए और उन्होंने यह भी कहा था कि मैं अपने सहयोगियों को मना लूंगा। अब मुझे नहीं पता कि उनके जो बाकी सहयोगी इधर बैठे हैं, वे माने हैं या नहीं माने हैं। हम तो नहीं माने। अभी मैं यह भी सुन रहा था, विद्वान वक्ता की तरफ से यह कहा गया कि एनडीए की सरकार के ज़माने में भी इसकी चर्चा की गयी थी और यह भी कहा गया कि हमारे वर्तमान नेता प्रतिपक्ष ने इस बारे में कुछ बयान भी दिया था। लेकिन वे यह बताना भूल गए कि मुम्बई के हमारे अधिवेशन में, जो हमारा अखिल भारतीय अधिवेशन था, हमने रिटेल में एफडीआई का विरोध किया। यह अंतिम प्रस्ताव जो हमारा है, जो लेटेस्ट है और जिस पर अखिल भारतीय स्तर पर विचार हो गया है...(व्यवधान)...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल (बिहार): उन्होंने भारतीय जनता पार्टी की नीति का उल्लेख नहीं किया, जो आप लोगों की सर्वानुमति से एनडीए का चुनाव घोषणा पत्र था, उस घोषणा पत्र में रिटेल में एफडीआई का उल्लेख किया था, उसी का उन्होंने उल्लेख किया है।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: मुझे मालूम है।...(व्यवधान)... मुझे मालूम है।

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: इसलिए बीजेपी के घोषणा पत्र का उल्लेख उन्होंने नहीं किया।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: मैंने यही निवेदन किया कि जो बीजेपी का दृष्टिकोण है, वह यह है और वह सुनिश्चित है क्योंकि उसे अंत में अभी मुम्बई के हमारे अधिवेशन ने और प्रतिनिधि सभा ने पुष्ट किया है। मैं यही बात सदन के ध्यान में लाना चाहता था। वैसे इस प्रश्न पर अगर आप एक दूसरे के ऊपर टीका-टिप्पणी के हिसाब से - आपने यह किया था और उसने वह किया था - इस पर ही लगे रहेंगे तो शायद यह मसला हल नहीं होगा। बुनियादी बात यह है और मैं सदन से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब से वैश्वीकरण की नीतियां चली हैं, तब से लेकर आज तक 15-20 साल का समय होने को आ गया है, यह तो विचार होना चाहिए कि इसमें हम जहां जाना चाहते थे, वहां पहुंचे हैं या नहीं पहुंचे हैं और अगर नहीं पहुंचे हैं तो क्यों नहीं पहुंचे हैं? जिस तरह से हम चल रहे हैं, क्या यह रास्ता हमें वहां पहुंचा सकता है? अगर इसमें कुछ सुधार करने की जरूरत है तो वे सुधार क्या होने चाहिए? ऐसा तो नहीं है कि यह कोई बाइबल है कि जो ग्लोबलाइजेशन में लिख दिया गया या कोई कुरान शरीफ है या वेद है कि अब इसमें कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हो सकता, कोई सुधार नहीं हो सकता। दुनिया के तमाम देश, मैं आपके सामने निवेदन करूंगा, इसमें कैसे सुधार कर रहे हैं। इसके जो समर्थक हैं, उनके द्वारा यह बताया जाता है कि इसके बड़े लाभ होंगे और अक्सर यह कहा जाता है कि पहला लाभ तो यह होगा कि जो उपभोक्ता है, उसको बड़ा सस्ता सामान मिलेगा। इसके अलावा हमारे देश में उस सामान के सस्ता मिलने के साथ-साथ टेक्नोलॉजी भी आएगी जो हमारे इस व्यापार को बहुत सुदृढ़ करेगी, आधुनिक करेगी। इसके अतिरिक्त इसमें वैट लगाना भी बड़ा सरला होगा, टेक्सेशन की दृष्टि से भी यह बड़ा अच्छा होगा, कंज्यूमर को

सस्ता दाम मिलेगा। कुछ लोग यह भी कहते हैं कि इससे हमारे उत्पादकों को लाभ मिलेगा। ये सारी बातें कही गयी हैं। जब मैं इसको देखता हूँ कि क्या ये बातें सच हैं, क्या इन बातों में कोई तथ्य है तो मुझे बहुत निराशा हाथ लगती है। पहले इस बात को देखें कि यह समस्या उठी क्यों? भारतवर्ष में जिसको खुदरा व्यापार कहते हैं, उसका व्यापकता बहुत अधिक है और यह हजारों सालों से इस देश में चल रहा है। यह गांवों से लेकर शहरों तक स्थापित है और इसकी एक पूरी श्रृंखला है। मैं नहीं जानता कि किसी walmart या किसी और अधिक बड़ी भारी मल्टिनेशनल कम्पनी ने मरुस्थल के किसी छोटे गांव में या सुदूर हिमालय की कंदराओं में या उत्तर पूर्वांचल के किसी गांव में या हिमाचल, उत्तरांचल या कश्मीर के दुर्गम स्थानों में कोई सामान पहुंचाया है? मैं नहीं समझता कि पहुंचाया होगा। ये कितनी लम्बी चेन बनाएंगे? ये सिर्फ दस लाख की आबादी वाले शहरों से आगे बढ़ेंगे ही नहीं। यह एक विचारणीय बात है कि ये कौन सी चेन खोलेंगे? हमारे देश में एक बहुत बड़ी तादाद इस व्यापार में लगी हुई है। इस व्यापार में चार से पांच करोड़ लोग सीधे लगे हुए हैं। यदि उनके घर वालों के साथ एक और चार का अनुपात मान लिया जाए और साथ ही साथ वे ठेले वाले, लोडर्स, अन-लोडर्स इन सबको कायम किया जाए, यह संख्या जो इस व्यापार पर निर्भर करती है, यह सौलह से बीस करोड़ तक पहुंचती है। खेती के बाद सबसे अधिक रोजगार इस क्षेत्र में मिल रहा है। यह कहा जाता है कि इस क्षेत्र में जो रोजगार मिल रहा है, यह अन-एम्प्लॉइमेंट इसकी वजह से है क्योंकि रोजगार नहीं है इसीलिए लोग इसमें चले जाते हैं। यह बात ठीक है कि बहुत हद तक लोग इसमें इस कारण जाते होंगे, क्योंकि उनके सामने और कोई अच्छा रोजगार हमारा समाज नहीं दे पाया है और कोई सरकार नहीं दे पाई है। जब से यह ग्लोबलाइजेशन हुआ है, तब से आर्गेनाइज्ड सैक्टर में कितनी जॉब्स बनी हैं, इसका विचार कर लिया जाए? क्या एक करोड़ बनी हैं, दो करोड़ बनी हैं, चार करोड़ बनी हैं? पचास से साठ हजार तक आंकड़े हैं। यदि इसको बहुत खींचिएगा तो एक लाख, इससे ज्यादा नहीं है।... (व्यवधान)... मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि यह अपर लिमिट है, इससे ज्यादा नहीं है। यह जो कहा जा रहा है कि बड़े चेन्स आएंगे, रोजगार पैदा करेंगे, मैं आपके सामने उसको भी बताना चाहूंगा कि ये क्या रोजगार पैदा करेंगे और किस ढंग से पैदा करेंगे। जरा इसको भी देख लिया जाए कि इनकी क्या स्थिति होगी? एक मिलियन डॉलर लगाने पर ये हमें कितना रोजगार दे पाएंगे, इसको जरा देखने की जरूरत है। आप देखिए कि अगर walmart यहां पर अपनी-अपनी दुकानें खोलें और जो हमारे दस लाख से अधिक की आबादी के नगर तीस-पैंतीस के करीब हैं, उनमें खोल लें तो जो उनकी रिपोर्ट है, उसके अनुसार उनका टर्न ओवर 8300 करोड़ रुपए का होगा, जिसमें सिर्फ 10195 लोग काम करेंगे। 8300 करोड़ के टर्न ओवर में केवल 10195 लोग काम करेंगे और यह भी मानते हुए कि एक एम्प्लॉई पर, एक व्यक्ति पर एक लाख 75 हजार डॉलर का टर्न ओवर है। इसका मतलब यह है कि अगर यह चीज लागू हुई और इस इन्वेस्टमेंट के मुताबिक केवल एक लाख 75 हजार

लोगों को काम मिला तो इसमें यह पता लगाया गया है कि एक लाख 80 हजार व्यक्ति displace होंगे। यानी एक लाख 80 हजार लोगों को displace करना और 10195 लोगों को काम देना, यह कौन सा एम्पलायमेंट देने का तरीका है? आप यह कौन-सा रोजगार बढ़ा रहे हैं? फिर यह जो walmart रोजगार होगा, बड़ी रिटेल शॉप्स का रोजगार होगा, वह किसी मलयाली पढ़े व्यक्ति के लिए नहीं होगा, वह किसी तेलुगु, कन्नड़ या बंगला पढ़े व्यक्ति के लिए नहीं होगा, उसके लिए अंग्रेजी जानना जरूरी होगा। एक बड़ी भारी मात्रा में जो हमारे देश की भाषा से पढ़े लोग हैं और जो आज अपना काम कर रहे हैं, अगर वे वहां पर नौकरी करना भी चाहेंगे तो उन्हें नौकरी नहीं मिलेगी। यह सारी दुनिया का तजुर्बा है। फिर ये किसको रोजगार दे रहे हैं? रोजगार देने की क्षमता इसमें बिल्कुल नहीं है। ये रोजगार को displace करेंगे, विस्थापित करेंगे। हमारे देश में वैसे ही बहुत बड़ी तादाद में यहां के रोजगार दफ्तरों में 4 करोड़ 13 लाख लोग पंजीकृत हैं। ऐसे हालात में अगर आप उसके अंदर एक करोड़ 80 लाख लोग और जोड़ देंगे तो यह संख्या तो 6 करोड़ हो जाएगी।

ये वे बेरोजगार लोग हैं जो पंजीकृत हो जाएंगे। इसके अलावा, जिसको आप कह रहे हैं कि under-employed है, unemployed है वह इस रोजगार में गया हुआ है। ठीक है, गया हुआ है, लेकिन क्यों गया है, यह किसकी जिम्मेदारी थी कि उसको रोजगार मिले? इन 60 सालों में हम उन्हें रोजगार नहीं दे पाए, चाहे उधर की सरकार हो, चाहे हमारी सरकार थी, चाहे कोई सरकार हो, लेकिन इस बात पर गहराई से विचार होना चाहिए कि इन 60 सालों के बाद भी इस देश में बेरोजगारी की स्थिति क्यों बनी हुई है, क्यों नहीं उन्हें रोजगार मिला? आज अगर यह कहा जाए कि हम बड़ा भारी रोजगार पैदा करेंगे और ये बेचारे तो चूक गए, इनको रोजगार नहीं मिला, इसलिए ये वहां चले गए, मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि किस FDI से इन्होंने रोजगार लिया है? सौ, दो सौ, चार सौ, हजार, दो हजार रुपए लेकर ये लोग रोजगार में आते हैं, अपना पेट पालते हैं और अपने साथ चार और लोगों को काम पर लगाते हैं। यह फेरी वाला होगा, यह grocer shop वाला होगा, जिसे Mom & Pop Shop आप कहते हैं, वह होगा, पान वाला होगा, ये लोग कितनी कैपिटल से काम कर रहे हैं? अगर आपको इनकी efficiency बढ़ानी है, तो पिछले 50-60 सालों में हमने क्या किया या पिछले 15-20 सालों में हमने ऐसा क्या किया कि उन दुकानदारों की, उन व्यवसायों में लगे हुए लोगों की efficiency हम बढ़ाएं? क्या किया है हमने, किस आधार पर हम कहते हैं कि वह वहां चला गया और उसको वहां से हटाना है। वह गया क्यों? अगर अर्थव्यवस्था ठीक होती या पिछले 15-20 सालों से, जब से हमने वैश्वीकरण के नुस्खे अपनाए हैं और Walmart को अपना नया डॉक्टर मान लिया है, मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि तब से हिंदुस्तान के इन बेरोजगार मरीजों का क्या इलाज हुआ है? ये तो और अधिक बीमार होते चले जा रहे हैं। इसलिए यह कहना कि इससे रोजगार मिलेगा, मैं नहीं समझता कि इसमें कोई तथ्य है, क्योंकि मैंने यह देखा है और मैं आपसे बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि देखिए दुनिया में, जहां ये लोग गए हैं, वहां क्या हुआ है। एक बार यह कहा गया था और अभी भी कहा

जा रहा है कि सरकार को उन तमाम लोगों की बहुत फिक्र है, जो इस छोटे व्यापार में लगे हुए हैं और किसी भी हालत में हम उन्हें बेरोजगार नहीं होने देंगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, अब मैं आपको बता रहा हूँ कि जिन देशों में यह व्यवस्था चली है, वहां क्या हुआ है। फ्रांस में स्थिति यह है कि 30 साल पहले जितनी दुकानें थीं, जितनी grocery shops थीं, आज उनमें से केवल 17 प्रतिशत बची हैं, बाकी सब गायब हो गई हैं। फिर डेनमार्क में सन् 1982 से 1992 के दौरान 37 प्रतिशत छोटी दुकानें बंद हो गई हैं और यह कहा जाता है कि आने वाले 10-12 सालों में केवल 3,500 छोटी दुकानें डेनमार्क में बचेंगी, बाकी सब दुकानें गायब हो जाएंगी। वहां के लोगों ने इसका बड़ा विरोध किया है। इसके साथ-साथ फ्रांस में क्या हुआ, अमरीका में क्या हुआ, जर्मनी में क्या हुआ? जापान, जर्मनी, कोरिया और फ्रांस ने बहुत सी चीजों के लिए कानून बनाए हैं, ताकि वे इस retail trade में विदेशी निवेश के आगमन पर अंकुश लगा सकें। क्यों लगाया? ये तो बड़े विकसित और पश्चिमी अर्थव्यवस्था के समर्थक देश हैं। अगर डेनमार्क के साथ आप थाईलैंड को देखें, तो उसको कानून बनाने पड़े, इसी काम के लिए एक मिनिस्टर बनाना पड़ा। थाईलैंड में Restrictive law for retail trade बन गया, क्यों बना? उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे यहां तबाही आ रही है, शहरों की दुर्दशा हो रही है, वह एक अलग पक्ष है, जिसको मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहूंगा। वहां एक Walmart बना या एक बड़ा भारी complex बना, जिसमें आपने 500-700 दुकानें खोल दीं, उसकी पार्किंग का क्या होगा, उसके environmental नतीजे क्या होंगे, पर्यावरणीय नतीजे क्या होंगे? नौकरी का तो मैंने आपको बताया कि वह नहीं देगी, हां, पर्यावरण जरूर खराब करेगी। बड़े-बड़े शहरों में मैं देखता हूँ कि जिस समय Walmart की दुकानों की तरफ या Mall shops की तरफ जाते हैं, तो शहर में stampede हो जाता है। थाईलैंड के सामने यही समस्या है, इंडोनेशिया के सामने यही समस्या है और उन्होंने कहा कि ये Mall शहर के बीच में नहीं बनेंगी, ये शहर के बाहर 10-12 किलोमीटर पर बनेंगी। उन्होंने restrictions लगाए हैं और इसके लिए सारी व्यवस्थाएं की हैं। हमें दुनिया के तजुर्बे से सीखना चाहिए। ऐसा नहीं है कि जो अमरीका की ओर से कहा गया, वह हमने मान लिया या जो WTO के अंदर कहा गया, वह हमने तत्काल मान लिया। यह जरूरी नहीं है। वह इलाज जो उनके यहां कारगर हो सकता था, अगर आज वहां भी कारगर नहीं है, तो मुझे यह देख कर आश्चर्य हुआ, जब मैं विश्लेषण कर रहा था कि खुद अमेरिका में इन बड़े chains का विरोध हो रहा है, क्योंकि वहां के रोजगार पर भी यही हालत हो रही है। इसलिए आप पहले यह देखिए कि यह श्रम को नष्ट करेगा, बेरोजगारी को पैदा करेगा, पर्यावरणीय सवाल पैदा करेगा।

इसके अलावा यह जो कहा जा रहा है कि सस्ता दाम है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि ये सस्ता कैसे देंगे। मुझे याद आ रहा है कि जब वॉलमार्ट के सज्जन, जॉन मैजर, जो इसके अध्यक्ष हैं, पिछले साल मई के महीने में यहां आए थे, वे 12 मई 2005 को यहां आए थे, और उन्होंने कहा

कि हमने अमेरिका को value for money दिया है और कहा कि देखो, जो बटुआ, wallet हम 70 डॉलर का बेचते हैं, वह हम 17 डॉलर का खरीद कर लाते हैं। बहुत अच्छी बात है। हो सकता है कि आप 3 डॉलर का लाते हों, 2 डॉलर का लाते हों, लेकिन उससे हमारे देश के उत्पादक को क्या लाभ होगा? जहां से आपको सस्ता मिलेगा, आप तो वहां से लाएंगे। एक साहब ने मुझे बताया और कहने लगे कि साहब, आप क्या बात कर रहे हैं, देखिए वॉलमार्ट हिन्दुस्तान से कितना एक्सपोर्ट कर रहा है और चीन से कितना एक्सपोर्ट कर रहा है। आपके यहां इतने स्टोर्स भी नहीं हैं और चीन के यहां इतने स्टोर्स हैं। मैंने कहा कि अगर चीन में एक भी स्टोर नहीं होता, तो भी वॉलमार्ट वहां से खरीदता, क्योंकि वह सस्ता दे रहा है। यह कोई इस पर निर्भर नहीं करता है कि वहां वॉलमार्ट की कितनी chains हैं। वॉल मार्ट profit के लिए आता है। ये बड़ी मल्टीनेशनल्स, जो यहां आएंगी, वे लाभ के लिए आएंगी। वे हमें रोजगार देने के लिए नहीं आएंगी, वे हमारा development करने के लिए नहीं आएंगी। उनके किसी manifesto, किसी objective या किसी memorandum में यह नहीं लिखा है कि वे जिस देश में जाएंगी, वहां development करेंगी। कई बार तो ऐसा लगता है कि वह anti-development होंगी। यह क्या बातें कही जा रही है कि वह सस्ता देगा, कैसे सस्ता देगा! उसे तो सस्ता खरीदना है। इन कंपनियों का और सारे व्यापारियों का नियम यह है कि सस्ता खरीदो और महंगा बेचो और उसी से मुनाफा कमाओ। ये बड़ी मल्टीनेशनल्स जब आएंगी, ये chains खोलेंगी, तो यह कैसे होगा? अच्छा, फिर ये मुनाफा कमा कर कहां ले जाएंगी, अगर हिन्दुस्तान में भी रखें, तो भी समझ में आता है, यह तो बाहर जा रहा है। अभी मैं देख रहा था कि इसका investment and return ratio बहुत जबर्दस्त है। एक मिलियन डॉलर लगाने पर पांच मिलियन डॉलर का return कमाते हैं। इसका विश्लेषण किया जाए कि वे एक मिलियन डॉलर का investment यहां कर रहे हैं और उसमें से पांच मिलियन डॉलर return पैदा कर रहे हैं। क्या यह सस्ता देने से पैदा हो रहा है या मुनाफाखोरी करने से हो रहा है? इससे कितना repatriation होगा? कितनी power है उनके पास सस्ता खरीदने की? एक कंपनी है, जिसके पास पांच सौ बिलियन डॉलर का turn-over है, वह हाथ मरोड़ कर उत्पादक से bargain करती है, क्योंकि they have the bargaining power. उनसा में देना है, इस दाम में देना है, तो दो, नहीं तो मत दो। जगह-जगह की ऐसी रिपोर्ट्स हैं, जो वह बताती हैं कि उत्पादक परेशान हैं, क्योंकि इससे तो धीरे-धीरे 4-5 कंपनियों के हाथ में monopoly हो जाती है। क्या यह देश monopoly का समर्थक है? हमने तो monopoly तोड़ने का कानून पास किया था, मेरा ख्याल ठीक है। हमने monopoly तोड़ने का कानून पास किया था और monopolies बनाए जा रहे हैं। हमने Competition Commission बनाया है। इसमें कौन सी competition है। 2-4 कंपनियां मिल कर अपना तौर-तरीका ऐसा करेंगी कि किसी भी हालत में हिन्दुस्तान के आम आदमी को सस्ता नहीं मिलेगा। अगर शुरू में सस्ता भी मिलेगा, तो 2 साल, 4 साल, 5 साल बाद जब हिन्दुस्तानी प्रतिस्पर्द्धी समाप्त हो

जाएंगे, तो फिर दाम बेतहाशा बढ़ जाएंगे। इंग्लैंड में यह साफ कहा जा रहा है कि अब जो सामान इन बड़े chains से मिल रहा है, वह धीरे-धीरे अब 40 परसेंट ज्यादा कीमती है, बनिस्बत उन छोटी shops की, जिनके लिए कहा जा रहा है कि ये तो uneconomical हैं, inefficient हैं। फिर यह कहा जा रहा है कि यह बड़ी efficiency लाएगा। हां, लाएगा, कुछ दुकानों के लिए लाएगा, मुझे इसमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। मैं मान सकता हूँ कि इनमें computers होंगे, उनमें तरह-तरह की व्यवस्थाएं होंगी, लेकिन हमें यह विचार करना है कि क्या कुछ कौं efficiency और 16 करोड़ आदमियों का जीवन, किसकी efficiency, किसके लिए efficiency, किन आदमियों के लिए efficiency? यह जो आपका manifesto है, जिसमें आम आदमी के लाभ की बात कही जाती है, common man की बात कही जाती है, उसके लिए तो कोई efficiency इसमें नहीं है। एक बहुत छोटे सेक्शन के लिए, मैंने रिपोर्ट्स देखी हैं कि targets कौन से हैं, income level कौन-से हैं, कौन खरीदेगा? कौन-सा सामान खरीदेगा, वे तो इस निगाह से आ रहे हैं। क्या आप यह समझते हैं कि वे हिंदुस्तान के लोगों को लाभ पहुंचाने के लिए आ रहे हैं? महोदय, जहां 70 करोड़ आदमी आज हिंदुस्तान की देहात में रहता है, वहीं सारे यूरोप की आबादी 68 करोड़ है। हमारे कृषि क्षेत्र की आबादी 70 करोड़ है। हम किस तरफ जा रहे हैं? हम देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को किधर ले जाना चाहते हैं, किन लोगों के लिए ले जाना चाहते हैं, किसे फायदा पहुंचाना चाहते हैं? महोदय, यह सदन समूचे देश का प्रतिनिधित्व करता है और 70 करोड़ लोग इस सदन की तरफ निगाह से देखते हैं कि यह हमारे लिए क्या करना चाहता है, कौन-सी नीतियां बना रहा है? मुझे बड़े अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि यह जो नीति आ रही है, इस पर गंभीरता से विचार होना चाहिए। मैं फिर दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि अब किसी एक पार्टी का सवाल नहीं रह गया है। यह सारे देश के लिए गंभीरतापूर्वक विचार करने का सवाल है कि वैश्वीकरण के जो नुस्खे हम ने अपनाए थे, उन का लाभ किस को हुआ, कितना हुआ और कहां तक हुआ?

मैं एक और तथ्य आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। यह कहा जाता है कि इस से बहुत चॉइस होगी। दुनिया के तरह-तरह के सामान मिलेंगे। मैंने अक्सर यह देखा है, जब मैं पढ़ता था तो जो बच्चों के कपड़े भारतीय परिधान, भारतीय जलवायु और भारतीय रहन-सहन के मुताबिक होते थे। अब आप को जितने कपड़े मिलेंगे, वे वही मिलेंगे जो अमेरिकन डॉल्स पहनती हैं या जो डिजाइन चाइनीज या जापानीज बनाते हैं। वे तो वही बनाते हैं जिनकी खपत पश्चिमी देशों में है। आज आप के कपड़े बचपन से बदल दिए गए हैं। धीरे-धीरे वे आगे तक बदल देंगे। तो कपड़े बनाने वाले जो हिंदुस्तानी हैं, वे कहा जाएंगे? उन को वही सीखना है। वे हमें सुहाते हों, न सुहाते हों, वे हमारी जलवायु के मुताबिक हों या न हों, हम उसी को खरीदने के लिए मजबूर हैं। वे दो या तीन बड़ी भारी श्रृंखला वाले बनाएंगे और जो इंफॉर्मेशन टेक्नॉलोजी के करिश्में से विज्ञापन करेंगे। फिर आप के कपड़े वहीं हो जाएंगे।

भोजन के बारे में भी यही होगा। आप इस को न समझें कि उस की आदत भोजन पर नहीं आएगी। भोजन पर आएगी, कपड़े पर आएगी, संगीत पर आएगी। मैं आप को एक घटना बताना चाहता हूँ। मेरे पास तीन-चार साल पहले एक अमेरिकन विद्वान डा० ब्रजिस्की आए थे। मैं उन से सस्टेनेबल कंजप्शन की बात कर रहा था। उन्होंने कहा कि मैं इस से सहमत हूँ। मैंने कहा कि आप कैसे सहमत हैं? अमरीका में तो सस्टेनेबल कंजप्शन का सवाल ही नहीं है, वहां तो हैवी कंजप्शन का सवाल है। फिर उन्होंने एक घटना बतायी। उन्होंने कहा कि मैं एक दिन बैठा हुआ था तो मेरी पुत्री कहीं जाने के लिए निकली। मैंने उस से पूछ लिया कि बेटी कहां जा रही हो? उस ने कहा, बाजार जा रही हूँ। क्या खरीदना है, बोली पता नहीं। मैंने कहा कि पता नहीं और बाजार जा रही हो। फिर क्या जरूरत है तुम्हें? वह बोली जरूरत जब पता चलेगी जब मैं बाजार जाऊंगी और देखूंगी कि वहां क्या है। उस से मैं अपनी जरूरत पैदा करूंगी। मतलब यह कि उस के पास पैसा है और खर्च करना है। अब क्या खर्च करना है, किधर खर्च करना है, यह चॉइस उस के पास नहीं है। यह चॉइस इस पर है कि बाजार में क्या नई चीज आई, क्या नया माल आया है? अब उस की जरूरत है या नहीं है, लेकिन अच्छी लगती है और जेब में पैसा है, इसलिए खरीदो। तो क्या आप इस देश को इस कंजूमर सोसाइटी की तरफ ले जाना चाहते हैं जहां हम खुद अपनी जरूरत का निर्धारण न कर सकें? बाजार हमें हमारी जरूरत बताएगा, बाजार हमें क्या खाना है, यह बताएगा? बाजार हमें क्या पहनना है, यह बताएगा? बाजार हमें क्या सुनना है, यह बताएगा? आप कौनसी व्यवस्था की तरफ जा रहे हैं, ये सवाल गहरे सवाल हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस के जो सामाजिक परिणाम होंगे, उन पर गहराई से विचार किया जाना चाहिए। उस का आर्थिक परिणाम है, बेरोजगारी। अगर यह बेरोजगारी पहले से फैली हुई उग्र हिंसा के तत्वों की निगाह में आ गयी तो मैं नहीं जानता कि इस के कितने विस्फोटक परिणाम होंगे।

मैं सरकार को और सभी पार्टियों को बहुत विनम्रता से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस बेरोजगारी को रोकने के बजाय बढ़ाने की तरफ मत जाइए वरना इस के परिणाम भारी खतरनाक होंगे। फिर हमें उस से निपटना मुश्किल हो जाएगा। महोदय, यह कहा जाता है कि यह जो व्यवस्था है इस में अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर प्लेयर्स हमारे यहां आएंगे और हमारे यहां कंपटीशन होगा, हमारी एफिसिएंसी बढ़ेगी वगैरा-वगैरा। मेरे सामने 2003 में Cornell University के रिसर्च पेपर्स हैं। अब मैं उससे उद्धृत कर रहा हूँ। ये मुझे इसी सरकार के एक पुराने कैबिनेट सचिव श्री टी०एस०आर० सुब्रहमण्यम ने भेजा है। कहते हैं:

A Cornell University research paper (2003), after studying the impact of entry of foreign retailers in Latin American and Asian countries has inter-alia mentioned the following comments: "It is likely that retail modernisation will also have negative consequences for traditional retailers, producers, and distributors. As modernisation serves to

concentrate a fragmented food system, "it is also conceivable that eventually a concentrated food sector would result in higher food costs and less choice." A key note speech at an International Conference on "Supermarkets and Agricultural Development in China: Opportunities and Challenges" at Shanghai in 2004, has referred to the impact of the entry of leading marketing chains in developing countries, leading to "shifts towards centralised procurement system (shifting from traditional wholesale markets to use of large distribution centers); shift towards cross-border sourcing; shift towards specialised/dedicated wholesalers; use of multinational global logistics and the shift to preferred supplier systems". There is also a mention that "Product quality and safety" are used as "competitive arms against small shops and markets". It has also concluded that the "resultant requirements are often tough for small farms and firms to meet, and there is evidence of exclusion of these players." A year 2000 study by the US Centre for Applied Economic Research, focusing on War-Mart found that there is a "strong impact on small business in rural communities, on employment rates, sales and the environment of small towns through the effects of neighbouring 'big box' retail chains. "Studies have shown that small towns lose up to 47% of the retail trade after the War-Mart town nearby. (Time-bell) "The new position of powerful mega-retail chains, discounters or otherwise, was not to augment but to compete. Obviously, this puts the small retailers at a disadvantage, specially as these wholesalers lose more and more business".

अब कहा जा रहा है कि हम रिटेल में...। सर, यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विषय है। मैं डेढ़ सोल से इसके लिए आवाज़ उठा रहा हूँ। मैं चाहूंगा कि इस पर पूरी चर्चा होनी चाहिए। इसमें समय की ऐसी पाबंदी नहीं हो कि ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सीताराम बेचुरी (पश्चिमी बंगाल): इसे ढाई साल से उठाते तो बेहतर होता ...(व्यवधान)...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: जी, यह अच्छा होता ...(व्यवधान)...हमें जहाँ उठना था, हम तब भी उठा रहे थे। ...(व्यवधान)... लेकिन तब आप क्या कर रहे थे, यह देखने की बात है। ... (व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Joshiji, others also have to speak. Please conclude.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: येचुरी जी, मुझे अच्छा लगेगा कि जो हम कर रहे हैं, आप वही करें।

...(व्यवधान)... आप बाकी पर भी धीरे-धीरे करेंगे। ...(व्यवधान)... न्यूक्लीयर पर आपने किया, इस पर किया ...(व्यवधान)... बाकी पर भी धीरे-धीरे करेंगे।

इस तरह यह कहा जा रहा है कि हम तो सिंगल ब्रांड का रिटेल कर रहे हैं, हम तो पूरा नहीं खोल रहे हैं। तो सिंगल ब्रांड की डिफिनिशन क्या है, सिंगल ब्रांड का मतलब क्या है? हमारे ही देश में एक कम्पनी आईटीसी है, जिसका एक ट्रेड मार्क है—विल्स। विल्स एक ब्रांड है। उससे सिगरेट भी बिकती है और उससे कपड़े भी बिकते हैं। मुकद्मा किया गया कि कपड़े का नाम विल्स कैसे हो सकता है, विल्स तो सिगरेट का ट्रेड मार्क है, इसके नाम पर कपड़े कैसे मिल सकते हैं? न्यायपालिका ने इस पर निर्णय दे दिया कि विल्स तो विल्स है, वह सिगरेट नहीं है। लिहाजा मुकद्मा कम्पनी के पक्ष में चला गया। लेकिन यह सवाल तो उठेगा कि आप जो यह ब्रांड बना रहे हैं, तो अम्ब्रेला ब्रांड बना लेंगी कम्पनियां, किसको पता है? आज कोई कम्पनी है, जो कॉस्मेटिक्स बना रही है, उदाहरण के लिए मैं कहता हूँ—लैक्मे। वह कॉस्मेटिक्स बना रही है, पर कल को वह अपने ब्रांड में दलिया भी बनाए, Wafers बनाए, तो क्या आप उसे रोकेंगे? वह कॉफी, चॉकलेट बनाए या इलेक्ट्रॉनिक गुड्स भी बनाए, तो क्या आप उसे रोकेंगे? आपने तो सिर्फ इतना ही कहा है कि जहां वे बनती हैं, वहीं और आपकी कम्पनी के द्वारा वह सर्टिफाइड हो कि यह आप ही का ब्रांड है, इतना पर्याप्त है। इस तरह आपने सिंगल ब्रांड की डिफिनिशन नहीं दी कि सिंगल ब्रांड का मतलब क्या है? ब्रांड का मतलब क्या है और सिंगल ब्रांड का मतलब क्या है? उसके अन्दर कौन—सी चीजें आएंगी और कौन सी चीजें नहीं आएंगी, यह कहीं डिफाइन्ड नहीं है, यह आपके गाइडलाइन्स में भी डिफाइन्ड नहीं है। अभी तो आपने होलसेल की इजाजत दे रखी है, वही काफी खतरनाक है। उससे जो Chains बनेंगी, वह कल और चीजें भी बेचने के काम में आएंगी। एक बार इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर बन गया, तो फिर उसमें घुसने में दिक्कत नहीं होती। वहां अगर एक सुई के बराबर भी छेद होता है, तो मल्टिनेशनल्स उसको बहुत गहरा छेद बना लेती हैं, उसके अन्दर आदमी घुस सकता है। उनके अन्दर इतना छेद करने की क्षमता रहती है। इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि यह सिंगल ब्रांड का मतलब क्या है? इस तरह की शब्दावली का प्रयोग करके आप सदन को और देश को क्या बताना चाहते हैं? यह क्या भ्रम-जाल पैदा हो रहा है? बात साफ होनी चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Joshiji, actually, your time was 31 minutes, and that is over. ...(Interruptions)...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: मैं जानता हूँ कि यह सवाल बहुत अनकंफर्टेबल है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): But, the problem is, the total time is 2 hours 30 minutes. The number of speakers is ...(Interruptions).... No, no. There are other Members who have to speak on this. The total time allotted to it is only 2 hours 30 minutes.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: यह देश के 70-80 करोड़ लोगों से जुड़ा हुआ सवाल है। ... (व्यवधान) ... सच बात तो यह है कि इस पर पिछले ही सत्र में बात हुई थी और आज यह अंतिम दिन बहस हो रही है।

उपाध्यक्ष (प्रो० पी०जे० कुरियन): देखिए, लेकिन the problem is, the total time is 2 hours 30 minutes. The number of speakers is ... (Interruptions) ...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: मुझे मालूम है, चर्चाएं सदन में होती हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): How many more minutes would you take? Please conclude. You have made all important points. ... (Interruptions) ... Joshiji, please conclude in two-three minutes. ... (Interruptions) ... I am helpless. ... (Interruptions) ... I have to allow everybody.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपको बहुत विनम्रता पूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें ऐसी पाबंदी उचित नहीं है। यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विषय है। हम तो नहीं टोकते, ऐसे मामलों में, जब इम्पोर्टेंट बात होती है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): The total time is only 2 hours 30 minutes. Every party has to be given a chance to speak. ... (Interruptions) ...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: सर, अब हमको यह कहा गया है कि सरकार इस मामले में देखेगी, वैसे कहा गया है कि छोटे दुकानदारों पर कोई वज्रपात न हो। यह कैसे देखेगी? इसका तो कोई इलाज नहीं किया गया। उनके लिए क्या व्यवस्था करेगी? इसका तो कोई इलाज नहीं किया गया। आज यह दुर्भाग्य से स्थिति है। साथ ही यह कहा जा रहा है कि हमारे आईटी सेक्टर में और बीपीओस में बहुत तरक्की हुई है। इसमें क्यो नहीं हो सकती? हो सकती है। कब? जबकि आप अपने देश के उत्पाद को पहले सुदृढ़ करें, उसकी क्वालिटी ठीक करें, उसकी कोस्ट एफिसिएंसी बढ़ाएं। इसके लिए अगर हम कुछ कर सकें, अपने उत्पाद को, अपनी क्वालिटी को ठीक कर सकें और अपनी प्राइसेस को नीचे रख सकें, तब तो हम इस कंपटीशन में खड़े हो सकेंगे, अन्यथा नहीं हो सकेंगे। हम अगर इसके लिए कुछ भी नहीं कर रहे हैं, तो हम इन छोटे दुकानदारों के साथ-साथ अपने उत्पादकों के लिए भी कठिनाइयां पैदा कर रहे हैं। उनका समान नहीं बिकेगा। मैं बहुत विनम्रता से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस दिन यह होगा, उस दिन विदेशी समान हमारे यहां सस्ता आएगा और हमारे उत्पादक भी ठंडे हो जाएंगे। न केवल रिटेल शॉप-कीपर्स बल्कि हमारे प्रोड्यूसर्स भी इसमें सफर करेंगे। यह सिंगल ब्रांड वाला मसला मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। यह

बिल्कुल वह चीज है, जिस के माध्यम से इन तमाम कुरीतियों को इस देश की अर्थव्यवस्था में लाने का रास्ता खोला जा रहा है। भगवान के वास्ते जो हमारी हजारों सालों से चली आ रही अर्थव्यवस्था थी, विकेन्द्रित प्रणाली थी, उसको नष्ट मत कीजिए। भारतीय मॉडल दुनिया में जाएं, वह हमें करना चाहिए। हमारे मॉडल में कोई कमी न हो, उसको सुधारने और आधुनिक बनाने के लिए, अधिक कुशल बनाने के लिए सरकार उपाय करे। हम उसमें मदद करेंगे, लेकिन अगर उसको नष्ट करने की कोशिश की जाएगी, तो जितनी हमारी शक्ति है उससे हम इसका विरोध करेंगे। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Now, Shri Sitaram Yechury.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, how much time?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Actually, the time is eight minutes. ... (*Interruptions*)... But, try to conclude within that. ... (*Interruptions*)...

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: सबसे पहले तो मैं शुक्रगुजार हूँ।

SHRI PENUMALLI MADHU (Andhra Pradesh): Please speak in English.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Yes, I will come to English. डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी जी, मैं आपको इसलिए टोक रहा था, जो आप कह रहे थे कि आप ये बातें रखने के लिए डेढ़ साल से इंतजार कर रहे थे, मैं चाह रहा था कि आप ढाई साल से विचार करते, जब आप सरकार में थे और तब यह बातें कहते, तो हमारा पूरा समर्थन रहता और सिलसिला यहां तक नहीं पहुंचता।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: मेरे ख्याल में अब तो समर्थन करेंगे।

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: बिल्कुल, वही मैं कहने वाला हूँ। आप आपने कई सारी आर्ग्युमेंट्स गिनाई, इसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ and the reason—since you have asked me to speak in English—Sir, why I am rising to express my concern and urge the Government not to proceed with this process of opening up the retail trade sector to the FDI is because it has very serious consequences and implications not only for the economy but also for the people and the future of the country. Why I say this, Sir, is that the FDI in the retail sector must be distinguished from the FDI in the manufacturing sector. In the manufacturing sector, we, the CPI(M), have been saying very clearly that FDI that comes into our country will have to satisfy three conditions. These

conditions are that first, it should augment our productive capacities; second, it should upgrade India and Indian economy technologically; third, it should enlarge employment opportunities. If these conditions are met—some people from the Treasury Benches have alluded by implication that we are also welcoming the FDI in the States where we have our Governments, but that welcome is on the basis of these three conditions and we would want this Government, Sir, also to publicly announce to the world that India will welcome FDI coming in if you accept these three conditions and that will be good for the country and also for the future of the UPA Government. That is what ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): You are giving an example of West Bengal...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: No, because there was a reference made. *(Interruptions)* I am giving you the example of West Bengal because...

AN HON. MEMBER: Otherwise you will meet the same consequences...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा): केरल में भी। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: केरल में भी शुरू हो रहा है, केरल में भी करेंगे *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): If you get diverted by these comments, then you will be losing time. So, stick to your point.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, the only point I am saying is, the FDI, on these three conditions is useful for our country and we can also benefit from it. These three conditions, which the Government has not yet announced for the rest of the country while we are doing it in the States where we are in Government, but for the rest of the country, if they do it, it will be good. But in the retail sector, opening up of FDI will directly affect your existing employment—forget enlarging it further. In the National Common Minimum Programme, we have laid emphasis on the fact of enlarging employment opportunities and by adopting any move which will shrink employment opportunities, I think, we are going directly contrary to our own spirit that is there and, therefore, that is the first reason why I would like to urge this Government not to proceed with this.

The second reason why I would like to buttress my argument on the basis of the fact is that the retail trade, Sir, today accounts for about

10-11 per cent of our country's GDP. It is, by far, after agriculture, one of the largest contributors to the country's GDP. And, actually, the total retail trade within the unorganised sector accounts to over 90 per cent of your workforce. In this situation, while you have a situation where in the organised sector there has been a decline in employment, which the Planning Commission's Mid-Term Review has clearly stated, the absorption of employment and particularly in the rural areas for people to be employed has come mainly from the retail sector. So, the retail sector acts, also, as a social security net. It is not merely in terms of employment which it generates, but it also acts as a social security net for the rural areas and curtailing that will have a very adverse impact on the rural areas in our country.

Next, what I would like to emphasise in this House, through you, Sir, is the fact that we have an entity called "own account enterprise". Own account enterprises, actually, are non-agricultural enterprises, and own account enterprise of this nature which fall within the realm of retail trade, in the rural areas, it is 42.5 per cent and in the urban areas, it goes up to 34.3 per cent. If all these facts taken into account, what is the net result? Today, you have 7.36 million workers in these non-agricultural establishments of which 10.3 per cent of the employment is in the non-agricultural establishments in the rural areas and 17.4 per cent in the urban areas. 10.3 per cent in the rural areas and 17.4 in the urban areas, and this is the workforce size that is employed in the sector. Anything that you do to this particular sector that is going to shrink employment base will have a very, very bad effect that will fall on our work force, and this I am saying, precisely, because you have in India, today, 54 per cent of our population living below the age of 25. It is this youth between the ages of 18 and 25. If you are not able to provide them employment and a future contribution to our economic well being, it is this youth which, instead of becoming an asset, can turn itself into a liability for the country. Instead of turning this into an asset by providing greater employment, if you are going to make victims of social conditions in which there is no other alternative for them, that will be the worst thing that will happen to the future of India. Therefore, I want this to be kept in mind. Secondly, the argument that is often given that if you have—Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi touched many of these aspects and I would not repeat them—an expansion of these multinational corporations coming into your retail trade, with your big depart-

mental stores, we are often told that that will also lead to greater employment generation. About this I would like to inform the House, Sir, on the basis of the calculations that have been undertaken in our country—If you want I can give you the details, but since I am sure you will ring the bell, so I am not going into those facts—I would only put conclusions that the study has come forward with. The annual turnover per employee in Wall-Mart International Departmental Stores—this is from the Wall-Mart study—is nearly 95 times that of the average annual turnover per employee in the Indian retail sector—95 times is the actual difference. So, in other words, for every one person employed in Wall-Mart, 95 people are employed in our country already and that if you replace this retail trade with that sort of departmental stores, you just look at the scale at which you are displacing people. This, as I said, will have its negative consequences, and, therefore, I urge the Government to reconsider if they are planning to go ahead in this direction. There is one another important issue, Sir. One is the question of contribution of this sector to our GDP and the second question is the contribution of this sector to our employment. On both these scores, opening up this sector for foreign direct investment will have adverse implications and that will not be beneficial for the country. It will be worse for the country and its people. Therefore, on these two counts, alone we should reject it. But you come to the third aspect and the third aspect has been on the predatory practices of these companies and what has been said here, Sir. Sometimes, argument is given that when you have these big departmental stores, our farmers will gain because they will buy their produce and on the basis of that our farmers' income will increase, and, therefore, it is good for us. Now what does the FAO study tell us? I am quoting from a study of the FAO. It says, "Farmers experience many problems in supplying supermarkets in Asia and in some cases this has already been reflected in fairly rapid declines in the numbers involved. As the companies tend to de-list suppliers who do not come up to expectations in terms of volume, quality and delivery." And the FAO study tells you that the farmers who are contracted by these stores often are at the receiving end and instead of their incomes growing up, they tend to have income decline and future insecurity in terms of their produce being sold. This is what FAO study tells you, Sir. Further, I would like to only expose this point that this is an illusion created that if these big stores buy, our producers in the third world countries who are producing raw materials will gain more. Now, what the same study tells

you, Sir, is that a coco farmer in Ghana gets only 3.9 per cent of the typical milk chocolate bar while the retail margin is around 34 per cent. Banana producer gets around 5 per cent of the final price of the banana while 34 per cent goes into your retail market. Even with jeans, which is one of the things that is sold through these high end stores, the manufacturing worker who produces actually gets 12 per cent of the total sale price of that garment. Now, this is the exploitation of the workforce that takes place. So, it is not that because of these big chains, the workers are going to gain much. Unfortunately, many of you in the morning when you go for a walk, you wear Nike shoes and the Nike shoes' cost of production is five dollars, that is what the worker who produces it gets, and it is sold anywhere close to, depending on in which country you are—between 50 dollars and 100 dollars. So, these are the margins that are there in the retail trade and the people who are at the receiving end are the working people for whom there are depressed wages and depressed living conditions. Many more of them are out of employment altogether. So, it is these practices that are there which we should also keep in mind. It is not as though that because of these stores coming in—Dr. Joshi talked about culture that they bring around, that is true ... (*Time-bell*) I will just conclude. The sort of culture that they bring about, I really want to tell you that it is not only a question of advertising, with due respect, you do not mind, if I quote Karl Marx here who has been voted as intellectual of the second millennium, Sir, I hope you do not object to it... But he said one thing very, very significant. He said this system, i.e., capitalism "produces not only the object for the subject but it also produces the subjects for the object" and it is the subjects that are being produced. And we all have been produced as subjects for purchasing what they produce as the objects and it is no longer far satisfying my need that they are producing, contrary I am being produced to satisfy their needs. It is that culture which, I think, is completely alien to absolute human civilisation and civilisational ethos and that is something that we will have to bear in mind. Finally, Sir, I only urge the Minister and the Government that let us not open up the retail sector in FDI through back door methods. Why I am saying back door is because you have allowed it in the wholesale sector. The earlier Government allowed it. But that in itself has the seepages, through which, it is entering the retail sector. Now, Sir, the largest eatable that is sold in London today, I believe, is your chicken *tikka* sandwich by Marks and Spencer. Marks and Spencer

is selling sandwiches. Marks and Spencer sells you clothes. It sells you electronic goods. It sells you everything. If there is a single brand coming, from sandwiches to shoes to clothes to electronic goods, it is all Marks and Spencer brand. So if a single brand also comes in with such a large canvas, then, you are virtually opening up the FDI in the retail sector in the name of single brand. You are actually, virtually opening it. Therefore, keeping all this in mind Sir, I seriously urge the Government to sincerely consider this aspect that let us not take decisions that are violative of the very National Common Minimum Programme on the basis of which this Government exists. Let us not violate our promises to the *aam admi* that we have given that we will generate greater employment and improve his livelihood. Let us also protect our domestic produce, our mom and dad shops as they are called, our retail trade on which crores of people survive and in the interest of India, in the interest of its people, I think, this policy direction must be reversed and the Government must take it back in the interest of our country.

श्री बनवारी लाल कंचाल (उत्तर प्रदेश): माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, खुदरा व्यापार के नाम पर आज बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियों को यहां पर बुलाकर यहां के व्यापार को बर्बाद करने की साजिश की जा रही है। मैं उस विषय में एक खुदरा व्यापारी का बेटा होने के नाते अपनी बात कहने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं। उपसभापति महोदय, हिन्दुस्तान में आज व्यापार में 16 करोड़ लोग लगे हुए हैं। जो खुदरा व्यापार की बात कही जा रही है, खुदरा व्यापार में एफ॰डी॰आई॰ आएंगी, मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि खुदरा व्यापार में ही नहीं आएंगी इससे होलसेल व्यापार भी प्रभावित होगा, लघु उद्यमी भी प्रभावित होंगे, क्योंकि जो बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियां यहां पर आएंगी वे यहां का उत्पादन नहीं खरीदकर जहां से उनको सस्ता मिलेगा-चायना से, जर्मनी से, जापान से, वहां से वे मंगाएंगी, क्योंकि वे यहां पर लाभ कमाने के लिए आ रही हैं। इसलिए खुदरा व्यापार की बात कहना बेइमानी है। मैं स्पष्ट रूप से बताना चाहता हूं कि बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियां हमारे थोक व्यापार को भी प्रभावित करेंगी। वाणिज्य मंत्री जी बैठे हैं, मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि अगर दिल्ली से किसी बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनी का शोरूम खुलता है तो क्या वे निरमा के डिस्ट्रीब्यूटर से साबुन खरीदना पसंद करेंगे? क्या हिन्दुस्तान लोवर के डिस्ट्रीब्यूटर से साबुन खरीदना पसंद करेंगे और अगर हिन्दुस्तान लोवर के डिस्ट्रीब्यूटर से माल नहीं खरीदेंगे और चायना और जर्मनी से साबुन मंगाएंगे तो क्या हमारे डिस्ट्रीब्यूटर का व्यापार प्रभावित नहीं होगा? डिस्ट्रीब्यूटर की लाइन में लाखों की संख्या में जितने लोग लगे हुए हैं, क्या वे बेरोजगार नहीं हो जाएंगे? इसलिए खुदरा व्यापार की बात कहना बेमानी है, यह केवल उस्तावा है, यह केवल भ्रम में डाला जा रहा है। अगर विदेशी कम्पनियां आएंगी तो खुदरा व्यापार को बर्बाद करेंगी, थोक व्यापार भी बर्बाद होगा और हमारे लघु उद्योग

भी बर्बाद होंगे और यहां के बड़े उद्योग और मीडियम उद्योग भी बेरोजगार और बर्बाद होंगे। यह कहा जा रहा है कि सस्ता माल मिलेगा। माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे अभी अमेरिका, पेरिस और फ्रांस जाने का मौका मिला। वहां मैं हेरोड डिपार्टमेंटल स्टोर में गया और वहां के मालिक से मैंने बात की। मैंने कहा कि आपका मार्जन क्या है? उन्होंने कहा कि रिटेल में हम 60 से 70 परसेंट का मार्जन रखते हैं। हमने कहा कि इतना ज्यादा क्यों रखते हैं? उन्होंने कहा कि यहां इतनी बिजली, इतने नौकर, इतने चाकर, दो बार सफाई होती है, इतने कम्प्यूटर लगे हुए हैं और कम्प्यूटर का हिसाब करने वाली तितलियां यहां पर बैठी हुई हैं। और इनका पैसा कहां से आयेगा? उपसभापति महोदय, मैं अभी केदारनाथ की यात्रा पर गया था। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि केदारनाथ की यात्रा के दौरान मुझे केदारनाथ में चाय दो रुपया कप मिली और दिल्ली में चाय 3 रुपया कप मिलती है, जबकि वहां चीनी जाती है खच्चर से, चाय जाती है खच्चर से, दूध जाता है खच्चर से। केदारनाथ में चाय 2 रुपया कप और दिल्ली में चाय 3 रुपया कप मिलती है। हिन्दुस्तान का व्यापारी सबसे कम मुनाफे पर काम करता है। हम नेपाल में गये, हमने नेपाल में झंडे गाड़ दिये, हम इंडोनेशिया में गये, इंडोनेशिया में झंडे गाड़ दिये। मित्तल साहब इंग्लैंड में गये, उन्होंने सारे इस्पात का साम्राज्य अपने कब्जे में कर लिया। मैं डंके की चोट पर कहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान की तुलना से कम मुनाफे पर, विदेशों का कोई व्यापारी काम नहीं करता है। दस रुपया तोला सोना हम पांच रुपया तोले पर बेच देते हैं। चीनी का बोरा 1700 रुपये का केवल खाली बोरे के मुनाफे पर बेच देते हैं। मान्यवर, वनस्पति धी की टीन साढ़े छह सौ रुपये की हम आठ आने टीन के मुनाफे पर बेचते हैं। हम कम से कम मुनाफे पर व्यापार करते हैं जबकि पूरे संसार में कोई भी व्यापार जगत नहीं है, जो हिन्दुस्तान के व्यापारियों से कम मुनाफे पर काम करता हो और इसीलिए हिन्दुस्तान के ये आंकड़े गवाह हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान का व्यापारी, हिन्दुस्तान का उद्यमी जिस-जिस देश में गया, चाहे मारीशस में गया हो, चाहे जापान में गया हो, चाहे जर्मनी में गया हो, चाहे अमेरिका में गया हो, वहां के व्यापार पर हमने पकड़ बनाई है और वहां के व्यापार पर कब्जा करने का प्रयास किया है। इसलिए यह असत्य अफवाहें फैलाई जा रही है। कि जो विदेशी कम्पनियां आयेंगी, वे सस्ता सामान हिन्दुस्तान में बेचेंगी। वे सस्ता सामान हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं बेचेंगी, वे हिन्दुस्तान को और हिन्दुस्तानियों को लूटने का काम करेंगी। इसलिए विदेशी कम्पनियों को देश में लाना, हिन्दुस्तान को गिरवी रखने के बराबर है।

उपसभापति महोदय, यह कहा जा रहा है कि इससे रोजगार बढ़ेगा और उत्पादन बढ़ेगा। क्या माननीय मंत्री जी यह बातें करेंगे कि आपने उन पर यह पाबंदी लगा दी है कि जो विदेशी कम्पनियां आयेंगी, वे केवल हिन्दुस्तान के उत्पादन का ही माल खरीदेंगी, विदेशों का माल नहीं खरीदेंगी, क्या यह आपने शर्त लगाई है? अगर ऐसी शर्त लगाते हैं, तो भी मैं इससे सहमत नहीं हूं, इसलिए सहमत नहीं हूं कि हमारे देश के उद्यमी क्या करेंगे? हम कहते हैं कि हवाई जहाज विदेश के लोग

3.00 P.M.

आकर बनायें, रेल का डिब्बा तो हमारे देश के लोग दूसरे देशों में जाकर बना रहे हैं। आज हमारे देश में उद्यमियों की कमी नहीं है, इसलिए हमारे छोटे-छोटे उद्योगों में भी आकर वे दखलअंदाजी करेंगे और उनको उजाड़ने का काम करेंगे।

आज चीन की सरकार अपने उद्योगों को इतना बढ़ावा दे रही है कि आज आप दिल्ली के किसी भी बाजार में चले जाइये, चीन के सामान से बाजार पटा हुआ है। हम इंग्लैंड गये, तो वहां मिली हिन्दुस्तान के हल्दीराम की भुजिया, हल्दीराम के रसगुल्ले, लेकिन साइकिल मिली, तो चीन की मिली, घड़ी मिली तो चीन की मिली, पैन मिला तो चीन का मिला। हम पैन में भी चीन से पिछड़ गये हैं, हम रबड़ की पैसिल में भी चीन से पिछड़ गये हैं, हम इसको बना नहीं पा रहे हैं। आज हम पापड़ और भुजिया, आचार और मुरब्बा बनाने के लिए विदेशी कम्पनियों को अपने देश में आमंत्रित कर रहे हैं। क्या वे देश में आकर रोजगार बढ़ायेंगी, वे कैसे रोजगार बढ़ायेंगी? मैं मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि वे कैसे रोजगार बढ़ायेंगी? 16 करोड़ लोग रोजगार में लगे हुए हैं और विदेशी डिपार्टमेंटल स्टोर बीघों में होता है, दिल्ली में कोई दुकान, दिल्ली तो बहुत बड़ा शहर है, हमारे लगभग में कोई दुकान 500 स्क्वायर फीट से ज्यादा बड़ी नहीं है। उपसभापति जी, हमने हैरॉल्ड को अगर का में देखा, कम से कम नहीं 2 लाख स्क्वायर फीट का शोरूम और 25 मंजिल को शोरूम और एक-एक मंजिल पर पांच-पांच सौ दुकानें। खुदरा बाजार में अगर एफडीआई को आमंत्रित किया गया, तो इसका सीधा सा अर्थ होगा कि जिन फ़ैक्ट्रियों को हमने भगाया है, महात्मा गांधी का यह देश है, राम मनोहर लोहिया का यह देश है, चौधरी चरण सिंह का यह देश है, भगत सिंह और सुभाष की कुर्बानी बेकार हो जायेगी, अगर ये वॉलमार्ट जैसी कम्पनियां हिन्दुस्तान में प्रवेश करेंगी। इनके आने का मतलब होगा या तो हम उन कम्पनियों के बरतन साफ करेंगे उनकी डिपार्टमेंटल स्टोर्स में या तो हमारे व्यापारी वहां झाड़ू लगायेंगे, हमारे व्यापारी उनकी चौकरी करेंगे या हम बेरोजगार हो जायेंगे। हमारे व्यापारियों की, गरीब व्यापारियों की रोजी-रोटी छीनने की यह तैयारी है। यह जो चकाचौंध, वॉलमार्ट चकाचौंध ला रहे हैं, Harrods वाले चकाचौंध ला रहे हैं। क्या इससे देश में फिजूलखर्ची नहीं बढ़ेगी? मैं समझता हूं कि इससे फिजूलखर्ची बढ़ेगी।

उपसभापति महोदय, क्या इससे भ्रष्टाचार नहीं बढ़ेगा? आज हमारे मोहल्ले में अगर दो आदमी जाकर के किसी मॉल से माल खरीद लाते हैं, तो पूरे मोहल्ले में यह हो जाता है कि हम भी उस मॉल से माल खरीद कर लायेंगे। और जो माल से माल खरीदकर नहीं लाया, उसका स्तर नीचा ... (समय की वंटी) ... सर, मैं केवल दो मिनट और लूंगा। न मेरे पास कोई आंकड़े हैं, न मेरे पास कोई किताब है, मेरे पास व्यापारियों का दर्द है, 16 करोड़ व्यापारियों का दर्द, इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं और मैं केवल दो मिनट ज्यादा लेना चाहता हूं। हमारे देश में भ्रष्टाचार क्यों बढ़ा? हमारे पास कोठी हो जाए, हमारे पास पड़ोसी की तरह तीन गाड़ियां हो जाएं, हमारे पास सोने, चांदी, हीरे,

जवाहरात के गहने हो जाएं, भ्रष्टाचार इससे बढ़ा। जिन चीजों की हमें जरूरत नहीं-जैसा अभी जोशी जी ने कहा, हमारी संस्कृति बदल जाएगी, हमारे संस्कार बदल जाएंगे-आइसक्रीम खाने की हमें आदत नहीं थी। हमें आइसक्रीम खाने की आदत डाल दी गयी है कि खाना खाने के बाद हमें बीस रुपए की आइसक्रीम खानी है। चाहे हमारी जेब में पैसा हो या न हो, चाहे हमें डकैती डालनी हो और अगर कोई कर्मचारी है तो चाहे वह रिश्वत लेकर आए, चाहे वह फाइल रोककर, किसी का गला काटकर पैसे लेकर आए परन्तु आइसक्रीम खाने के लिए उसको पैसा लाना है। इसलिए अगर विदेशियों की शर्त्स हमें खरीदनी हैं, विदेशियों का कपड़ा हमें खरीदना है तो वह महंगा मिलेगा, सस्ता नहीं मिलेगा। आज हमारे यहां लखनऊ में एक 'सहारा गंज' खुला हुआ है। चाहे देसी हो या विदेशी हो, चाहे टाय हो, बिरला हो या मुकेश अम्बानी हो, किसी का भी खुदरा व्यापार में हस्तक्षेप हमारी समाजवादी पार्टी बर्दाश्त करने वाली नहीं है। समाजवादी पार्टी चाहती है कि छोटे-छोटे व्यापारी अपना व्यापार स्वच्छंद होकर करें।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल (महाराष्ट्र): सहारा के खिलाफ बोल रहे हो न।..(व्यवधान)।..

श्री बनवारी लाल कंचाल: मैं सबके खिलाफ बोल रहा हूं, मैं अपनी बात कह रहा हूं, आप सुनिए।..(व्यवधान)।.. कोई हो, देसी-विदेशी, कोई हो, सहारा कोई हमारा बाप नहीं है, व्यापारी मरेगा तो हमारा मरेगा। हां, मैं कहना चाहता हूं-राजीव जी, आप मेरी बात सुनिए-हम सबकी बात कहना चाहते हैं। हम खुदरा व्यापार में किसी भी बड़े पूंजीपति के खिलाफ हैं। छोटी दुकान हम करेंगे। 16 करोड़ व्यापारी इस देश को आगे बढ़ाने का काम कर रहे हैं। हम 70 परसेंट राजस्व दे रहे हैं, हम 76 परसेंट नौकरियां इस देश को दे रहे हैं।..(व्यवधान)।.. पान की दुकान में भी एक छोटा पान की पुड़िया बांधने वाला बैठा होता है। इसलिए हम कहना चाहते हैं कि जो व्यापारी समाज ..(व्यवधान)।..

श्री राजीव शुक्ल: परमिशन ले ली आपने? ..(व्यवधान)।..

श्री बनवारी लाल कंचाल: राजीव जी, सुनिए। जो व्यापारी समाज 70 परसेंट राजस्व दे रहा है, एक लाख करोड़ रुपया सर्विस टैक्स दे रहा है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Conclude please.

श्री बनवारी लाल कंचाल: 76 परसेंट नौकरियां दे रहा है, 90 प्रतिशत धर्मशाला, मंदिर, मस्जिद, गुरुद्वारे, अस्पताल बनवा रहा है, सरस्वती शिशु मंदिर बनवा रहा है, ऐसे व्यापारियों के पेट पर लात मारने का काम यह सरकार न करे। ये जो विदेशी कम्पनियां आएंगी, ये हमें बेरोजगार करेंगी, ये हमारा हक छीनेंगी, ये हमारी रोज़ी-रोटी छीनेंगी, ये हमारे मुंह का निवाला छीनेंगी। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि इस विषय पर पूरे दिन भर की डिबेट होनी चाहिए, पूरे दिन भर की बहस होनी चाहिए और जो लोग बोलना चाहते हैं, 15 मिनट, 20 मिनट, आधा घंटा, उन्हें बोलने दिया जाए,

आप घंटी मत बजाइए। घंटी तो हमारी यह कांग्रेस की सरकार, ये लोग बैठे हुए हैं, हमारे व्यापारियों की घंटी तो ये बजाने ही चाले हैं, इन विदेशी कम्पनियों को बुलाकर। इसलिए मान्यवर, मैं आपसे हाथ जोड़कर विनती करना चाहता हूँ कि इन विदेशी कम्पनियों को आने से रोकिए, अपने देश के व्यापार को बचाइए और 16 करोड़ व्यापारियों की रोजी-रोटी छीनने का कार्य न कीजिए। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल: आज आप बहुत अच्छा बोले।

श्री बनवारी लाल कंचाल: मैंने जो बोला, सही बोला, सच बोलूंगा।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल: पूछकर बोला या नहीं बोला?(व्यवधान)...

श्री बनवारी लाल कंचाल: हमारे नेता मुलायम सिंह जी का कहना है कि(व्यवधान)...

श्री रत्ननारायण पाणि: आप लोग(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष: पाणि जी, प्लीज़। शुक्ल जी... (व्यवधान)... बैठिए, प्लीज़।
Mr. Narayanan, please start. They are taking your time.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, at the outset, I oppose the foreign direct investments in the retail establishments. The Foreign Investment Promotion Board made an attempt to remove the flats of local players and went on to say that they made this stronger by adopting modern technology and management practices, when faced with foreign competition. Thus, this observation is ridiculous because our local entrepreneurs would be handicapped economically to adopt modern technology. This aspect has to be considered seriously by the Government, before allowing the FDI in the retail sector. The retail trade is one of the oldest businesses in the country, which has been established all over the country. Retail trade has established a network of shops; supply chains extending to the length and breadth of our country. Sir, these shops, which sell products ranging from pencils to pocket computers, have established rapport with the local community also. Ninety-five per cent of the people are used to buying their daily necessities and provisions from these shops. Prices in the retail shops have also been, by and large, reasonable because of the inherent competition among the shops. The market forces work effectively and the consumers get a good deal from the shops. In the Southern States, especially, in Tamil Nadu, even governmental agencies run

shops. they set the prices which, by and large, the entire retail market follows. Sir, several lakhs of people have found gainful employment from the retail shops. Employment is provided in the neighbourhood also and people are not displaced from their houses.

Sir, the Government on the dictates of the World Bank and Foreign Institutional Investors is now hell bent on demolishing the highly successful system in our country. They have now decided to open up the retail trade to global super bazaars. Once they come into our country, they will initiate the price war first and, then, kill all these small-time shops dotting the country. I do not know why parties like the CPM should support this diabolic move of the UPA Government. If they are really Communists, they should come out openly against FDI in retail trade. If their ideology to support the poor is true and unadulterated, they should not support this diabolic move of the Government which deprives the poor. I also demand that the UPA Government which came to power on the sole plank of supporting the *aam admi* should not now betray them. Betrayers should be taught fitting lessons from the *aam admi*.

Finally, I strongly emphasise that any policy on opening retail sector for FDI has to have adequate safeguards to ensure the livelihood and employment of the large section of small traders and shopkeepers.

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise with a little bit of hesitation because I want to really support this move towards FDI in retail trade. I wish the Commerce Minister had allowed me to support him. But I find it a bit difficult because I do not quite know what his policy is. I know the policy of the Prime Minister. He has, definitely, supported FDI. I have looked for the Commerce Ministry's policies on FDI in retail trade. I have seen the latest initiatives on the FDI in the single brand which is at par with the earlier Government's FDI in wholesale trade. I still do not have a very clear idea whether this Government is committed to supporting FDI in retail trade. But I start from that presumption because there are very good reasons to support freeing trade FDI but has to be carefully examined.

The first argument against FDI is very easy to dismiss. I am afraid, Dr. Joshi made references about culture. The FDI will bring in products which are not really the products of that are acceptable in our culture. Unfortunately, my friend, Shri Sitaram Yechury also, in the last part of his

statement seemed to have supported that point saying something in a hesitant way that this is a kind of culture he does not support. I do not want to get into this, because that argument has been talked about and rejected about any contact with foreigners, I hope, today, after so many years of economic policy and opening up, we do not have to spend much time on this. If the people in this country like to have coca-cola; if they like to have foreign brand things, jeans, or, whatever it is, they should have it. It is not because somebody else dislikes it that, it should not be there. So, that is a question which is not necessary to debate, any more.

But the other question which Mr. Yechury mentioned, and which I think, Mr. Joshi also hinted, is that it will affect the Level of output. He mentioned about contribution of retail trade to GDP, and said that contribution will fall. I am afraid, this is not correct. Because if FDI comes to retail trade, it will expand the organised trade in our country. And organised trade would reduce transaction cost, inventory cost, intermediation cost, and establish supply chains all over the world. This reduces the unit cost of production and also sales, as a result of which output would expand. As output expands, the system will become much more viable. Even if this country were not growing—it is now growing at eight per cent growth rate—I do not think FDI entrants will reduce the output of the retail trade sector. It will, actually, expand the volume of the retail trade.

The third point is whether it will affect employment. This is a very major question which we must deal with. As a matter of fact, retail sector in our country is mostly unorganised. About 98 per cent of the retail trade is unorganised which means that they are very small units which produce without much capital, without much market, and without much space. Actually, the total number of shops with 500 square feet or more than that is very few in our country. We have little shops. There is the so-called A 'Pop and Mom store'. That is not a very right phrase, but very poor people come there. As a matter of fact, Sir, the retail trade absorbs the unemployed. If you are not employed, if you cannot get a job, normally, you move to retail trade; so that, you can survive. That is how the retail trade has, actually expanded, absorbing unemployment.

Now it is very difficult to say that if we expand organised trade, it will not affect unorganised trade unemployment. It is not true. There is no connect. Whatever connect there is would reduce the unorganised sector employment. The retail traders, because they will be outbid, they would

lose in competition, they would not have the kind of a market reach and plenty of other reasons which make them uncompetition. There is now no doubt that if you have a kind of an expansion of the organised retail trade or FDI in a country like ours, they would, definitely, have an immediate adverse effect on employment. They would not be able to sell, and they would not be able to compete in a non-level playing field. This is true not of FDI, only, but for any kind of opening up in the international trade, the first impact is that it will out-compete the existing units. The question is: should that be a good enough reason not to allow trade, expansion of trade, and in a similar argument not to allow expansion of FDI? I am afraid, this particular question has to be answered. I want to request my friend, Kamal Nathji, that he represents a Government which believes in free trade, which believes in liberalisation, but, at the same time, he has also to ensure that its effects on the poor people, on the unemployed people are minimised. You will find it at every point. The other day, Sir, you must have noticed the question about the FTA, the question of cardamom, etc., that came up. Again the problem is the same. You introduced free trade without taking care of the problems of the people who will be affected by that trade. I am afraid this question will come up again and again for instance when you try to open up agriculture. I do not believe that anybody in this Government or in the Congress Party will believe that there should be no increase in trade or lowering of trade barriers in agriculture. But the only point is that when you reduce that trade barrier, you must make sure that the effect of that on the poor, on the unorganised, on the unemployed has to be taken care of. It is a different debate. We have been talking about this for quite some time. I hope at some point of time, we shall have a very good general discussion on WTO. I don't want to get into that now.

But in the case of FDI, Sir, exactly, a similar approach has to be taken. Mr. Kamal Nath owes it to us, owes it to his Government, owes it to his programme, his Prime Minister, to come out with a policy which will allow FDI in retail trade but would not allow the effect of that on the poor, unorganised retail traders in our country to push them into unemployment. How can he actually protect them? It is not a very easy task, but the Government is not an easy thing to do. It has to be considered what are the main problems that these retail traders are facing. We have

examined it in our little way and it is known quite alright that they lack trading opportunities, they lack marketing opportunities, they lack credit, they lack finance, they lack capital, they lack technologies etc. All these things are there. Somehow, these will have to be provided. Market cannot provide that. I am afraid, Mr. Sharad Joshi is sitting here, and I found that he is a great champion of opening up of all this trade, but he is not the friend of Shri Kamal Nath's philosophy. That is a neo-liberal solution which will believe that you open the market, market prices will take care of problems. People will invest in products which will actually compete in the market. It does not work, and does not work in unorganised sector, does not work with the vulnerable poor, the poor traders. You have to take special measures to support them, to see that the unemployment does not expand. I fully agree with Mr. Sitaram Yechury on that point. Mr. Kamal Nath has to provide a policy which would make sure that unemployment is not going to expand and the retail traders, the poor retail traders are being helped to be able to compete. Now, I might mention a very simple point here which Mr. Kamal Nath may take into account. He is now involved in the negotiations on WTO. Mr. Jaitley is here. He was also involved with this. I presume he does not share the views of Dr. Joshi, as he propounded here. He might have, but I am just making a presumption. But the question is that in the WTO, the negotiation on services is just starting, it is open, it is perfectly possible for India and under India's leadership other developing countries to point out that we shall allow, what you call, the commercial presence in our country. We shall allow accordingly FDI, provided they accept certain conditionalities. The only conditionality that you cannot impose according to WTO is that you cannot link it with domestic content or facing of TRIPS problems. But it does not prevent you from imposing export performance as a conditionality, not export related to actual product that you take, but export performance in general. It does not prevent you from imposing upon them certain condition of capital expenditures, R&D expenditure, employment-related clauses. These conditions a like are actually allowed. And why I am saying that? Let me just talk about the export performance, the only way the Wal-Mart and others can really do good to us as they did to China. Wal-Mart has a history in China. I am not comparing India and China but that is what we should learn from them. Wal-Mart has been able to produce a substantial expansion of exports of the Chinese products. Now, it doesn't

mean that we would be able to do that because we do not have their manufacturing capacity. The Chinese have that manufacturing capacity. Somebody was saying that they went to London and they found that Chinese were producing pens and everything and we only produce Haldiram. They have a manufacturing capacity. But the fact of the matter is that Wal-Mart helped Chinese exports all over the world and piggy-backing on Wal-Mart, Chinese companies came forward and they got into the whole world to export their products. If you can do that, if you can impose that thing on Wal-Mart, Wal-Mart will take it only if they can make money out of this and it is perfectly possible to make money on exports from India; getting this thing sourced from India, they would do that. That will increase our exports; that will increase our employment and that will protect—and create millions of jobs that Mr. Sitaram Yechury was thinking that we shall lose. So, Mr. Chairman, I would request the Minister now to come out with a proper FDI in Retail Trade Policy which is consistent with the UPA and the Common Minimum Programme and which is consistent with the protection of the poor and the vulnerable. It can be done. There is no reason to shy away from this. The FDI's merits have been established by everybody. My friends on the other side believe that they tried to introduce FDI through back channels in all different ways because they were also opposed by their Dr. Joshi and his followers this is an old debate. There is nothing new in it. But the only point that I would like to submit to Mr. Kamal Nath is, please realise that you are now the Commerce Minister of a Government which is not just old-fashioned, liberal, free-trade Government. It believes in free trade; it believes in reforms, but specifically with a set of policies that will protect the poor. Thank you.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI (Maharashtra): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. Before I state my position, I would start by saying how did I come to that. From 1975 to 1990, I led a farmers' movement which stated that the Government deliberately depressed agriculture prices and that was the reason of the poverty of farmers and indebtedness of farmers. In 1991, luckily our present Prime Minister, who was the Finance Minister at that time, opened the new door of liberalisation. Even though we did not really go to the extent of scrapping the Essential Commodities Act, I saw the winds of change that had come in and advocated a three-points programme for the farmers. One was that women should carry out a research in the backyards.

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, in the Chair)

They should play with plants and find out what is good and what is bad. I would not go into the details. Second thing that was advocated kitchen food processing. And the third thing was the super market network in Maharashtra. Unless we have an alternative to the Agricultural Produce Marketing Committee, we would not be able to ensure the quality of the produce and we would not be able to sell our commodities abroad. Why did I choose the supermarket type of retailing rather than the ordinary type of traditional retailing that Banwari Lalji eulogized and Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi eulogized. Sir, for hundreds of years, Indian agriculture has lost all links between the farm and the dinner table or the kitchen. There is no organized system for storage, or processing, or trading and for grading. All these things are left, to hazard, to chance, to such organisations, as might come up.

When the Food Corporation of India was given the task of procurement of wheat, it was expected that the Food Corporation of India would build up the chain that was lacking. Unfortunately, the Food Corporation did not do that. What we needed was that the APMC should be replaced; the whole chain of Artiyas should be replaced by some interface that will put the farmers in as close a contact as possible with the consumer himself. That was what was necessary and we found that this would be best attained by supermarket networks.

People have talked very bitterly about the Wal-Mart, about the bigger Harrods and all that. I would like to start by quoting George Mikes. He is not an economist but a humorist. He is on record saying, 'Marks and Spencer have done much more for the poor masses than Marks and Angles. It is the Marks and Spencer who permitted a shop girl to dress like a Duchess. That is what he has said.

The advantage is that they spread out their network; they have a backward strategy for procurement and they have a forward strategy for contacting the consumer making him purchase as much as possible. There is nothing wrong about that. And that is where the interest of the farmers lies. And, therefore, Sir, in Maharashtra, we actually started a farmers' supermarket network, which is still working, and if Murli Manohar Joshi were present here, I would have liked to tell him that his very close friend, Mr. Bindu Madhav Joshi, who is a leader of the Consumers' Movement

was with me, and, he has himself started a supermarket in Pune which is doing pretty well, the Grahak Panchayat.

The traders are good people, honest people and nice people. I am not differing with Banwari Lalji or with Murli Manohar Joshiji, but it is not in their nature to provide the kind of services of post-harvest and pre-kitchen processing; they are not in a position to furnish that at all. That is the reason why we need to have another kind of interface that will give maximum advantage to the procedures viz. the lowest possible prices and assured quality to the consumers and assured markets to farmers. That is exactly what I expected the supermarket networks to do.

Now, many Hon'ble Members have talked as to why is that the supermarkets come here to make a lot of profit, that the supermarkets come here to exploit and they cannot give employment. I think, rather than quoting statistics etc., I would give a very simple example, Sir. At one point of time, in the farmers' movement, we were thinking of boycotting all the industrial products of cities and propagating the Khadi and Gramodhyog products instead. One of the products that we took up for examination was the ordinary soap. You might have seen the Khadi Gramodhyog soap, and, we started wondering that why is it that Khadi Gramodhyog is not able to compete with the Lux toilet soap – Lux toilet soap comes in so many colours perfumes in nice packing; so much money is spent on advertisements, and, beautiful stars, actresses come in the advertisement – and why is it that the Khadi Gramodhyog soap is not able to undersell even the Lux toilet soap of the Hindustan Levers. We examined the whole question. While the Khadi Gramodhyog soap was not able to use a particular that is formed when soda and oil are added, which the Hindustan Lever is able to use, and, market therefore, by technological advancement, they make a margin, which explains their profits. Sir, similarly, where do they give the employment from? It was said, "How would they increase employment?" Then, my answer is, if you say that only 10 per cent of the agriculture produce is processed today, then, there is a scope for increase in the employment to the extent of processing 90 per cent of the agriculture produce. This is where actually the multinational, or the super market networks, retail traders will score over the existing system. Sir, the statistics and the report that were quoted here etc. were very well-researched. But, I would like to say that this is not really a dispute between facts or dispute of opinions. There were two

different mindsets. When I find that Murali Manohar Joshi – I don't think he would be annoyed if I called him a sanatan Hindu, because Gandhi himself said that he was a sanatani Hindu – and Sitaram Yechury come to ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sanatan is always modern. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: You don't mind it. That is the point. If Murlil Manohar Joshi and Yechury come together, then, there must be something very special about it. And what is so special about it? I will tell you one thing. Sir, in case of the people on the right hand side, there is a sense of nostalgia. They do not like any changes. Old was gold and what we have continued with will continue to be good. That is the first thing. They have, in addition, a sort of a neurosis or an inferiority complex. They feel that every time we come in touch with the foreigners, we will be the losers and that the foreigners will always be the gainers. That is possibly the lesson they have learnt from history. But, that is not necessarily true. At least, in the new scenario, they are going to enter it may not happen at all. The third thing is, there is a matter of self-interest. Banwari Lalji, of course, is interested in it because he comes from the trading community and he would like to preserve the trading community. And, Sitaram Yechury has a vested interest because the Communists will always advocate methods that would retain and expand poverty, because if the poverty disappears, they will be left with no business to do at all. That is the kind of vested interest that they have. There are several examples. The kind of argument that we have heard here, Sir, today, we heard them when the first industry started, how green was my valley? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN (West Bengal): Sorry to interrupt, Sir. We only deal with what Mr. Sharad Joshi and company create for the people of the country.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: Now, when the first computers came, these people were saying that if the computers come, there will be massive large-scale unemployment. It has not happened and unemployment has increased. Every time there was anything like a change to take place, these people have, by their mindset, opposed it. I would like to tell them that if we had that kind of a mindset, or, people had that kind

of mindset, then, we would never have even underground drainage and we would have continued with the practice of scavengers carrying the maila head load, because no economies can not justify the construction of an underground drainage. And if you make calculations of that type, then, you go on opposing. And every time the history has proved you false. Computers created employment; computers did not destroy employment. And, I can tell you that the retail shops are going to increase employment. In fact, that would be the beginning of the end problem of the eradication of poverty in India and for the farmers. I would like to congratulate the Minister. Arjunji made three or four references to Joshi, and I thought, at least, one reference was to me. And, I must say that long before Kamal Nath probably thought of FDIs in retail trade, I had been writing about it and advocating it. And, as far as the WTO is concerned ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR (Tripura): Sir, I have a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, wait, wait. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: What point of order? Show the book. Show the book. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR: But in reply to my question, the hon. Minister said that the unemployment now ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: Show me the rule. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, there is no point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*... There is no point of order. The Minister has not stated anything yet. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please, Mr. Sarkar.

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR: Out of the workforce, 40 per cent is unemployed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order in this. Just to intervene you are saying that you have a point of order.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: I think most of the people, who talked about retail trade, Harrods, and Walmart, have only seen their consumer outlets. They have not seen how much goes is behind them. If they see behind Harrods, or if they see behind the Walmart, there are hundreds of factories which prepare different things, purchase raw

material, process them, package them, and carry out sales activity. There is a whole economic empire which goes behind it. Sir, since Independence the Government, whether under the name of socialism or liberalism, has failed to produce the kind of development cycle that we expected. And since the Government has failed, we think with the FDI and the free enterprise and innovativeness of the Indian entrepreneur, we will certainly make progress. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You just want to intervene.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY (Gujarat): Thank you very much, Sir. I had no initial intention of participating in this debate, which I must confess, has been a debate of very high quality. I am fortunate to speak after Mr. Sharad Joshi because that has saved me of the adjectives that he would have otherwise used about what I also intend to say. I don't claim to be like him the sole repository of wisdom on the issue of FDI in retail. But all that I wish to suggest is that this debate has been going on in this country for the last two years, and one factor about a policy is that, unlike a legislation, it does not come up to this House or the other House for approval. But even if a policy, unlike a legislation, does not come for approval or disapproval before the House, yet being a live and a vibrant democracy, I think, it is incumbent upon the Government to have due regard to what a large part of the parliamentary opinion, and hence a national opinion, on the subject is. In a debate of this kind, we have seen speakers almost from all sides, including Shri Arjun Kumar Sengupta, expressing very serious concerns about the idea of opening out immediately in this area. I think even though the Minister is not bound to seek a parliamentary approval for any step that he may take in future, whatever policy he announces he would take the larger opinion expressed by this House, by Members of all sides into consideration while the policy is formulated. Sir, I have four reasons to advise the hon. Minister, through you, Sir, why he must, for the present, go a little slow on this subject. It is normally argued that FDI adds an additionality to our domestic resources; and when an additional resource comes in, it increase economic activity; and increased economic activity will generate more employment, more revenue and hence bring larger prosperity to this country. This is a general argument which is given. My first reason for advising the Minister to go a little slow on this subject is that the Indian economic growth model is developing within its own parameters. There is one fundamental difference

when the Chinese example is cited in comparison with the Indian example and it is that the growth model of the Chinese economy has been substantially FDI-driven; it has been substantially Government-driven. The Indian model is substantially entrepreneur-driven. We, of course, have an advantage of being a democracy which at times makes the growth process a little slow—in China the decision-making is much faster than that we have in India—but that is the price we have voluntarily agreed to pay. Therefore, having consciously chosen a system, which is entrepreneur-driven, in most of our sectors which have been sustaining this 8 per cent growth now on an average for the last three years, I don't think we should blindly follow the example and say let us go in for an FDI-driven model which, even if there is an additionality of resource, need not be a great asset as far as our growth pattern is concerned. The second reason—and the Minister now is a very experienced trade negotiator—is, what is the compelling necessity for India to announce a unilateral reform in this area at this stage? Dr. Sengupta mentioned that the trade negotiations are on and one pattern of the trade negotiations of the WTO which is visible is that we have been quite anxious for an expeditious disposal of the negotiations in the services sector. In areas like outsourcing, in areas like movement of natural persons, which is Mode-1 and Mode-4 of the service sector negotiations, India always has a proactive interest and what we have seen in the course of the last 3-4 years is that there is a conscious attempt being made to put these negotiations on the back-burner. You have requests being made; you have offers being made; you have offers having been exchanged; but nothing substantive on the service negotiations has still come about. There is no anxiety on the part of the developed countries to expeditiously settle as far as service negotiations are concerned because if the service sector negotiations are expedited, India has an obvious advantage. We have a large human resource. We are in a position to even transfer physical individuals to various parts of the world who can manage the economy for them. The demographic changes which are taking place across the world, we have a much younger population profile, they have an older population profile. And, therefore, they need our people more than they have their own. Similarly, in areas like BPO etc., in Mode-1 area, where we are in a position to provide much cheaper services, there is a natural attraction towards India which is taking place. Now, these negotiations are being put on a slower track. What they have been trying is to put the agricultural

negotiations on a fast track which really today have been deadlocked and that's why the Doha Round itself was not able to progress. Now, It's one of the basic principles which any experienced trade negotiator like the hon. Minister will keep in mind that when you negotiate, you don't win in every area. There is a give and a take. You will have to make some concessions. Now, whenever the developed countries negotiate with us, there are two areas in the services sector which they want us to open immediately. There is an emphasis that you must open your retail sector immediately and there is a request, particularly from countries like Britain, that you must open your legal services and financial services immediately. I leave that for a moment. Americans are particularly very keen that we open out the retail sector immediately. You are now putting pressure on India as far as the BPO are concerned; you are limiting the number of visas every year so that areas where we have pro-active interest, you obviously are trying to put a shield and block the negotiations. Now, these areas are a very powerful instrument in our hands when we bargain across the table -- our own specific interests in the WTO negotiations. If we go in for an adventurist approach that we unilaterally open the retail sector out, we are going to significantly weaken our negotiating ability at the WTO. We will be conceding to them what they want without taking any reciprocity in return. So, my second piece of advice to the Minister is that even if our growth model is not FDI-driven, trade negotiations compel us not to do anything which actually takes away the bargaining chip which we have in our hands without having received any corresponding benefit for this purpose.

The third reason, Sir, why I would suggest to the hon. Minister to go slow in this area is that there is this great debate which goes on all over the world as to what is the impact which large retail organisations when they come up in the country, particularly with very deep financial pockets, will have on our small shops as they have been popularly referred to as the mom-dad or the mom-pop shop etc. Now, those who advocate opening out always say that the both operate in different fields and, therefore, if you have large retail shop coming up, it doesn't have any adverse effect as far as the small street corner shops are concerned. Now, there is no detailed study which has been done. In fact, a lot of studies which are being done by individuals are indicating to the contrary. And one of the reasons they suggest to the contrary is that the size of the purchasing

power is limited, and if that purchasing power gets diverted into the Walmart or the area where whichever shops comes up, there is going to be a corresponding impact in terms of reduction of the sales capacity as far as the small shops are concerned. They will not be able to compete with them, and therefore, there is naturally going to be an adverse effect as far as the small shops are concerned. Now, without there being any detailed study on this subject, merely on a premise that they will not be affected, is not correct because, this debate has been on, and every time, I have had an opportunity to go out of this country and travel internationally, I always try and make an informal inquiry as to what effect in those economies these large stores had, particularly, in the agriculture, and the food areas of the small shops, and whatever inquiries I made from shops from where I buy milk or any other product, I came to know that before the organized food chain came into existence, between then and now, I am 30 per cent of what I used to originally be, and the answer is very simple. The size of the purchasing power is limited. If it expands, it expands for all. If this purchasing power is diverted towards the large stores, then, what happens to the small one's. Sir, whenever we have an experience of travel across the States, particularly, the rural areas, you ask them a question as to what are the sources of employment that you have, and you will get only two answers. Either there is no source of employment or they will say थोड़ी बहुत खेती है और छोटी-मोटी दुकान चला लेते हैं।

In large parts of this country, there is no third avenue of employment. Now, if we allow deep pockets to come into this area, and compete with that man, it is going to be an uneven battle, and therefore, is the Indian economy ready today for this?

Lastly, Sir, there is one more reason which the Minister must keep in mind that in every growing economy, there is a space for organized retail, and this space for organized retail in India has just about started picking up. Our own domestic retail organizations, they may be larger in size, we may like them or we may not like them, but, it is only during the last four, five years that they have started emerging. Now, if they are just emerging, they have spent billion of rupees on real estates, they have not started even making profits, if we open them up for competition with those who have been in existence for the last 50 years or 80 years, who have the deepest pockets, and who can, as my friend, Mr. Yechury said, start the

predatory pricing immediately, who can undercut and then create monopolies and faces the disadvantages of that, I think, that is a danger which we cannot overlook at this stage. So, sir, while thanking you for permitting me with this unscheduled opportunity to intervene, my request would be that this is high time for the hon. Minister to consider going slow, particularly, when a majority of these parties, including Members from his own party, have serious doubts about opening up at this stage. Thank you.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, I would like to thank the hon. Members for their concerns and their inputs. In fact, this discussion was scheduled in the last Session of Parliament, but because there was a bomb scare that day, we could not have it. I obviously think that this is a matter of great concern, and the concern expressed by the Members in different ways. It is not that it is not a matter of concern to me, or, to my Government. Our Government is committed to a Common Minimum Programme, with our Allies, and one of the crucial aspects and ingredients of that programme is generation of employment, not replacement and displacement of employment. So, obviously, the Government and I would be concerned, and would not like to take chances where there is likely to be displacement of people. I would like to thank Mr. Yechury because he has come.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yechury, the Minister has just started.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: That is why it was necessary and I consider it necessary, and I immediately said on that day that we must have a discussion to get these inputs and concerns.

Our Government is committed, and because our Government is committed, let me at the onset say--there was a presumption, which I thought I could sense, as if the Government is on some fast track to announce this-- that the Government has already made up its mind. Sir, for the last two years or one-and-a-half years, we have been studying this. I have said so, amply, on the TV, and I have said so in the Press also. Sir, what is the model? I dug into it; I dug into the records of the past; I held discussions with various stakeholders. I went to the Retailers' Conference, held in Bombay, to understand this. Why? Sir, I am deeply concerned about it, and personally concerned also, because I come from a district which grows the best oranges. My friends from Maharashtra may pardon me for saying so; they grow the best oranges in the district, and I see them

rot. I see the vegetables, produced in my district, rot, which cannot be moved. But then, I need to understand this, and this Discussion is only helping me to understand this. It is not that we are going through this discussion as the motions. Let me assure you that there is no question of going through the motions. These are useful inputs with which we are concerned. Those are valid concerns. Sometimes, some of them appear to be, initially, valid, but, later on, those concerns, after studying deeper, appear to be not correctly founded. I had concerns. I looked into what were the efforts made by the previous Government. My predecessor, Mr. Arun Jaitley, himself examined it in detail. I do not want to go into that, and I don't want to make this political. Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi said that we said this at that time and we say this now. I do not want to say. It was you yourself; the then Prime Minister himself was saying; the then Prime Minister, Mr. Vajpayee, himself was announcing that they were going to have FDI in retail. I don't want to make this point. But this is not an issue concerning politics. This is an issue which concerns us all.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Mr. Minister, a Member from your side started saying it; otherwise, I would not have said like that. You started saying it.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: No; I am not saying that; I don't want to say that. He may have said so.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: All right.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: We did not. I don't want to mention that this was something which the earlier Government also looked into. And why not? The Government examines everything. I looked into, and I have found the studies made, in the past, by the Governments; leave aside whose Government it was. But my Government itself made studies. I looked into what the Group of Ministers said. And they had taken a view on that. Fine. They were looking into it. No issue. They even went to the extent of saying, "We must have it. I don't want to say—I don't want to get into the politics of it because I think it is far too serious a subject. To get into the politics of it, I do not want to say what was said in your own agenda for the 2004 elections -- that this is a must. Now when I hear this—and I appreciate Mr. Jaitley for drawing my attention to these concerns. Certainly, as time goes on, we see some more things; some more things come to light, some more inputs come to light. He has drawn my concern

to very valid things; I have no contradiction to that. But, Sir, the basic question, about which I felt concerned, was that this became a discussion which got centred around Walmart. I am not bothered about Walmart. Whether it is Walmart or not, is not the issue. The question is: What is good for our country and what is not good for our country? And that is what we should look into. When we are talking about retail, what do we mean by 'retail'? This is one thing which I grapple with. What is 'retail'? Now, there is a big retail; there is a small retail. There is a retail of goods by the kiriyana shops, our neighbourhood shops. There is a retail of electronic items; there is a retail of sports goods; there is a retail of foodstuffs; there is a retail of fashion items. So, do we take all kinds of retail under one umbrella? This is what I have studied. I also thought that retail is just generalised. So, what is retail? First, there is small retail versus big retail. The question of FDI comes much later. It is a question of big retail versus small retail. Today, you have kiriyana shops. You have having these hundreds of malls open up. You have hundreds of big, big food stores. My friend, Shri Ramdeo Bhandari said "जब मैं हैरोड में गया था तो मैंने देखा कि वहां हल्दीराम की भुजिया भी मिलती है - अमेरिका में कहीं गए थे - वहां अचार और मुरब्बा भी मिलता है"। So, what retail are we talking about? Just saying "retail", we may be misleading ourselves and, I thought, maybe, I am misleading myself if I just look at one aspect of retail. What is the retail which is incremental and what is the retail which is not incremental? what is the impact of allowing a big retailer? Today, as India grows, we are growing; we are having 8-9 per cent growth. We are having growth in our manufacturing sector. What is the macro-economic situation? We have people, 20 million people, belonging to the middle class. Our retail sector is growing. Our retail sector is substantially growing every year. Now, that retail sector is going to be serviced by large retailers. Leave aside the FDI for the moment. That is why local Indian retailers, local Indian business houses, are coming into retail and these big business houses, which are coming in, have made a judicious business decision that we want to go into retail because there is a growing market and rightly so. If our retail sector is not going to grow, where is the demand of our growing population, in the middle class, going to be met? So, the first issue is: What is the kind of retail we are looking at? If we are looking at retail to protect our kirana stores - of course, kirana stores, our neighbourhood shopkeepers, the mom and pop stores, as they are called--are a very important part. But that is an

4.00 P.M.

urban phenomenon. Unfortunately, nobody talked about rural phenomenon. Other than Sharad Joshi, nobody talked of the food sector. What percentage of retail is food? Such a large sector of retail is food.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: It is about 70 per cent in food.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I am saying so. I am not disagreeing with you. I am saying that. Now, how will we ensure that about 30 per cent or 40 per cent of our food does not rot? Rupees fifty thousand crores worth of food and vegetables rot. In my own district, we can't move out the oranges. What is the percentage of oranges that rot? What is the percentage of vegetables that rot because we can't get them into the shelves? There is no back-end. What is retail? Today, retail is not mainly kirana shops. Large retail that is going to be done by Indian companies is technology. It is technology in packing; it is technology in preservation. These are the sources which we have to look at. So, first, we have to look at what is retail, what is the type of retail. I was in Chicago and one large electronics chain retailer met me and he said, "I source two billion dollars from China". This is a large electronics chain which is there. I forget the name. It is "Bylight" or something like that. He sources from China two billion dollars. He says, "I have so many stores in China". Who was that big Indian electronics retailer? It was an Indian. He says, "In India, if I will have to do it, I should source this from India. Why should I source? What can I source from India which I can't sell in India? No logic?". So, I said, "No, we are concerned about the small persons". He asks, "Which small person sells electronics? Please tell me which small person in India sells the type of things which I sell". That got me thinking that there were different type of retail. Take, sports goods. They also met me. They said, "We too do. Where do can we ask for sports goods from?", If we are to develop, we have to have an economic chain. I am not talking necessarily about foreigners. I am talking about Indians. So retail cannot be looked at in generality. Retail has to be looked at in what type of retail it is. Now there is this concern that if FDI is allowed in retail, Wal-Mart will come in. This Wal-Mart phobia should not mislead us. (*interruptions*). Let me finish.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Or it can be anything. Because Wal-Mart is popularly known, therefore, it is ... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Everybody was citing it. What I am saying is

(Interruptions). Let me complete my sentence why I am saying this. The issue is not Wal-Mart. the issue can be the big players when they come in. Why only Wal-Mart?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: That is the point.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Their issue is what can they do. (Interruptions). it can be anything. That is the point. It is a question of big versus small. There is this concern that when FDI is allowed, these big players will come in and some of the predatory practices they have used or because of the deep pockets, they will displace the existing employment and the existing retailers. Sir, this concern can be valid. At the onset, I must say, as I have said, there is no policy which we are going to announce. There is no policy which we have framed on this. Even in the WTO—offer on services, I would thank Mr. Jaitley when he said that keep this as a bargaining point. We have not agreed to this. We have just made our offer for services. We have not agreed to the opening of retail. Let us be very clear. I must say that I do not know the model. We are committed to the Common Minimum Programme. Shri Sitaram Yechury has said that there are three ingredients. The three absolute ingredients, which he named, are necessary for FDI or any kind of FDI. I completely agree with him. He said that it should augment manufacturing; it should upgrade technology and thirdly, it should generate employment. I completely agree with him. Whether FDI in retail is going to do that, I am afraid I cannot give you the answer. That is why we don't have a policy. If he says I do not know it. I completely agree with him. I have said so before he spoke that whatever he is going to say I am going to agree with him.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Do you agree with us also?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: No, I agree with Shri Jaswant Singh. So I hope that he would disagree with me when I say that don't have a policy because he has a policy.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: You should be candid enough to say that you agree with the Opposition also.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I am saying that I agree with his observations that these should be the ingredients for FDI. Why only in retail, these are the ingredients for any FDI because we do not want to allow FDI...

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY (Gujarat): You cannot disagree with him and

you cannot say that you agree with us because that will have adverse consequences ... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I want to be very clear. In all my public pronouncements on FDI, I have consistently made this point that unless it is incremental in these things, India's economic growth is not driven; it is internally driven, unlike China's. If China's growth is driven, China has 10 times more FDI than us; six times more export than us and only 1.5 per cent more growth than us. It takes much more fuel to drive China's growth. It takes much less fuel to drive India's growth because India's growth is domestic market driven. So all these macro economic parameters ...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Would you assure us that domestic market will not be handed over to the foreign players?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: There is this concern that FDI in retail will displace us. The Government is still studying this concern. I have no answer. I can't even say, "It will or it will not". But the Government's objective is very clear. Our objective is laid out in the Common Minimum Programme.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: I am very happy that he has agreed to this condition. The only thing I want is an assurance that if their study finally proves that the FDI in retail, instead of generating employment will, actually, reduce employment, then, they will not announce it. That is the assurance.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I am saying that we are committed to our Common Minimum Programme. And there are certain essential elements of our Common Minimum Programme. So, it should be taken that the Government will stand by its Common Minimum Programme, which we have been doing and we will continue to do it because our Common Minimum Programme is not a matter of convenience; it is a matter of belief and conviction. That is why, for the last one-and-a-half years, I have been studying this, going from place to place, talking to people, because I wasn't satisfied myself. And when I said, "I was looking forward to these discussions", I was looking forward to these discussions that there may be some concerns or, maybe, I have some concerns which you aren't expressing. Let me tell you this that there are concerns which you haven't expressed...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Share with us.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I will share that with you. There are concerns which have not been expressed in the House...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (उत्तरांचल): जब वे कहते हैं कि you share with us, तो हमको लगता है कि वे Coordination Committee में भी शेयर कर सकते हैं। हम मंत्री जी से सदन में यह आश्वासन चाहेंगे कि इतने संवेदनशील मामले पर कोई भी नीतिगत घोषणा करने से पहले, वे सदन को विश्वास में लेंगे और सदन के साथ शेयर करेंगे। Coordination Committee में केवल अपने वामपंथी साथियों के साथ शेयर नहीं करेंगे, आप हाउस में इसे लाएंगे, सदन को विश्वास में लेंगे और आप हमें आश्वस्त करिए कि आप कोई नीतिगत घोषणा करने से पहले, सदन में अपनी नीति को लेकर आएंगे।

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: मैं यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सदन में हमने मंत्री महोदय से कहा था कि please share with us. So, we mean sharing in the House, not sharing anywhere else.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: इसलिए मैंने उसको clarify किया है। मैंने आपकी बात को ही पुष्ट किया है कि आप कोई नीतिगत घोषणा करने से पहले सदन में आइए, बाहर मत करिए।

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, on various points, I would not go into the specifics. As regards some of the points made by Dr. Joshi, he said that this is going to hurt our culture; this is going to hurt our ethos. अगर FDI retail में आता है, तो यह हमारी संस्कृति और संस्कार को यह प्रभावित करेगा, आपकी राय में ये मुद्दे भी हो सकते हैं। यह भी खयाल था, जैसा एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि जब हम कंप्यूटर्स लाएंगे या किसी प्रकार की और कोई छूट देंगे, तो इससे हमारी संस्कृति और संस्कार प्रभावित होते हैं, इस बारे में सबकी अपनी-अपनी राय हो सकती है।

Sir, one concern which has been expressed here is that retailers will not sell Indian goods...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: मंत्री जी, मैंने जो बात कही थी, वह उस sense में नहीं कही थी, जिसकी तरफ आपने इशारा किया है। मैंने तो यह बात उस sense में कही थी, जिस पर आज सारी दुनिया में विचार हो रहा है कि ये जितने भी centralised economic systems की वजह से centralised culture, uniformity of culture का सारी दुनिया में विस्तार हो रहा है, वह खतरनाक चीज है। आज choice खत्म हो रही है, जिसको आप pluralism कहते हैं, वह खत्म हो रहा है। इसलिए आप उस गहरी बात को समझिए। मैं इसलिए नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि कंप्यूटर आने से कोई फर्क पड़ता है, सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री कमल नाथ: मैं यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि आपने कहा है, मैंने कहा कि कुछ सदस्यों ने कहा है, मैंने यह नहीं कहा कि आपने कहा है। One thing which was mentioned here, which I want to dispel, is that retail means allowing import. In the retail today, what imports are allowed under our policy and what tariffs are there, they are, in any case allowed to be sold. Somebody need not allow FDI on retail. If the Indian investors want to import, the question is, whether they can be comparative. So, anyone who is going to do retail, whether he is foreign investor or he is an Indian investor, will necessarily import on his term. I think this is very misplaced today because today you are getting all imported things. You pay a duty and you get it. So, that is a misplaced concern and I want to dispel that. The only thing which I would like to say is, since WTO was mentioned by Mr. Jaitly, I want to repeat two points so that he will remember that he gave me this advice. The first thing to which he drew my attention was that agriculture was on the fast track and services were on the slow track. I must assure him—that is the whole argument we are having—that we cannot put agriculture on the fast track and put services on a slow track. With our new demographic structure that India has, we have great interest and great concern in the services sector.

The second point he made was that retail can be used as a bargaining point. Sir, up till now, we have not agreed to it. We are in the process. We have recently submitted our offer on services to the WTO. We have not agreed to retail. So, I want to just say that up till now that has been the situation.

Sir, the other point that he made is that it is all give-and-take and that we must keep all our bargaining chips in our pocket. I agree with him—because he has himself handled it. The other point is that our own retailers are coming into the foray. I must point it out to the House that there has been a great opposition from the Indian retailers to allow any FDI. Naturally, they would not like competition. In 1991, '92, '93, when we were liberalising foreign investment, there was resistance from many others in all the industries. The same people who were big opponents in 1991, 1992—we remember it because we were in Government—who opposed liberalisation, have become the biggest proponents of liberalisation. So, there is, and there has to be, opposition locally from our Indian investors. That is a fact. We take it into account.

But, in conclusion, I would like to thank Members for the concerns they have expressed here. I would like to thank Members for drawing my attention to their own concerns. But I would like to reiterate and reassure that our Government is committed to the Common Minimum Programme; our Government is committed to ensure that and we look for any employment generating avenue which could be opened, which creates employment, which does not displace employment.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Will the Minister assure the House that he will bring the policy before the House before implementing it? Is he committed to this or not? This is the basic question now. Whenever your studies are complete, whenever you come to a certain conclusion, whenever you are in a frame of mind to give us a clear-cut vision of your FDI policy, will you come before the House or not with that policy?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir this Short Duration Discussion is not about this. Government makes its policy. Government will continue to make its policy.

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA: Kamal Nathji, I hope you do realise that the Prime Minister himself has said that he would try to promote FDI in retail. Are you saying that you are not interested in this or you have not studied the implications? I gave you a suggestion of having export performance in the WTO negotiations. Are you considering that, or, are you still saying that you have not thought about all the different things.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I will say that we are looking at various modules and the essential ingredients, how to achieve those ingredients which the hon. Member has pointed out, whether it is by export obligation, whether it is on type of investment, whether you will invest this much or not, all these will be taken into consideration when we formulate the policy. At the moment, we are still looking at it. That is the point I am just trying to make.

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: Sir, just a few days back, when a discussion on this subject was initiated in this House, the hon. Minister hinted at the basic problem, that it is the fight between the big and the small in our country. Corporatisation of the whole retail sector is itself creating a very big displacement in the unorganised retail sector. Coming of FDI in that sector will make that even bigger, even larger. So, how will this be addressed? You must make it clear to the House.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, I have said repeatedly that there is a question of the big versus the small. Whenever any big player comes, whether it is FDI or whether it is a local investor, when it is a large business group, there could be, I am not saying there will be—because we do not have any large ones as yet, but they are going to come; we read in the newspapers every day—that has got to be seen because at the moment there is no foreigner; they are only domestic. And that impact, if it comes, we will respond to it.

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: They have already started coming.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, the hon. Finance Minister, in response to the demand in the House, is making a statement. And, I would like to remind that whenever a statement is made on demand, there are no clarifications sought on that.

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI (West Bengal): Sir, clarifications should be allowed on that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No clarifications. Yes, Finance Minister.

STATEMENT BY MINISTERS—*Contd.*

Recent Developments in Stock Market

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): Sir, over the last one week, the events in the global markets, especially movements in the commodity markets, have brought sharp volatility to the stock markets in many emerging markets. Markets both in the developed world as well as in the emerging economies have seen sharp corrections. There has been a decline in Russia, China, Korea, Brazil and Indonesia. India also saw considerable volatility as part of these global events. The last two days of the previous week saw a fairly sharp correction in the stock markets in India.

The market sentiments on Monday were weak and, consequently, the markets began to fall. Sensex had recorded a level of 12,217 on 17th May 2006. On the next day, it declined to 11,391. On 19th May, 2006, it lost another 452 points to close at 10,938. On 22nd May, 2006, markets hit a 10 per cent circuit breaker at 11:56 a.m. when it reached 9,826 and as per procedure trading was suspended for an hour till