

The House reassembled after lunch at two minutes past two of the clock,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair.*

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE STATEMENT BY MINISTER — Contd.

India's stand in the WTO

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we take up clarifications on the Statement of the Minister regarding India's stand in the WTO. Now, the point is, it is not a discussion; it is clarification. So, those who participate should restrict to putting questions; don't take more than 3-4 minutes. Shri Anand Sharma.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, let me remind you that this House discussed, and there was no discussion, sought clarifications on the Statement, which, the then Commerce and Industry Minister, *i.e.*, My self, had made on 18th December, and it continued until the 19th. And the then Leader of the Opposition, you can check from records,...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That was a discussion; it is clarification.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: There was no discussion, Sir. I am sorry; it was a *suo motu* Statement. This is a subject which requires time, and my other colleagues in the Opposition would also speak.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What do I do? Then, there should be some consensus on that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: You have Shri Sitaram Yechury here. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY (West Bengal): Yes, I have given my name.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is not the point. The issue Shri Anand Sharma raised is this. Usually, clarification means, Members will seek clarifications in two-three minutes, and after that, the Minister will reply. So, in a maximum of half-an-hour or forty-five minutes, it will be completed.

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल (उत्तर प्रदेश): नियमों में स्पष्टीकरण पूछने का ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री उपसभापति : नहीं है। मुझे मालूम है। Now, Shri Anand Sharma is quoting precedent and saying that more time should be allowed to him. Is it not that which you are saying? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI P. RAJEEVE (Kerala): Sir, it is a five-page Statement.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay; you take a little more time as you are a former Minister.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: It is not a question of taking a little more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are a former Minister... *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sorry, Sir.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, may I suggest one thing? Sir, the point is that it has been a practice in this House that we ask clarifications. Now, before asking clarifications, a very brief and an introductory situation which leads to this clarification that must be explained. Otherwise, merely asking a question 1,2,3,4 doesn't serve the purpose.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is why I said you take three-four minutes.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: So, you must permit a brief introduction as to why this question was being asked.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, a maximum of five minutes should be taken.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Yes, a maximum of five minutes should be given.

SHRI K.C. TYAGI (Bihar): Sir, he is a former Minister, so...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I agree; he is a former Minister of the same Ministry. So, he can be given more time. *...(Interruptions)...* You will get more time.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am also the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Let there be no doubt on that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Being a former Minister, you will get more time. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am also a Deputy Leader. *...(Interruptions)...*

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : यह कहां लिखा हुआ है, किस किताब में लिखा हुआ है कि पूर्व मंत्री को ज्यादा टाइम मिलेगा? *...(व्यवधान)...*

श्री आनन्द शर्मा : नहीं, नहीं, ऐसा नहीं है। *...(व्यवधान)...*

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल: मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ। कोई पूर्व हो या मौजूदा हो, आप नियम के अनुसार चलेंगे। *...(व्यवधान)...* नियमों में किसी पूर्व मंत्री को ज्यादा समय देने का अधिकार नहीं है। *...(व्यवधान)...* सबको समय बराबर मिलेगा। *...(व्यवधान)...*

SHRI D. RAJA (Tamil Nadu): He is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI P. RAJEEVE: Deputy Leader is okay, but not as a former Minister. *...(Interruptions)...*

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल: आप यह रूलिंग वापस ले लीजिए । This ruling is not good.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is not the ruling. ...*(Interruptions)*... That is not applicable to former Ministers ...*(Interruptions)*... I only said, Mr. Anand Sharma, because he knows the subject very well... ...*(Interruptions)*... That is all. ...*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI PRAMOD TIWARI (Uttar Pradesh): He is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

श्री उपसभापति: क्लेरिफिकेशन्स में पार्टी टाइम का क्वेश्चन नहीं है । Clarification seeking is individual.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): Sir, he is a former Commerce Minister, besides the Deputy Leader of our Party, otherwise, I could have spoken about it. But I do not know much about it. He was the Commerce Minister.

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल: मैं भी ऊर्जा मंत्री रहा हूँ । पूर्व मंत्री को कैसे ज्यादा टाइम मिल सकता है? ...*(व्यवधान)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am only saying that it is only clarification, it is not a discussion. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री गुलाम नबी आज्ञाद: मुझे नहीं मालूम कि आप ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल: सर, यह प्रथा नहीं बननी चाहिए कि कोई मंत्री रहा है इसलिए उसे ज्यादा टाइम मिलना चाहिए । ...*(व्यवधान)*... राइट सबका बराबर है । ...*(व्यवधान)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. LoP, that is all what I am saying. I am saying that it is not a discussion, it is only seeking clarifications. So, you have to confine yourself to maximum five minutes. That is all what I am saying. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Frankly speaking, Mr. Deputy Chairman, with due respect, when a statement of 30 paragraphs is made by the hon. Minister and we thank her for making the statement, it is but expected for the Opposition to have clarity on the subject. It is not a subject which is a routine matter. It is a global multilateral organization of which India is a Member. The statement pertains to the collapse of the Geneva General Council. The General Council was only to discuss the agreements which were reached in Bali Ministerial Meeting in December, 2013. Sir, the Bali Ministerial Meeting of the WTO had ten elements. The Agreement was reached. The Minister's statement says that two of these were very important. It is in para 3. I will say that all were important because the subsequent paragraphs of Minister's statement also refer to the LDCs issues. The Agreements which were reached in Bali included four Agreements for the LDCs which India supported and it is termed as 'LDCs Package'. I would also

like to mention that Bali Ministerial Meeting of 2013 was the first Ministerial Meeting where an agreement was reached since the establishment of the WTO in 1995. At that time also, India had to face a challenge particularly for bringing on an agenda, issues of agriculture which pertain to public stock holdings for food security purposes. There was a stiff resistance. The Minister would know that the developed countries US, EU along with their coalition partners stiffly opposed even that issue to be brought on the agenda for the Bali Ministerial Meeting. But India remained steadfast and firm and this issue was brought on the agenda. Once it was brought on the agenda, there was opposition. China, we expected then and our earlier understanding was that they would remain with us, but they crossed over and advised India not to press the issue for public stock holdings for food security purposes. Sir, the issue is not of food security, the issue is of procurement at administered prices. It flows out of the Uruguay Round of 1994 which allows the developing countries to procure foodgrains, but if it is on administered prices and is not on market prices, the *de minimis* of ten per cent, that is, the value of the production of the product. This is connected with the external reference prices of 1986 to 1988. We said in Bali that this was India's position. When a position is taken by a country, as the hon. Members know, it is a mandate which is given because that was a Ministerial Summit where sovereign commitments are made. It was not a general conference. Those mandates were given through two Cabinet decisions. One, India took a stand. There was a time like this time, that India will be isolated. Sir, just to put it on record, India was not isolated. India forced the US and the EU to cede the ground. India built a big global coalition which represented the majority of the membership of the WTO. There were 160 countries in Bali and the majority stood by India. It was India's leadership which forced a solution including complete protection from any challenge and the developed countries conceding that there shall be a permanent solution under the Agreement on Agriculture. The Agreement on Agriculture is separate from the other agreements which were reached, but to have a complete protection, we needed an interim protective cover because we were almost on the verge of breach when it comes to one particular agricultural product where we became the largest exporter in the world. So, after hard negotiations, it was accepted that a negotiated permanent solution shall, definitely, be put in place by MC 11, that is, 11th Ministerial Conference. Now, there is a myth which I want to clear here. That if the word was 'definitely' by MC 11, it does not mean that you have to wait until MC 11. The second clause of the same understanding reads very clearly that until a permanent solution is found, no member country shall challenge another member country on its breach of public stock holding and procurement. So, the protection was there. It is not that we were seeking another protection here in Geneva. Geneva is not meant to revisit the Bali Ministerial decisions. Now, there are some concerns. I have read carefully the Minister's Statement. It is not

[Shri Anand Sharma]

clear as to why, but the perception is of a retraction and linking of this particular issue with the Trade Facilitation Agreement. I am happy to hear in the Minister's Statement positive references in para 4, that India is in favour of the Trade Facilitation Agreement and we should be because we do not want to be a country which remains a very small player in the global trade. Today, we have 1.7 per cent share in merchandise trade and over 4 per cent in services trade. Both put together, India's share in the global trade is 3.3 per cent. We are one trillion dollar plus in trade. Therefore, trade facilitation was in India's interest. We were also in favour of the Trade Facilitation Agreement. In this House, a question was put to me by the then Leader of the Opposition who is today the Finance Minister and also the Leader of the House, Shri Arun Jaitley. As the House would recall, I had said that we were one of the proponents of the TFA. India was not opposed to the Trade Facilitation Agreement. What is Trade Facilitation, the Minister has explained. It is about customs cooperation, faster movement of goods, turnaround time to be brought down and also about electronic data interchangeability using the new technologies for payments, for clearances, for approvals, including customs. India has done most of it. I am happy that the Minister's statement refers to that. But you referred to the 'Customs Single Window Project' announced in the Budget of 2014-15. I would just like to inform the Minister that in the 2009-14 Foreign Trade Policy this was made clear to bring down the transaction cost and we brought it down by 65 per cent, and that was important for us. It was also to ensure that we upgrade our infrastructure and electronic data interchangeability between all export and import terminals and all payments to be made electronically, all duty drawbacks electronically. So, what Trade Facilitation Agreement is she talking about? Most of the things India has done. Therefore, this perception which has been created by default that India is not allowing the Trade Facilitation Agreement to go forward is unfortunate and we would like more clarity on that. I have given the details on the intrinsic merit of the TFA. (*Time-bell rings*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: The second thing which I would like to say is about the consultation processes, particularly, with the political parties because what position you take, what is your negotiating stance in the multilateral forums must have a broad national consensus. There is a complete national consensus. This has always been there when it comes to procurement from our subsistence farmers, resource-poor farmers, on the Minimum Support Price, and that is a battle which India has fought and rights were secured and protected. So, that is important.

Sir, I say it with sadness. Whereas, we regularly consulted the Leaders of Opposition in both the Houses ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now please conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: No, Sir, these are important points which I would like to make.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Very important. But there is time constraint.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: No, I have more questions on this. Please.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But don't take more time.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: No, you have to allow. You have to go by the past precedents to see on this subject how long the discussion was.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On clarifications, there is this precedent.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: No, Sir, I am sorry.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can take two more minutes. You have already taken eleven minutes.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: No, Sir, I am sorry. I have something to say. If you want me to sit down, I will sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala): Sir, he may take my time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have no time. What can I do? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: We will not accept this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, try to conclude. Try to conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Well, I am very clear, I will say with all respect what I must say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But, see ..

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Please.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There cannot be an exception for you. You must know that.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: No, it's not for me. It's not only*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, take two-three minutes more. That's all. ...*(Interruptions)*... No. No. You finish in two-three more minutes. You have already taken eleven minutes. I never allow so much time for clarifications. Take two-three more minutes.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is unfortunate.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What can I do? I have to go by ...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Well, you have to go by the precedents also. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, on clarifications, there is this precedent. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I won't quarrel with the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I also don't want to quarrel with you.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: But we are wasting time now. The Opposition was kept informed – that's the point where I was – the then Leader of Opposition in both the Houses and leaders of political parties were informed. The Commerce Secretary of India, the Chief Negotiator, were sent in advance before Bali Ministerial to brief the Leaders of Opposition, and I personally briefed and wrote to the Leaders of Opposition as to what India's negotiating stance was. I must ask the Minister as to why this courtesy was not extended to all the Opposition parties this time when you are making a retraction, when you are taking important decisions which may lead to confusion and also alienation of India from its coalition partners. Sir, linking these two-three things, I would like to put a few questions to the hon. Minister. The impression is that it was a fight for food security. Will the Minister clarify that food security is a sovereign space and that food security was never a part of the WTO agenda? So, this issue is not on food security, but public stockholding. This should be made absolutely clear. Therefore, on this food security and the humanitarian concern, which this long statement talks about, we have our concerns.

Sir, my second question is about the LDCs. The Statement says that it is also about the LDC issues, whereas para 3 says that there were only two important issues. (*Time-bell rings*) This proposal was a specific proposal made by India for the LDCs and the LDC package was secured. I will agree that it was not a satisfactory package. It could have been a stronger package for the LDCs, but that package was secured. Now, will the impasse in the WTO not create problems for the LDCs, who were one of the biggest beneficiaries of the success of the Bali Ministerial and the Bali package?

My third point is, the LDCs themselves have expressed concern about the confrontationist stance. My fourth question to the Minister is, para 28 of her Statement...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, please conclude. You have taken 15 minutes. It cannot be a discussion.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, these are queries and I am specifically referring now to paragraphs. ...*(Interruptions)*...

Now, para 28 of the Statement says that the stance taken by India has resonated across the world. We had the majority of nations, with India leading the coalition of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. I have seen reports. We have been closely following it and many people have been in touch. I want, therefore, an answer so that any misgivings can be removed that the large coalition partners, including Nigeria, Egypt, Kenya, Ghana and Brazil, all left us. BRICS fell apart in Bali itself. We were not that fortunate to keep it together. But, in the Geneva General Conference, IBSA has also fallen apart. So, India's alienation, the collapse of the coalition, is a matter of sadness. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NARESH GUJRAL (Punjab): Sir, he is making very relevant points. He should be allowed to speak, but we should also be given the same consideration. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : सर, यह डिस्कशन है या क्लैरिफिकेशन? I want to know this from the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would clarify. ...*(Interruptions)*... Now, please. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा : मैं अपनी बात खत्म कर रहा हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, yes. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : फिर सबको इसी हिसाब से समय दिया जाए या फिर सभी दलों को टाइम दिया जाए। अगर यह क्लैरिफिकेशन है, तो इसके लिए चेयर को नाम नहीं दिए जाते, क्योंकि क्लैरिफिकेशन कोई भी पूछ सकता है। डिस्कशन के लिए आपको पार्टी वाइज़ नाम देना होगा।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, the point is, Mr. Anand Sharma, I am sorry... *(Interruptions)*... For clarifications, there is a precedent. It is only for asking questions and is for just three or four minutes because we have got only a maximum of 35-45 minutes for this. If it was to be a discussion...*(Interruptions)*... Now, listen. If it was to be a discussion, you could have given a notice. There are other devices. That is what I am saying. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am absolutely in favour of a detailed discussion. I know this is an important subject which needs discussion, but for that there are other devices. You could have given notice. There are other devices. Now, when it is clarifications, how much can the Chair allow a Member? I have got 15 names here. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह स्टेटमेंट किस नियम के तहत आया है?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a *suo motu* statement.

SHRI NARESH AGRAWAL: So, there is a procedure.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That I know. I have already said that each Member should take five minutes maximum. I said that. What can I do, Mr. Anand Sharma? It is an important subject. Then you should have given another notice. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : सर, उसी अनुपात में आप सारे दलों को समय दें। यह नहीं होगा कि एक दल को तो समय मिल गया और बाकी दलों को समय नहीं मिला।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what I am saying. ...*(Interruptions)*... Clarification is not on the party basis. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TARUN VIJAY (Uttarakhand): We have to discuss disaster affected people. Dead bodies are lying rotting in our area and we are not able to discuss that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : सर, फिर तो जो मैम्बर पूछेगा, चेयर को उसे एलाउ करना पड़ेगा।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anand Sharma, I am telling you that this is not a discussion. It is an important subject but that doesn't mean that you can take so much time. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is not on party basis; it is on the basis of names received. Every Member has equal right in this; it is not on party basis. It is a clarification.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, as I said, as a senior Member ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : डिप्टी चेयरमैन सर, क्लैरिफिकेशन के लिए आप पहले से कैसे तय कर लेंगे कि कौन बोलेगा और कौन नहीं बोलेगा? How? क्या ऐसा कोई नियम है कि क्लैरिफिकेशन के लिए पहले से पार्टीवाइज़ नाम दिए जाएंगे?

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिए।

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ऐसा कोई नियम है? इस पर इफ-बट हो जाना चाहिए। कोई बड़ा दल है कोई छोटा दल है, लेकिन इस पर पहले से नाम कैसे आ जाएंगे? क्या इस सदन में ऐसा कोई नियम रहा है कि क्लैरिफिकेशन के लिए दल वाले पहले नाम भेजें?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I didn't say that. I said, I go by names received. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : नहीं, मैंने अपने दल का नाम भेजा, तो आपने कागज़ लेने से मना कर दिया, यह कैसे हो जाएगा? आप एक रोटेशन रखिए।

श्री उपसभापति: यह नहीं है, You sent the name after starting the discussion. That is why I didn't take them. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : यह किसी नियम में नहीं लिखा हुआ है कि डिस्कशन शुरू होने के बाद नाम नहीं लिए जाएंगे। फिर यह डिस्कशन नहीं है, यह क्लैरिफिकेशन है। यह डिस्कशन नहीं है, this is the clarification. इसके लिए हम पहले से नाम कैसे भेज देंगे?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, I don't think there is any hard and fast rule. It depends on the subject. There are some subjects which may not be that important; there are subjects which are important and have national and international ramifications. So,

this is one of the subjects which have national and international ramifications. I have a paper before me. The clarification by the present Leader of the House and the then Leader of the Opposition on 18.12.2013 was thirty-seven minutes long.

SHRI NARESH AGRAWAL: As an LOP, you can speak without any time limit.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Since I am not speaking ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If hon. LOP is speaking, he can speak. That is a point. But I cannot transfer your right to somebody else. What can I do?

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : हमें ऊर्जा पर भी सुनना है, ऊर्जा भी नेशनल इंटररेस्ट का विषय है ।

SHRI P. RAJEEVE: Giving names in advance is applicable to discussion. This is clarification. Every Member can raise his hand. Giving names in advance is applicable only to statutory discussion. Clarification is another thing. Every Member can raise his hand. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am allowing that. What is the problem ? I have to first dispose of the names already received. Then I will allow those who will raise their hands. ...*(Interruptions)*... I didn't say I will not allow.

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : डिप्टी चेयरमैन सर, क्लैरिफिकेशन के लिए यहां जो नियम है, उसके अनुसार सबसे पहले आप बड़े दल को समय देंगे, फिर दूसरे नम्बर के दल को समय देंगे । यहां पर यही नियम रहा है । सुषमा जी जब यहां आई थीं, जितनी बार भी उनके सब्जेक्ट पर क्लैरिफिकेशन हुआ, आपने दलीय संख्या के आधार पर सबको समय दिया । लेकिन अब आप यह कैसे कर लेंगे कि जो नाम पहले आ गए, उनको हम पहले बुलवाएंगे, फिर उनके बाद जो हाथ उठाएंगे, उनको बुलवाएंगे । यह पहले से कैसे तय हो जाएगा ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, what do you want ?

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : आप दल के हिसाब से समय दें । आप सबसे बड़े दल के हिसाब से, सीरियल से बुलाएं ।

श्री उपसभापति : तब दल के अनुसार नाम भी मिलने चाहिए ।

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : अगर कोई दल बोलना चाहे तो ठीक है । अगर उसने नाम दिया है, तो बुलाएं, नहीं दिया है तो नहीं बुलाएं, लेकिन आप सीरियल से बुलाएं ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have no objection to that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TARUN VIJAY: Sir, who decides that who will get the privilege and who will get the benefit? How is it decided ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. So, do we allow it to proceed as a discussion and allow Members to take as much time as they want, or, should we only seek clarifications ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF POWER; THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COAL; AND THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF NEW AND RENEWABLE ENERGY (SHRI PIYUSH GOYAL): Sir, I have to reply to the discussion on the working of the Power Ministry. It is the third or fourth day. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, how much time should be given for clarifications? We will give five minutes to each Member. Okay, that's fine. Now, Anand Sharmaji, you please try to finish.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have raised some questions. We always believe in a bipartisan consensus, and that is why I referred to the past practice. It should be taken in that spirit because the Government and all the opposition parties, when it comes to important decisions, negotiating stance in multilateral forums, must have consultations and it is the Government's duty to keep the opposition leaders briefed.

My last point, which I want to make, is that in Bali, India's role was acknowledged in re-affirming two things - (i) the centrality of the WTO as a multilateral trade organisation to govern global trade in a rule-based manner, and (ii) forcefully bringing back to the fore the developmental agenda to take forward the Doha Development Round, the only round of trade negotiations which has been dedicated to development, and Minister's Statement does refer to that. Therefore, after the end of this impasse, but with the collapse of the General Council, as the last paragraph of Minister's Statement states that you will be able to persuade and convince, will the Minister clarify as to what the strategy for that is? I agree that the permanent solution of this particular issue of public stock holding and procurement is possible. Even there is a settled draft, that is, the 'Rev.4' draft of December, 2008. If we trigger that and force a work programme in a time-bound manner, perhaps, we can go back to where we have left and bring back others to the negotiating table.

Lastly, to conclude, they are those major countries who were originally, post-Uruguay round, the greatest advocates of the multilateral trade organisation and the WTO. Those very countries and those very organisations today, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, are not in favour of giving that strength and a central role, perhaps, except for areas of their interest to the WTO. We know about the TPP (Trans-Pacific Partnership) and the TTIP. Now, once these bypass and plurilaterals move forward, will, after this stance, India's position in playing a key role in the global trade organizations not be reduced? So, these are the concerns which we have and I conclude by saying that yes, India should take a leadership position, as we have done in the past, but the Minister must also explain that why the big coalition, that we had put together, has fallen apart.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri D. Raja.

SHRI DEREK O'BRIEN (West Bengal): Sir, we just agreed that we would go party-wise.

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : सर, अभी यह तय हुआ था कि दलीय संख्या के आधार पर मौका मिलेगा। अब इसके बाद अगर बीजेपी की तरफ से कोई बोलना चाहे, then BSP, TMC, JDU, etc. This is the order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The practice we have followed so far is to go by the names. The Members, who give the names first, will be called first.

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : सर, क्लेरिफिकेशन में ऐसा कभी नहीं हुआ।...(व्यवधान)... क्लेरिफिकेशन में यह प्रिंसिपल कभी नहीं फॉलो हुआ।...(व्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, I have no problem. Accordingly, the next turn is from BJP. Now, there are three names from BJP, but who will speak first? I will tell you the names - Shri Basawaraj Patil, Shri Anil Madhav Dave and Shri Bhupender Yadav. One of you can speak.

श्री बसावाराज पाटिल (कर्णाटक): माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से दो स्पष्टीकरण जानना चाहता हूँ। WTO के अंदर अभी जो बात हुई है, क्या इसके द्वारा अन्य थर्ड वर्ल्ड कंट्रीज में भारत की साख को बनाए रखने में कुछ क्षति हुई है? अगर शुरू में कुछ ऐसा लगा है, तो उस क्षति की पूर्ति के लिए क्या हमने कोई कोशिश की है? इसमें एक तो इस देश के किसान का हित है और दूसरा अन्न की सुरक्षा है। क्या यह इन दोनों से जुड़ा हुआ है? इन दोनों चीजों को जोड़ते हुए अगर यह हमारी साख अन्य थर्ड वर्ल्ड कंट्रीज के साथ जोड़ कर रखने में सफल होता है, तो यह हमारे लिए अत्यंत लाभदायक होगा। इस दिशा में मैं माननीय मंत्री जी के स्पष्ट विचार जानना चाहता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. Now, Shri Derek O'Brien. ...(Interruptions)... I should have name. That's all.

SHRI DEREK O'BRIEN : Sir, I read the Minister's statement. I also heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for seventeen minutes. I was beginning to wonder where the clarifications were, and, sometimes the clarifications also became justifications. I leave it at that. Sir, I will take a non-partisan view on this. Firstly, Sir, I think, the original sinner was the GATT Agreement of 1994. In the GATT Agreement of 1994, it was clearly stated that the procurement should not exceed ten per cent of the value of production. The problem which has happened and which has remained since 1994, hon. Minister, is that this re-calculation has not happened, and the prices, at which, it is being calculated on, are 1986-88 prices. The question here is, and, since you have come back, if we do the calculation as per the new prices, which are six or seven times higher, where does that take us? That takes us way beyond the ten per cent cap. So, the first one is that that was an inherited flaw. Please tell us as to what is the current flaw where the developed countries have still been kept out of disclosing their subsidies. It is 400 billion dollars,

[Shri Derek O'Brien]

if you take the EU and North America together, and the developed countries are still not disclosing their subsidies. Our understanding is -- and, please clarify it -- that we made three offers. The first is to market up to the current prices, the second was to link it to the CPI; rejected, and, the third, and, this is crucial, to allow us the opportunity to breach the ten per cent limit. There is no clarity on that. Please give us clarity on that because eventually the understanding is, and, I think, the Government need not feel shy of this, you had an opportunity to be part of one trillion dollar economy, or, you had an opportunity to come up with a Statement like that of yesterday, for one billion people in India. So, it is a tactical decision.

Now, the Government is very keen on pushing forward some so-called reforms in the name of FDI, and, you people are in a big hurry. You want to do it on a particular date; it has to be brought up in this Session; or, it has to be passed in three days. I am not playing politics here but there is one point. Fair enough, if that agreement, which you thought, you would sign before the 31st July, 2014, we are on the same page that you are. You do not need to rush in to sign that agreement. Try and sign it in December, try and sign it in February but the cut-off date, as you know, is August, 2015. And, the last point, Sir, the kind of communication strategy you have used with the Prime Minister and for his election campaign, we compliment you. It was a very good communication strategy because communication strategies need to work and you got the numbers. So, there is no problem. *...(Interruptions)...* Anyway, Sir, on a serious note, with such a great communication skill at your beck and call, why are you not putting those communication skills to use? I agree with Anand Sharma on this one, take us into confidence, talk to us. Whether it is a big international issue or even if it is something which is a Bill, if you put those communication strategies to use, I think, you will find all the solutions. But overall, we have always believed that the Food Security Bill, for all the hype and RA-RA you make about it, is impractical at times and it is also unwise. So, we are with you on this. But please, next time, get everybody on board. *(Time-bell rings)* If you have not found a solution in July, not a problem; look for one before March. Thank you. *...(Interruptions)...*

श्री के.सी. त्यागी : सर, मैं दो-तीन सवाल पूछूँगा, लेकिन उससे पहले मैं यह कहूँगा कि ये जो बीच वाले लोग हैं, ये अविकसित देशों की तरह हैं। एक तरफ अमेरिका है और दूसरी तरफ यूरोपीय यूनियन है और जिस तरह से अविकसित देश, यानी थर्ड वर्ल्ड कंट्रीज़ उनके सामने कटोरा लिए घूम रहे हैं, यही हालत नरेश जी ने हमारी आपके सामने कर दी है।

सर, जेनेवा कन्वेंशन के बाद और बाली सम्मेलन में भी किसानों की स्थिति को लेकर कई सवाल प्रकाश में आए हैं। अब हमारी चिन्ता इसलिए भी बढ़ रही है कि अब किसानों की फसल के जो दाम हैं, वह भी डब्ल्यूटीओ तय करेगा। इस देश का प्रोक्योरमेंट सिस्टम कैसा होगा, वह होगा या नहीं होगा, वह प्राइवेट सेक्टर में जाएगा या पब्लिक सेक्टर में जाएगा, यह भी डब्ल्यूटीओ तय करेगा।

कल मैंने देश के चीनी मालिकों का प्रेस कम्युनीक पढ़ा। उन्होंने भारत सरकार, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार और किसानों, इन तीनों से कहा कि गन्ने के दाम इतने पैसे पर लेने हैं तो लो, वरना हम दाम नहीं बढ़ाएँगे और चीनी मिलें बन्द कर देंगे। ऐसा आजादी के बाद पहली बार हो रहा है। इसमें कहीं न कहीं डब्ल्यूटीओ की झलक रहती है और जेनेवा सम्मेलन के अब जो ताजे प्रपोजल्स हैं, उनके अनुसार खाद्य सुरक्षा के मानकों के साथ समझौता न हो। जो टीएफए है, उस पर भारत ने अभी साइन नहीं किया है, उतने भर के लिए मैं इनकी प्रशंसा करना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन इसका जो एक क्लॉज है, that is the most disturbing clause and that is called peace clause. अगर उस पर दस्तखत होते हैं, तो उस पीस क्लॉज के तहत फूड सिक्योरिटी पर खतरा आने वाला है।

अगर आनन्द जी ने कहा है तो मैं उनकी प्रशंसा करना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन मैं मंत्री महोदया से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब आप केवल अपने अफसरों से बात मत कीजिए, इसमें हम भी एक पार्टी हैं, those who are the producers यह कोई मामूली बात नहीं है। पूरे हिन्दुस्तान में पीएल 480 खया गया, जिन्हें अमेरिका के पशु खाते थे। हमारे पुरखों ने, हम लोगों ने और कृषि वैज्ञानिकों ने, पंजाब के हमारे साथी यहां बैठे हुए हैं, मध्य प्रदेश और छत्तीसगढ़ के लोगों ने भी इसके लिए क्रांति की है। मैं सारे देश के किसानों और कृषि वैज्ञानिकों को बधाई देने के साथ-साथ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब हम भी डब्ल्यूटीओ के जितने ट्रेड और टॉक्स हैं, उनके मेज़र शेयरहोल्डर्स हैं। अब आप जब भी किसी वार्ता में जाएँ तो उसमें हमको भी शामिल करें। आप अपनी भारतीय जनता पार्टी के किसान संघ से पूछ लेते। मैंने कल लेट नाइट स्वदेशी जागरण मंच के अपने एक पुराने साथी से सवाल पूछे, वे आपके खिलाफ हैं। स्वदेशी जागरण मंच वाले आपके इंश्योरेंस बिल के खिलाफ हैं। मेरे पास उसकी कटिंग है, मैं तो गलतबयानी नहीं करता हूँ, इसीलिए मेरा कहना है कि अब जबकि इन चीजों के बारे में पूरी दुनिया में कंसर्न हो रहा है, ...(व्यवधान)... मैं अपनी बात से फिर अलग हो जाऊंगा, मैं आपके चक्कर में मैं नहीं पड़ूंगा। ...(व्यवधान)... चाहे फूड सिब्सडी प्रोग्राम हो और जो हमारे देश का public distribution system है वह भी खतरे में आ गया है। MSP नहीं बढ़नी चाहिए, यह भी मंत्री महोदया का क्लॉज है डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. का। एक शर्त है third world countries के लोगों के लिए। तो यहां भी, सदन में भी third world countries हैं और आप भी third world countries हैं जब जाते हैं यूरोपियन कन्ट्रीज से और अमेरिकन कन्ट्रीज के साथ बातचीत करने के लिए। सिडनी में आप 19 तारीख को उपस्थित रहें और जो मैंने रिपोर्ट पढ़ी है, आप कंट्राडिक्ट कर सकती हैं इसको, उसमें फूड सिक्योरिटी प्रपोजल्स का जिक्र नहीं है, according to this report. I may be wrong also. अब ज्यादा जो आपका emphasis था वहां पर ...(व्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

श्री के.सी. त्यागी : ऐसी third world countries की वहां हालत हो रही है ...(व्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Put your question and finish. क्वेश्चन पूछो और खत्म करो।

श्री के.सी. त्यागी : इस क्लॉज पर जाने से पहले आप अपोजिशन पार्टीज को, जो stakeholders हैं, जिसमें पंजाब के, हरियाणा के, छत्तीसगढ़ के किसानों ने जो अनाज, गेहूं, चावल पैदा किया है, इन सब संगठनों से बात की जानी चाहिए और 1954-55 में जब से फूड कारपोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया और सी.डब्ल्यू.सी. बना है, तब से भारत का जो कंज्यूमर है उसकी सुरक्षा के हितों की गारंटी होनी चाहिए। इसलिए अगर डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. आया और उसकी शर्तें मानी गईं तो बाजार में किसानों को न फसल के दाम मिलेंगे और न कंज्यूमर को मिलेंगे। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन सवालों को भी इसमें शामिल किया जाए। धन्यवाद।

SHRI A. NAVANEETHAKRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to seek clarifications from the hon. Minister from a layman's point of view. After going through the statement of the hon. Minister, I would like to seek the clarification regarding the ten per cent subsidy. What is the objection that the rich nations are raising? We want to know about the nature of their objection. Why are they objecting to ten per cent subsidy given to the farmers? What is the stand taken or reason given by India to the objections raised by rich nations? In the working of the ten per cent subsidy, what is the hardship that our nation is facing? It must be explained.

My colleague, Mr. Tyagi, referred to peace clause. What is meant by peace clause? The farmers do not know anything about economics or finance. Nobody knows what is happening in India. What is the obstacle in sanctioning or giving or granting subsidy to the Indian farmers? They are suffering a lot. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you for being brief and asking pointed questions.

प्रो. राम गोपाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री महोदया से दो सवाल, जो वक्तव्य आया है मंत्री महोदया का, उस पर करना चाहूंगा। पैरा-3, 5 और 6, इनको अगर एक साथ पढ़ें, पैरा-3 के अनुसार—

"इन मंत्रिस्तरीय निर्णयों के बीच, दो निर्णय विशेष रूप से महत्वपूर्ण हैं, व्यापार सुविधा संबंधी करार हेतु मंत्रिस्तरीय निर्णय तथा खाद्य सुरक्षा प्रयोजनों हेतु सार्वजनिक स्टॉकहोल्डिंग संबंधी मंत्रिस्तरीय निर्णय।"

पैरा-5 में है—

"व्यापार सुविधा करार (टीएफए) प्रोटोकॉल को डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. द्वारा 31 जुलाई, 2014 तक अंगीकार किया जाना है। इसके पश्चात डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के दो तिहाई सदस्यों द्वारा अनुसमर्थन प्रदान किए जाने के पश्चात यह करार 31 जुलाई, 2015 से स्वतः प्रभावी हो जाएगा।"

अगर ऐसा होता है तो हिंदुस्तान के विभिन्न क्षेत्रों में इस का पॉजिटिव या नेगेटिव क्या असर होगा, मंत्री जी अपने उत्तर में इस बारे में स्पष्टीकरण दें। दूसरे, आप पैरा 8 व 9 देखें। पैरा 8 में यह है कि, "भारत ने अपना यह मत रखा कि जब तक अल्प-विकसित देशों से जुड़े मुद्दों सहित सार्वजनिक स्टॉकहोल्डिंग तथा बाली में लिए गए निर्णयों से संबंधित अन्य सभी मुद्दों पर स्थायी समाधान ढूँढने का आश्वासन नहीं मिलता तब तक व्यापार सुगमीकरण करार के लिए संशोधन प्रोटोकॉल पर मतैक्य में शामिल होना कठिन होगा।" पैरा 9 में है कि, "किसी स्थायी समाधान के बिना भारत तथा अन्य विकासशील देशों में सार्वजनिक स्टॉकहोल्डिंग कार्यक्रम घरेलू सहायता पर मौजूदा अधिकतम सीमा के कारण बाधित होंगे।" मंत्री जी, आपके विरोध के बावजूद, जैसाकि त्यागी जी ने कहा, जब "गैट" था तब भी हमने सारे देश में इस का विरोध किया था कि आने वाले दिनों में एक ऐसी स्थिति आएगी जब इस देश का बजट कैसा होगा, यह भी बाहर के लोग तय करेंगे और इस देश के किसानों को हम क्या-क्या सुविधाएं दें, यह बात भी बाहर से तय होगी। इसलिए अगर यह मतैक्य नहीं होता है और उसके बावजूद भी कोई फैसला होता है, तब हमारा स्टैंड क्या होगा?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY : Sir, I will try and stick to the clarifications, rather

than participate in the discussion that you have allowed. First of all, I would like to add just one point here that since 1994, our Party has been consistently opposing the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade saying that this is detrimental to our country's interest. And I think this is now being proved to be correct by looking at the Minister's Statement. I am glad. Having made that point, my first clarification pertains to para 8. I quote para 8. It says, "India, therefore, took the stand that till there is an assurance of commitment to find a permanent solution on public stockholding and on all other Bali deliverables, including those for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), it would be difficult to join the consensus on the Protocol of Amendment for the Trade Facilitation Agreement." Sir, I have no dispute with that. I am glad that we are using or counterpoising what we call a countervailing, balancing act in clubbing together the solution to public stockholding and the Trade Facilitation Agreement. Trade facilitation, from what I understand, deals with a lot of other issues which may be useful for us in a multilateral trade agreement, which is not strictly connected with public stockholding. But, if you are using this as a bargaining part, I have no objection to that. But it is not really strictly connected to that. Having made that point, in Bali, India had achieved what was then called 'interim relief' or 'peace clause'. It was interim relief for a period of four years whereby we can continue with what we were doing and within four years, a permanent solution had to be found. That was the agreement as far as I know. He was the Minister then. So, that was the agreement on which we had agreed. Now, have we moved forward on that four-year permanent solution or not? Has there been any forward movement towards that? I would like to seek a clarification whether there has been any forward movement on that. Yes, linking it up with Trade Facilitation Agreement, I would say, is a good bargaining method. We should use it. But what is the position with regard to the permanent solution as far as this issue is concerned?

Secondly, Sir, this whole issue relates to the underlying philosophy of neo-liberal reforms. I must compliment the Government that they have finally admitted that this is what is happening in global capitalism in today's world of globalisation. I quote para 11. I quote from para 11, "Today, developing countries are fighting to keep the negotiations focused on development against the single-minded mercantilist focus of most of the rich developed world on market access issues." It is good. It is correct. Finally, the Government of India has accepted that this is what the developed world is doing. This is what the developed world wants, to actually access our markets for their profit maximisation. Therefore, this is a strategy that we must not fall prey to, and we should fight against it. My second clarification pertains to this. In continuation with this understanding will it extend to all other economic reforms or measures that the Government is contemplating?

We are discussing the question of allowing FDI into the insurance sector. This is precisely the single-minded mercantilist focus of the richest developed world which

[Shri Sitaram Yechury]

the statement says. That is precisely what is leading to such demands of opening up new avenues of the FDI into various areas, including the defence production. Will this philosophy be applicable to the other areas in which case it is welcome? But we want this clarification.

The third clarification that I want pertains to para 13. "... WTO is unable to agree even to fast track negotiations on an issue of such importance to millions of subsistence farmers across the developing world, while the rich world can continue to subsidise their farmers unabatedly." The rich world can continue to subsidise their farmers unabatedly — are we going to bring that on to the agenda of the WTO? They are subsidising their farmers in their countries in non-trade measures. They are subsidising their farmers in non-price measures. But the effect of that subsidy is impacting on prices of global trade which all of us know. Therefore, mere excuse that their subsidies are not connected with prices, and, therefore, does not impact on the global trade is a wrong assumption. (*Time-bell rings*). I am only seeking clarifications. Is the present Government of India prepared to put this on the agenda of the WTO, and say, discuss the question of subsidies across the board to the farmers, not price-related subsidies alone which is what they have putting the impact on us? They get away because they have non-priced subsidies whereas we have become the victim. Therefore, we should bring that on to the agenda. That is the main issue.

My fourth clarification pertains to para 16. The question of food security is our sovereign right. That has been reiterated. It is correct. It also says, "It is our duty to protect our citizens' fundamental rights to life and livelihood." It is absolutely correct. Now, if this is the point that we have said, the clarification that I want to know from the Government, when the Food Security Bill was moved here and adopted by our august House, we had objected to that Bill saying that it is limited because it covers only 67 per cent of the Indian population. We had said that it should be universal. Only 67 per cent of the Indian population should not get food security. The rest also should be covered. Our aim is to expand this 67 per cent to an eventual universality. Now, even according to the interim conditions put by the WTO your food security is capped *ipso facto* at 67 per cent. You can't go beyond that even today. Are we willy-nilly accepting that our food security whatever we give the right is capped at 67 per cent. In that case this contradicts the entire concept that you have yourself stated in para 16. In this para you say, it is our sovereign right. (*Time-bell rings*). Sir, these are important issues.

Therefore, what we have said, have we already compromised? That is the clarification I want to seek. Can we extend the food security beyond 67 per cent? If not, we urge you to take up the matter with the WTO, and we will support you, if you take up this matter, because we think the right to universalisation, whether we exercise it or not is a

3.00 P.M.

different matter, the Parliament will decide. But that right can't be dictated and curtailed by an international organisation, which is a sovereign right. My last point is, in Para 22, you have said, "We have offered practical suggestions for the way forward." It is good if we have suggested practical ways. But we would actually urge and demand that these practical solutions that the Government of India has suggested must be subject to a discussion here. How do we know what has the government of India suggested? Since this is a matter concerning the livelihood and food security of millions of our countrymen, the proposals that you have suggested, may be extremely well meaning, I am not questioning that, but they must be subjected to a public discourse and discussion and the opinion of the House, a sense of the House must be taken on this issue. My final point is...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How many final points?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Two, Sir. There are always two final points. You can't reach the final without going to the semifinals.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you lose in the semifinals, then what is the point in going to the finals ?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: That is why I am fighting. I am not losing. So, the final point is this. What has happened to this coalition? There was a BRICS coalition; there was a G-33 coalition at Bali. Now, today you are left with – I am glad the company is good – Bolivia, Venezuela and Cuba. I am entirely happy about it. But you are left with a company of these three countries, and these three countries, fundamentally, have been opposed to this entire concept of the WTO negotiations and the GATT, 1994. So if you are joining that group, I am very happy. Then you go back to oppose 1994. Otherwise, it is a matter of concern. Why is it that these countries which I have mentioned, who were with us till Bali, are now separate? The argument they have given is, this merits your attention also, Sir, trade facilitation has nothing to do with food security of your population. Trade facilitation is only to simplify the procedures of custom duties, etc., for making it transparent, making it accountable. So, that has got nothing to do with the issue that you are discussing. We have linked it up for our bargaining position, which is good. I don't dispute that. It is good that we have linked it up. But the point is, many of these countries have separated from us on that count. So, I think, India must make an effort to bring these allies of ours back on board and we should reassert our position as one of the leaders of the developing world in this entire struggle between the North and the South in terms of the economic space. These are the six clarifications which I want the Minister to answer.

श्री भूपिंदर सिंह (ओडिशा) : डिप्टी चेयरमैन सर, यह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण बात है और जैसा मैंने पिछले दिनों भी कहा था कि हम बोलते रहते हैं कि हमारा देश, भारतवर्ष एक कृषि प्रधान देश है, लेकिन मंत्री महोदया का डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के बारे में जो स्टेटमेंट यहां आया है, जिसके बारे में चर्चा हो रही है, यहां तो हम यह कहना चाहेंगे कि अगर सबसे दुखी इस देश में आज कोई है, तो वह किसान है। किसान हर वक्त पैदावार करता है, सरकार की तरफ से वैज्ञानिक जो भी पद्धति उसको देते हैं, वह उसको आजमाता है और उस पर कठिनाई से परिश्रम करके वह हमारा उत्पादन बढ़ाता है। उसको लेकर हम राज्यों में और यहां पार्लियामेंट में बहादुरी झाड़ते हैं, लेकिन सर, अभी समय कम है और मुद्दा यह है कि हमारा स्वार्थ क्या है? क्या हम डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में मेम्बर बनें? वहां जाकर हमारा यानी भारत का मुद्दा क्या होगा? आज अगर किसान के घर में पैसा है, आज अगर देश में अच्छी खेती हुई है, किसान के घर में लक्ष्मी है, तब बाजार अच्छे दिखते हैं। तब छोटे व्यापारियों का काम भी चलता है और स्कूल और कॉलेजों में जाकर बच्चे भी पढ़ पाते हैं, जब किसान के पास पैसा होता है। लेकिन हम उनके साथ क्या करते हैं? देश का और देश की सरकार का, केंद्र सरकार का, जो भी चाहे शासन में हो, किसी की सरकार हो, उनका उनके साथ क्या रवैया है? सर, सवाल यह है कि मिनिमम सपोर्ट प्राइस में हम डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के ऊपर कब तक डिपेंड करेंगे? जैसा पैरा-13 में कहा गया है, मैं उसे रिपीट नहीं करूंगा। जो डेवलपड कंट्रीज़ हैं, उनके लिए कोई प्रतिबंध नहीं है, उनके लिए कोई हर्डल्स नहीं हैं, चाहे वे कितनी भी सब्सिडीज़ अपने किसानों को दें, एग्रीकल्चर सेक्टर में दें। हमारे यहां अगर प्रतिबंध है, हर्डल्स है तो किसानों के मिनिमम सपोर्ट प्राइस के लिए हैं। मिनिमम सपोर्ट प्राइस और एग्रीकल्चरल पॉलिसी पर हम डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में जाकर बाद में जो भी करेंगे, वह अलग बात है, लेकिन मैं आपसे यह उम्मीद करता हूं और सारे सदन के माध्यम से मैं सरकार से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि थोड़ा दिल दिखाएं, हम आपके साथ हैं। हरेक भारतीय चाहता है कि भारत में अच्छे दिन आएँ, लेकिन अच्छे दिन तभी आएंगे, जब किसान के अच्छे दिन आएंगे। जब तक किसान के अच्छे दिन नहीं आएंगे, तब तक भारत की प्रगति, भारत की तरक्की का कोई मतलब ही नहीं है। पार्लियामेंट में हम जितने भी कॉस्टीट्यूशन में अमेंडमेंट्स कर लें, जितने भी बिल यहां पर लाकर उन पर चर्चा कर लें, उसका कोई मकसद नहीं है। 1994 में गेट की बात हुई थी। कुछ बातें ऐसी भी होती हैं, जो सही तरीके से नहीं रखी जाती हैं। मेरा देश गरीब नहीं है, मैं गरीब नहीं हूँ, मेरा कोई भी इंस्टीट्यूशन गरीब नहीं है। मेरी गरीबी यह है कि हम कभी-कभी कुछ तथ्यों का ऐसा प्रचार करते हैं, जिससे किसान समझ नहीं पाते हैं कि उनके लिए क्या किया गया है। वही हमारी गरीबी है। जिनके लिए यहां पर हम बात करते हैं, जो बिल लाते हैं, जो अमेंडमेंट्स लाते हैं, उनके ऊपर भी हम यह उम्मीद करते हैं कि इसके जरिए एक अच्छा मैसेज जाए।

मैं आपके माध्यम से दो तीन सवाल मंत्री महोदया से जानना चाहूंगा। क्या आज दुनिया में भारत से बढ़कर कोई सबसे बड़ा कंज्यूमर देश है? व्यापार करने के लिए दुनिया हमारी तरफ झुकेगी और अगर वह हमारी तरफ नहीं आएगी तो उनकी भी दुकानें नहीं चलेंगी, उनकी भी अर्थनीति नहीं चलेगी। मैं आपसे यह उम्मीद रखूंगा कि you will meet this point. Is India the largest market today in the whole world or not? If we are the largest market, I would like, in one line, that you meet this point of mine. सर, विशेष करके यहां पर आप जब भी मिनिमम सपोर्ट प्राइस की बात लाते हैं...(समय की घंटी)... उस समय आप स्टेट्स को बुलाइए, किसान के जो लोग हैं, उनको बुलाइए और मिनिमम सपोर्ट प्राइस जिस हिसाब से...(समय की घंटी)... सर, एक मिनट रह गया है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI BHUPINDER SINGH: I will conclude, Sir. 1986 से 1988 का जो प्राइस था, उसके 10 परसेंट से, उस प्राइस को लेकर सब्सिडी की बात की जा रही है। जब जनरल बजट आया था, तब मैंने पूछा था कि यहां जो फूड सिक्योरिटी का एक्ट पास किया गया है, उसके संबंध में यह सरकार क्या चाहती है, क्या मैसेज देना चाहती है? आप फूड सिक्योरिटी एक्ट को लागू करना चाहते हैं या नहीं? मैं आपसे उम्मीद करूंगा कि You should be very, very specific in giving that answer.

DR. K.P. RAMALINGAM (Tamil Nadu): Sir, first of all, I appreciate and congratulate the Commerce Minister that she has given a very elaborate statement on India's stand on WTO. I am very proud to say that my leader, late Shri Murasoli Maran, was the first man who, in the first meeting at Doha, opposed the WTO. Considering the anti-farmers' attitude which they had taken, he opposed that.

Sir, I would like to state that developing countries and developed countries are not on the same footing. The Government, while being committed to the WTO, should ensure that farmers' interests are protected firmly. There should not be any compromise on this issue. Sir, subsidy and public distribution are entirely meant to meet the interests of farmers as well as for people below the poverty line. And that is what everybody is talking about. But the Government should not compromise on these two aspects. While entering into any treaty or agreement, they must ensure this.

Then, in para 4, the Minister has stated, "The Trade Facilitation Agreement is, basically, aimed at a greater transparency and simplification of customs procedures." The Government has to be very cautious not only in the matter of exports, but also about the import of value-added agricultural products. In this connection, agricultural finished products which are using sugar, milk and other foodgrains for biscuits and chocolates are our staple food. In the pretext of signing of World Trade Organisation, products derived from them should not enter the Indian market, i.e. the products derived from milk or sugar or even wheat should not enter Indian trade because it will affect the Indian market. We have to ensure this also. Humanity cannot be sacrificed before mercantilisation. If we ignore this, then we will again come across more suicides by farmers. We have to be more cautious in this.

I want to seek another clarification. Lastly, in the 30th paragraph, the Minister stated that "India will be able to persuade the WTO Membership to appreciate the sensitivities of India and other developing countries and see their way to taking this issue forward in a positive spirit." If not, then? That is the question. India will be able to persuade. But if not, then what is our position? The Minister has to explain that. If we can't persuade, then what is our ultimate aim? That also has to be explained by the Minister. These are my clarifications.

सरदार सुखदेव सिंह ढिंडसा (पंजाब): थैंक्यू सर। सबसे पहले मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आनन्द शर्मा जी हमारे दोस्त हैं, बड़े अच्छे इन्सान हैं, बहुत intelligent हैं, लेकिन वे अपनी स्पीच में पहले ही यह कह रहे हैं, “He himself said that the last agreement was not entirely satisfactory.” फिर उस पर इन्होंने दस्तखत क्यों किए?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I was talking about LDC package.

सरदार सुखदेव सिंह ढिंडसा : चलिए, आपने दस्तखत किए, लेकिन आपने किसी को confidence में नहीं लिया, नेशन को confidence में नहीं लिया।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा : हमने विश्वास में लिया।

सरदार सुखदेव सिंह ढिंडसा : जैसा कि त्यागी जी ने कहा और माननीय भूपिंदर सिंह जी ने कहा।...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, is he having a debate with me? You can start a discussion. I respect Dhindsaji. I am ready to have a debate with him. ढिंडसा जी, आप कहते हैं कि आपको जानकारी नहीं है कि मैंने विश्वास में लिया या नहीं, यह गलत आरोप है। मैंने कहा कि हमने विश्वास में लिया। हमने बातचीत की, हमने ब्रीफ किया, हमने विपक्ष को ब्रीफ किया। आप मुझ पर इलजाम लगा रहे हैं। यह न्यायोचित नहीं है। आप बेइसाफी कर रहे हैं।

सरदार सुखदेव सिंह ढिंडसा : मैं आपके ऊपर इलजाम नहीं लगा रहा हूँ। आप खुद बोलते हुए कह रहे हैं, “This is not satisfactory.”

श्री आनन्द शर्मा : अगर आप मेरी बात नहीं समझे हैं, तो मैं आपको समझाता हूँ।...(व्यवधान)...

सरदार सुखदेव सिंह ढिंडसा : अगर आपने बोलते हुए कहा था, तो मैं यह...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: ढिंडसा जी, आप क्लेरिफिकेशन्स मंत्री जी से पूछिए। आप उनसे मत पूछिए।

सरदार सुखदेव सिंह ढिंडसा : सर, अभी जो त्यागी जी ने कहा और भूपिंदर सिंह जी ने बोला, तो मैं उसी बात पर क्लेरिफिकेशन लेना चाहता हूँ कि जो WTO का एग्रीमेंट हुआ है, क्या उसमें यह लिखा है कि 2017 के बाद MSP नहीं मिलेगी? किसानों के लिए MSP देने के लिए डा. स्वामीनाथन कमीशन ने लिखा था। मैं माननीया मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो एग्रीमेंट होगा, क्या उसमें प्राइस इंडेक्स के साथ जोड़कर किसानों को MSP देने का प्रावधान होगा? ऐसा मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि हमारा देश कृषि प्रधान देश है और खासकर हमारी स्टेट के पास देश की जमीन डेढ़ परसेंट है, लेकिन हम आज भी 50 परसेंट से ज्यादा फूडग्रेन इस देश को दे रहे हैं। क्या मंत्री साहिबा किसानों को पूरा यकीन दिलाएंगी कि डा. स्वामीनाथन कमीशन या प्राइस इंडेक्स के साथ जोड़कर MSP मिलेगी? मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि यह negotiate नहीं हो सकता है। मैं पंजाब की बात कर रहा हूँ। अभी ड्राउट पर डिस्कशन होगा और देश में बारिश नहीं हो रही है। आज पंजाब में किसान ट्यूबवैल से या डीजल पम्प से सिंचाई करता है, क्योंकि उसको बिजली भी समय पर नहीं मिल रही है, कोयला भी समय पर नहीं मिल रहा है, इसके बावजूद भी drought की situation में पंजाब देश को 50 परसेंट से भी ज्यादा अनाज देगा। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सरकार किसानों का पूरा ख्याल रखेगी, क्योंकि पहले WTO एग्रीमेंट में किसानों का पूरा ख्याल नहीं रखा गया था। महोदय,

मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीया मंत्री साहिबा से अपने क्लेरिफिकेशन में यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ये हमें यह यकीन दिलाएंगी कि आगे जब भी WTO एग्रीमेंट होगा, तो उसमें किसान के लिए खासकर MSP जारी रखने और ...(समय की घंटी)... महोदय, अभी मुझे बोलते हुए पांच मिनट नहीं हुए हैं।
...(व्यवधान)...

फूड सिक्योरिटी भी लगी हुई है। आप तो जानते ही हैं कि अगर drought की situation आ जाए, तो फूड सिक्योरिटी उससे जुड़ी हुई है, इसलिए मैं तो इसके लिए यही क्लेरिफिकेशन चाहूंगा कि MSP जारी रहनी चाहिए और उसको खत्म नहीं किया जाना चाहिए। Thank you very much, Sir.

SHRI D. RAJA : Sir, I have three clarifications to seek.

Several issues have been raised by my colleagues. The first one is, para 15 of the statement talks about food security and para 17 talks about agriculture. There it says and I quote:

"...In a country of the size of India with 60 per cent population dependent on a relatively unremunerative agriculture sector, we cannot give up administered prices. This is the only way we can procure food for the Public Distribution System, the central pillar on which our efforts to ensure food security, rest."

But, Sir, the Government is doing something opposite to what has been said in this statement. I can quote an official order issued by the Department of Food and Public Distribution of the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, dated 12th June, 2014. The subject is: 'Declaration of Bonus by some State Governments over and above MSP -- Change in policy of procurement for Central Pool -- Regarding.' Here, the Government really talks about private buyers of foodgrains, because the Government of India, on the basis of recommendations of the CACP, announces MSP for wheat and paddy every year to ensure reasonable price to the farmer. It has been observed that some of the State Governments are announcing bonus over and above the MSP. I hope you will appreciate that such declaration of bonus by the State Governments distort the market of concerned commodity and drives private buyers out of the market in the State. The Central Government is protecting the private buyers. Then, at the end of the circular of your Government, it says, 'The FCI, in consultation with the Department of Food and Public Distribution, will decide as to how much stock of wheat and rice it should acquire from the concerned State in a particular season and will restrict its Central Pool procurement to the extent leaving the rest of the surplus stocks to be disposed off by the State Government concerned at its own risk and cost.' I think, the Government does not stand by its commitment as it has been stated in the statement of the hon. Minister. You say something, but you do something else which is diametrically opposite to your declared objective. On the one side you talk about the food security and the PDS and, on the other, you are destroying and doing something which is opposite to it. It is contradictory. That is why the hon. Minister must clarify as to what your Government

[Shri D. Raja]

does. I would like to know whether your Government stands by your statement or your Government acts in a different way. This is what hon. Minister should clarify.

Then, Sir, since inception of the WTO, it continues to remain as a forum of struggle between rich and developed nations on the one side and the developing nations and less developing nations on the other. In this struggle, India should have become the real leader of developing nations and LDCs. India should have championed all their issues including the market access issues. But, that is where my question is. India somewhere has failed to mobilize the developing nations' support in our just struggle. For instance, I quote the Minister's Statement. Para 28 is very well said by Smt. Nirmala Sitharaman and I don't question her intention when she said, "I take this opportunity to also thank the countries that have stood by India in the WTO." Who are the nations that stood by India, except two-three? Where does India stand in the WTO forum?

Then, Sir, Para 29 states, "The timely correction of any imbalances or anomalies in the working of the system or its rules is critical to ensure that the WTO works impartially and fairly in the interest of all its Members and not just a select few." Who are the 'select few'? It is the U.S.; it is the E.U.; it is Australia. Why can't we say that and why can't we debate that in Parliament? Why can't we tell the people of this country that these are the nations which are against the interests of the developing nations? Why don't you say that you are fighting in the interest of all developing nations? This is what the Minister has to clarify.

Finally, Sir, when I referred to agriculture, I wanted to raise one issue because this new Government has approved the field trials for GM crops. Is it part of the hidden agenda of the WTO? Has the Government agreed to allow field trials of GM crops under pressure, or somewhere down the line under some pressure from some Members of the WTO? Sir, the Minister will have to clarify these things in the interests of our own country. I would like to know whether you take the Parliament and political parties also into confidence before taking a position in the WTO or not.

श्री उपसभापति : नरेंद्र कुमार कश्यप जी प्रश्न पूछिए ।

श्री नरेंद्र कुमार कश्यप (उत्तर प्रदेश) : जी । उपसभापति जी, माननीया मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य जारी किया है, मुझे वह कंप्यूज करने वाला एक स्टेटमेंट लग रहा है । इस स्टेटमेंट के एंडिंग पैरा 30 में मेशन किया गया है कि, "मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास है कि भारत डब्ल्यूटीओ के सदस्य देशों में अपनी तथा अन्य विकासशील देशों की संवेदनशीलता को मनवाने में समर्थ होगा और इस विषय पर पूर्ण उत्साह के साथ हमें उनका सहयोग मिलेगा । इस संस्थान द्वारा यह सबसे बड़ा योगदान होगा, जिससे खाद्य सुरक्षा की वैश्विक चुनौती को हल किया जा सकता है ।" आपने इस पैरा 30 में खाद्य सुरक्षा की चुनौती को हल करने की बात कही है । लेकिन जब हम पैरा 13 पढ़ते हैं, तो बात पलट जाती है । पैरा 13 में आपने लिखा है कि, "डब्ल्यूटीओ विकासशील देशों के लाखों कृषकों के लिए महत्वपूर्ण

मुद्दों पर त्वरित वार्ताएं करने पर सहमति देने में असमर्थ है।" इसमें किसानों के महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दों पर सहमति देने की असमर्थता व्यक्त करना और डब्ल्यूटीओ के अंतिम पैरा द्वारा यह कहना कि हम इसके अच्छे प्रभाव की कल्पना कर रहे हैं, अलग बात लगती है। महोदय, हमारे देश में मुश्किल क्या है? मुश्किल यह है कि खाद्य सुरक्षा के संबंध में हमारी सरकार - पूर्व सरकार ने भी और इस सरकार ने भी, even to Supreme Court also ने भी बहुत सारी बातें, बहुत सारे तथ्य, बहुत सारे निर्णय ऐसे दिए हैं, जिनमें उन्होंने इस बात की चिंता की कि जो गरीब है, उसको खाने के लिए अन्न मयस्सर नहीं होता और लाखों टन अनाज बरसात में सड़ जाता है। उस व्यवस्था को दुरुस्त करने के लिए आप क्या कर रही हैं? आप खाद्य सुरक्षा की बात कह रही हैं। खाद्य सुरक्षा की बात कैसे होगी, जब हमारे पास भंडारण की व्यवस्था नहीं होगी, ऐसे संसाधन नहीं होंगे, डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन सिस्टम सही नहीं होगा? खाद्य सुरक्षा की गारंटी देने की जो बात डब्ल्यूटीओ के अन्दर दर्शाई गई है, उससे हमारा देश कैसे लाभान्वित होगा, एक तो माननीया मंत्री महोदय से मेरा यह प्रश्न है।

मैं जो दूसरा प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ, वह खास तौर से व्यापार के क्षेत्र से सम्बन्धित है। हमारे देश में व्यापारिक स्तर लगातार गिर रहा है। आज हमें इस बात को बिल्कुल नहीं भूलना चाहिए कि चीन हमारे देश में इस हद तक अपने उत्पाद लेकर आ गया है कि छोटी-छोटी चीजों पर भी उसका आधिपत्य स्थापित हो रहा है। भारत के व्यापार को लेकर, भारत के उद्योग को लेकर हमारी यह चिन्ता है कि अगर इस विषय पर जल्दी ही हमारी सरकार ने कोई उचित कदम नहीं उठाया, तो जहां हमारे देश का किसान प्रभावित होगा, वहीं व्यापारी भी प्रभावित होगा। माननीया मंत्री महोदय कृपया इस बात को स्पष्ट करें कि इस डब्ल्यूटीओ एग्रीमेंट के साइन होने से भारत का किसान कैसे खुशहाल होगा; आप जो खाद्य सुरक्षा की बात कह रही हैं, उसको पूरा करने के लिए आपके पास क्या मैकेनिज्म है और तीसरा, व्यापार के क्षेत्र में हम कैसे आगे बढ़ेंगे? थैंक्यू सर।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, hon. Members, see, as per the suggestion from the House, I called the names party-wise. Therefore, four names, which were given in time were left out. If the House has no objection, I will call them and give them two, two minutes each.

SHRI D. RAJA: Yes, Sir, you call them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. You have no objection. All right. Then, Shri Anil Madhav Dave. As a special case, you take only two minutes. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री अविनाश राय खन्ना (पंजाब): सर, इनको पांच मिनट दे दीजिए।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no.

SHRI ANIL MADHAV DAVE (Madhya Pradesh): Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You put your question.

श्री अनिल माधव दवे : सर, अगर आप पांच मिनट नहीं देंगे, तो हम कैसे बोलेंगे?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: See, this is a special decision to allow you. आप अपना प्रश्न पूछिए।

श्री अनिल माधव दवे : फिर आप मुझे सिर्फ दो मिनट क्यों दे रहे हैं?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have shortage of time. Please take two minutes. ...(*Interruptions*)... Then, I will have to give it to all. There is no time. Your Power Minister is here. See, I became liberal and then you are exploiting that. That is not good.

श्री अनिल माधव दवे : आपने पांच मिनट कहा था ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I could have stopped there because I called everyone from the parties. I showed some consideration. Then, that is being exploited. I am very sorry.

श्री अनिल माधव दवे : उपसभापति महोदय ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dave, you take only two minutes.

SHRI ANIL MADHAV DAVE: Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, fine. I have no problem. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री अनिल माधव दवे : ठीक है, फिर मुझे नहीं बोलना ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have no problem. ...(*Interruptions*)... I have no problem. Now, Shri Shantaram Naik. ...(*Interruptions*)... Yes, I have no problem. Mr. Naik, take only two minutes.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK (Goa): Yes, Sir, I will finish within two minutes.

It appears, Sir, that the new Government is out to overturn all policies and schemes of the Government in various fields of economy. In recent times, we have seen as to how the ruling party was dilly-dallying on Palestine issue despite our known international position. They even sought to remove the item from the List of Business.

In international field, the policy of continuity is being sacrificed by the Government and the last WTO meeting is an example. I want to know whether this Government in order to show that they are a different breed, and also in order to damage the food security programme at home initiated by the UPA Government, has proposed a new formula at the recently held WTO meeting; or, is India facilitating some countries to evolve a formula which is adverse to the position taken by India earlier? I want to know whether this new proposal of the Government has alienated from India a number of countries which strongly stood behind India. What are the exact conditions the Government has laid for the purpose of signing the Trade Facilitation Agreement? I also want to know whether this is a conspiracy to sabotage the Food Security Act and the Scheme through international route. Which were the countries supporting India until recent time and are they all with us now? If not, which are the countries with us now? What has the Government ultimately achieved in the last WTO meeting, except getting humiliated ? Thank you, Sir.

श्री भूपेंद्र यादव (राजस्थान): सम्माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, बाली की जो कांफ्रेंस थी, उसके बाद देश भर की सिविल सोसाइटी और किसानों ने यह आशंका व्यक्त की थी कि कृषि क्षेत्र में जो समझौता हुआ है, उसके प्रभाव को मूल रूप से पूरा नहीं किया जाएगा। माननीय मंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य के पैरा न. 7 में यह सही कहा है—“अन्य निर्णयों को आगे कार्यान्वित करने में किए जा रहे संकोच को देखते हुए, विकासशील देशों को यह आशंका थी कि व्यापार सुगमीकरण करार को लागू करने की प्रक्रिया के पूरा हो जाने के बाद खाद्य सुरक्षा प्रयोजन के लिए सार्वजनिक स्टॉकहोल्डिंग हेतु सब्सिडियों के सम्बन्ध में स्थायी समाधान के महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दे सहित अन्य मुद्दों को नज़रअंदाज़ कर दिया जाएगा।”

मैं सरकार को बधाई देना चाहूंगा कि उन्होंने दुनिया के सामने, मुख्य रूप से कृषि क्षेत्र के सम्बन्ध में या किसानों के सम्बन्ध में एक व्यापक विषय को इस अभिवार्ता के माध्यम से उठाया है।

मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से एक स्पष्टीकरण मांगना चाहूंगा। माननीय मंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य के पैरा न. 22 में कहा है -

"हमने एक कदम आगे जाकर व्यावहारिक सुझाव प्रस्तुत किए। सार्वजनिक स्टॉकहोल्डिंग के मुद्दे का स्थायी समाधान बिल्कुल साधारण है, जिसका बड़ी आसानी से हल निकाला जा सकता है, क्योंकि सभा पटल पर ऐसे कई प्रस्ताव पहले से ही मौजूद हैं।"

मेरा यह मानना है कि अगर इस प्रकार के प्रस्तावों का वह कोई स्पष्टीकरण देंगे, तो देश की जो सिविल सोसाइटी और कृषक समाज है, जो बाली में किए गए समझौते से आशंकित था, उसकी समस्याओं का समाधान होगा।

अपने वक्तव्य के अंत में आपने एक संकल्प व्यक्त किया है—

"मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास है कि भारत डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के सदस्य देशों में अपनी तथा अन्य विकासशील देशों की संवेदनशीलता को मनवाने में समर्थ होगा।"

इसके सम्बन्ध में आपके द्वारा जो प्रयास किए जा रहे हैं, अगर आप अपने स्पष्टीकरण में यह प्रस्ताव देंगे तो ज्यादा साथकर्म होगा। धन्यवाद।

DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity. Actually, the statement which the hon. Minister has made from para 1 to para 30 is very clear indicating the stand of India. From the very beginning of 1984, when Pranabji was the Commerce Minister, and then subsequently Mr. Murasoli Maran, Arun Jaitleyji, ending with our Anand Sharmaji, who has successfully done the Bali talks, we have taken a clear stand. But unfortunately, the dates are not helpful for the present Government. On 15th July, 2014, the Preparatory Committee on the Trade Facilitation Agreement was entered into. Then from 15th July to 25th July, 2014, there was no political clearance given, I think, to the negotiating parties from our side. Indian negotiators are excellent negotiators, but there was no political clearance given. That is why they could not record it even in the Preparatory Committee. You have to include the preamble. The Hong Kong Talks Agreement, you

[Dr. E.M. Sudarsana Natchiappan]

have included in it, but you have not included the Bali talks. It was a peace clause and also which was a clause which assures us of agricultural protection, food security and having security stocks in our country. Therefore, this failure has to be explained by the hon. Minister. Finally, when the political clearance was given on 25th, that is, on Friday, our negotiator had made a strong statement before the General Committee Meeting. Therefore, we have failed. On 26th, the Secretary-General had come to India and had talks with the hon. Minister and other dignitaries. Finally, then that ended up on 31st. In the meantime, we lost all our 91 countries which were supporting us in Bali Talks. Why have we lost that? Finally, we have ended up with only three members supporting us for the final talks. Therefore, I would like to know whether China, Brazil, Egypt, Indonesia, Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana and LDCs countries, who were supporting us in Bali talks, have gone away from us. Is the Government having any strategy to overcome this deficiency within these 30 days before we go for the next talk in September, 2014 to finally settle it? We have to bring back the Bali Talks Agreement and the peace clause should be included in this Agreement. Thank you.

SHRI RANGASAYEE RAMAKRISHNA (Karnataka): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, food security is intrinsically a domestic issue. It has nothing to do with international trade. Anand Sharmaji says that procurement and stocking is an international trade issue; it is not. So long as procurement and stocking is done for food security alone, then, it does not become a part of the international trade.

Now, why has this been included in the agenda? Actually, this was meant by the developed countries as a counterpoise to the charge that we have been raising on excessive subsidization of agricultural and dairy products by the Western countries. That agenda has been put on the back burner and a red herring has now been thrown, linking it up with the trade facilitation. I want to know from the Minister whether she intends to bring the major issue of excessive subsidization of agricultural and dairy products by the Western countries to the centre stage in the future negotiations. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI ANANDA BHASKAR RAPOLU (Telangana): Sir, the World Trade Organisation and other national fora are places where the participating members are looking towards India, whether it is a participant or not. Such is our considered position and we have grown to this level. At this juncture, we can stand as a leader of the developing nations, but we were at the fault line in the recent debate at the WTO for which the new Government shall gear up in continuity to the efforts of the last ten years of the UPA Government. This is what I want to say. This is in continuation to the suggestions made by our seniors, till recently, the face of Indian governance, of Commerce Affairs Minister, Shri Anand Sharma and comrade Rajaji. These are the

considered positions which we have to sustain for the welfare of the agrarian sector of the nation. This is what we have to say. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY; THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE; AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN): Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity for answering to the clarifications or questions seeking clarifications which have been raised by several hon. Members. As much as possible, I will try to go in a particular order in which the hon. Members have spoken. Sometimes, if I do have two or three Members raising the same question, without reference to the particular names, I would, certainly, try to address.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No problem. You can club those questions and give answer to all of them.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: So, allow me that flexibility, Sir. Let me assure all the Members, to start with, that if there are apprehensions that our position has changed, we are now taking a slightly different position and if we are indeed taking a different position, we should have come to the House, taken the Opposition parties into confidence, there is no change in the position. We are honouring, reinforcing and taking forward what was agreed in Bali. Let me put that on record. So, if there are apprehensions and I am honestly not sure where this is coming from; it maybe, partly through some Western media sources or media houses which have been giving from the Western countries. But let me assure you that there is no difference or change or not even a little amendment. Of course, there is a course correction. So, my response to all those who have any element of doubt -- if there is a changed position -- I would like to underline, there is no change in position but, of course, a little change or a little amendment or a course correction, and that course correction I will certainly explain now.

My predecessor has raised a lot of important questions for which I am duty bound to give an answer. But, overall, I must say, they are not points of differences or they are not points on which he found that something has gone wrong. This is what I understand from the sequencing of the various questions that he has raised.

The first thing I would go to respond to him is: Is there a retraction ? He used the word 'retraction'. I would like to assure him, if he has seen it as retraction, I am sorry, he is wrong. There is no retraction. Where is the retraction ? We are saying that we are fully committed to implementing Bali, and we see Bali as a package. We see Bali as one plus nine issues, nine pillars on which Shri Anand Sharma*ji* had agreed in Bali and we are committed to fully implementing Bali. So, my answer, in clarification,

[Shrimati Nirmala Sitharaman]

is, please there is no retraction, Sir. I would want the House, through you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, and let my predecessor be sure that there is no retraction. On the contrary, we are making sure that that little discrepancy from the single undertaking principle which fell between two stools in Bali is now being picked up by us saying, stick to single undertaking, just don't push ahead only with Trade Facilitation. Let us not wait till 2017. Let us have that also agreed even now, if that is possible. That is all we are saying, and there is nothing other than that.

In a way, I am grateful to Anand Sharmaji when he says, 'yes that agreement was not all that satisfactory, and that is where, therefore, today we are holding on to some few things just ...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: There seems to be some misunderstanding. I said about LDC package. Please don't confuse it with the Bali package. I only referred to LDC package not being robust and satisfactory. This is just for your information.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: With that due answer taken on board, still it is not satisfactory whether it is LDC or whether it is public stock holding. Yes, it is extended to LDC, and my statement yesterday does mention, more than once, that we are taking up the case of LDCs also. We are not just talking about food stockholding. Yes, I am grateful that he recognizes that it wasn't a completely satisfactory thing. It could have been better. All of us hoped that it could have been better, and we are not holding that against him. Let us assure that to Mr. Anand Sharma. But then talking about what I have mentioned, amongst these Ministerial decisions – paragraph three of my yesterday's statement – two are of particular significance. I have said 'particular' significance. I have not said two are of great importance. So, that is one little clarification to my predecessor.

As regards LDCs-we still think those one plus nine, some of which consist of the LDCs matters also-our position is that we should include all of them together when the whole thing happens and therefore there is no confrontation in the stance. I was fortunately with the Prime Minister in the BRICS in the sidelines and again in G-20 in the sidelines and in some of the bilaterals. Of course, most of the LDCs weren't there in G-20. But the kinds of inputs that we have received are 'we are unable to speak out but we are sympathetic, we can understand that you are taking up this cause.' So, there has not been an approach of running away from India. On the contrary, they are, probably, for some reason, unable to publicly articulate their position. But they have said it in as many words that they understand the position that India is taking. Here, let me add that the South African Trade Minister, who was with us in Brazil and who

later met me at G-20 also, said, 'I am taking up the cause of the LDCs, but I know for sure-it is his saying – that the LDCs themselves are not able to speak out of it, for whatever compulsions'. So, LDCs are not running away from us. We have not been isolated. And, let me assure my predecessor, who had raised that first, and also because some of his Press statements have come across saying that India's isolation is painful, that if India hadn't taken this position, we would have felt even more pained that we sat back and allowed this whole thing to go away, and the Western developed countries to take or snatch away trade facilitation, and we are sitting with a Damocles sword over our heads thinking as to when it is going to come down heavily on us. Therefore, this little pain caused, because we took a principled stand, is very much in alignment with what the Agreement was in Bali. I think it is worth the pain, because today the WTO understands that it cannot go ahead without us and the many unspoken LDCs and, therefore, they are willing to wait till September, 2014, for all of us to convince each other. So, let us be very clear that that little pain about which you referred is a deserving pain. They have recognized it and that is why it has been postponed. They have not run away with the trade facilitation.

Sir, I would also refer to Anand Sharmaji's centrality of WTO and bringing the developmental agenda back on the table in Bali. My statement here and our Ambassador's statement in Geneva, both of them, underline the importance and the respect that India would want to give to the multilateralism for which WTO stands. We have reiterated that we believe in multilateralism and we will keep going with that; there is not going to be any change in that. And again, on bringing development on the agenda, we have done precisely that now too! We are asking, is trade facilitation the only thing, at the end of the day, about Bali, or, is it trade facilitation and also development? Because, for development we want inclusive growth, for which my poor have to be fed, for which India should stand up, ensuring that the poorest of the poor farmers get the Minimum Support Price and the poor get fed through the PDS. And, therefore, if bringing the developmental agenda was mentioned in Bali, it has got reinforced now. So, let there not be any confusion on that.

Sir, I will quickly move over to Shri Basawaraj Patil, who asked कि हमारी साख बढ़ी है या नहीं। Have I correctly understood it? You had asked whether with this भारत देश की साख बढ़ी है या नहीं? Pardon my Hindi, but I think today, अगर हम प्रिसिपल पोज़िशन नहीं लेते हैं तो इससे भारत की साख खराब होगी। इसके अलावा, मैं यह भी कहना चाहती हूँ कि आज पूरी दुनिया में हमारी साख इसलिए रेकग्नाइज़ हो गई है, क्योंकि जो छोटे देश हैं, जो लेस डेवलप्ड कंट्रीज़ हैं, वे जो नहीं बोल पाए, वह हम खड़े होकर बोल पाए हैं। इसलिए हमारी साख के बारे में पूछने वाले श्री बसावाराज पाटिल जी को मैं यह जरूर आश्वासन देना चाहती हूँ कि आज भारत देश की साख पहले से ज्यादा है। I would like to say that to Patilji through you, Sir.

[Shrimati Nirmala Sitharaman]

Sir, the hon. Member from TMC, Shri Derek O'Brien, spoke about the '86-88 prices. It is important that we understand that that is a great injustice which continues to go on in the WTO. Many Members spoke about Western advanced countries giving subsidy. Mr. Yechury mentioned about it and asked whether we would bring it back. Ramakrishnaji too mentioned about that and asked whether we would bring it back on to the agenda and discuss why Western developed countries can get away with the agricultural subsidies that they give, whereas ours becomes an issue. I will just take a minute to give you figures to exemplify why that 1986-88 base year is a grave injustice. Let us just assume and take the case of wheat. Today the MSP per kg is ₹ 13.50. If you take the international price with which the WTO should compare, it was ₹ 17.96 in 2012-13. In other words, a negative amount of ₹ 4.46 has been given as subsidy through MSP procurement. There is actually an External Reference Price through which the subsidy per kg, as per WTO guidelines if you want to take on board, is at ₹ 9.96 because it is based on the 1986-88 base year. So, where your subsidy is actually minus ₹ 4.46 compared to what prevails in the market, you are actually being accused that you are giving ₹ 9.96 because it is based on 1986-88 base year. So, this is one of the things on which India is fighting with the WTO and, in fact, is an answer to Bhupender Yadavji's question, 'Are you giving any proposals?' The G-33 proposal which was given in July 2014 this year partly, probably, addresses Shri Sudarsana Natchiappan's question 'Was there an absence of political direction till before July and because of that we couldn't get into correcting the clause related to Peace Clause?' I am sorry, Sir, that was not a failure. We have been arguing; we have submitted a proposal -- the G-33 proposal -- which includes this anomaly and says 'No, please don't carry on with 1986-88 base year; use a dynamic pricing base which is, take the nearest last three years' average price and then tell us, compared to that, where our subsidy lies rather than looking at 1986-88 as a base year'. So, one of the alternative suggestions that we have given is to make sure that base year is shifted to a dynamic three years' average which is nearest to the year about which we are talking. So, if you are talking about 2014, you would talk about the previous three years' dynamic average and that will move by one year when you are talking about 2015. So, that is a form of progress or way of addressing a base year and no economist worth his salt can ever justify 30 year old base and talking about today's prices and then saying, 'You know, this is not fair'. Therefore, I hope the House stands together in understanding that there has not been a time gap in giving political direction to the Ambassador who is representing our case and, in any case, the Prepcom that Natchiappanji was referring to was rushing through with the Trade Facilitation deadline of July 31st and it was not going into details of

Peace Clause at all. So, there was no absence of political direction. Clearly political direction was being given right in time. First week of July itself, our Ambassador knew what the Government's position was and she mentioned it there and subsequently the western media picked up much before we came to July 24. So, no absence of political direction and actually with constructive alternatives that was given. Now, I will come to Shri K.C. Tyagi whose passionate appeal, 'Will WTO decide our MSP?' This whole debate is about India making sure that our MSP is decided by us. This whole debate is about how agriculture in this country will be run by our own policies and, therefore, this passion is equally passionately answered, Shri K.C. Tyagi, that we don't allow our farmers' prices or agricultural production to be determined by somebody else outside; it is our right and we will decide and that is why the fight is going on. Shri Tyagi also picked up a paper to show that there is no reference to food security. I am sorry that was my intervention in G-20. I don't want to go into a graphic detail of what happened. Of course, whoever is interested, I can always do it; but not to take away the time of this House. When the summing up of the Trade Ministers' Conference of G-20 in Sydney happened, and when in spite of my giving, during my intervention, a complete elaboration of India's position, the summary account of the host country did not include our concerns, with due respect, even there I took the permission of the Chair to say, I am going to break the protocol to say I am terribly let down that you didn't even take my concern on board. And, that concern was that we have a right to hold public stocks and we have a right to distribute food to our poorest of the poor, which ensures food security. So, it may not have got reported, but let me assure you that I did say that.

Shri Navaneethakrishnan of AIADMK asked as to what exactly this 10 per cent subsidy is. These are details which I would not want to elaborate on, but I think certainly, we have covered a fair deal of ground. It is nothing but the price that you gave to your farmers over and above what is the external reference price, which you may compare with a market price, multiplied by the total quantity of what is produced. This is what the WTO uses, and we, even today, are protesting on that saying it cannot be the price at which you are procuring into the market price, or, the differential of the market price to the total quantity of what agricultural produce is. It should only be to the total amount procured through this MSP. So, they are widening the basket by making entire agricultural production to come on board. That is wrong because only to those whom we give the Minimum Support Price and procure, should they look at the subsidy going into the kitty, and that is the issue we are raising with the WTO which I can, if the Member so desires, explain to him aside rather than here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can write to him.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I have just one clarification. I have no intention to interrupt. About this food security, what we give to our poor people, that is an issue of supply side and that is a sovereign space, as I mentioned and you know it. That is not something which we discuss in G-20 or in WTO because food security is a sovereign right, a sovereign space, which has never been on the WTO agenda. So, I just have a word of caution on linking the two.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: The word of caution is well taken, but without holding the food stock, how are you going to talk about food security?

माननीय प्रो. राम गोपाल यादव जी ने जानना चाहा कि अगर हमें permanent solution नहीं मिलता, तो आप क्या करने वाले हैं? सर, मेरी हिन्दी कमजोर है, इसके बावजूद भी आप उसे समझ सकेंगे...(व्यवधान)...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : आपकी हिन्दी अच्छी है ।

श्रीमती निर्मला सीतारमण : आपने यह भी पूछा कि अगर permanent solution नहीं मिलता तो आप क्या करने वाले हैं? मैं इस प्रश्न का छोटा सा जवाब देना चाहूंगी । सर, permanent solution के लिए हम मेहनत करके डब्ल्यूटीओ को convince करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं । हमारी कोशिश अभी भी जारी है। उम्मीद है कि सितम्बर में हमारी कोशिश से हमें सफलता मिलेगी, फिर भी इसके जवाब के लिए सितम्बर तक wait करें ।

Then, Yechuryji raised quite a few questions. He was happy that I was keeping good company because the countries which are in reference are friendly countries with whom ideologically...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have got only a few companies; that is, why you are happy.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: I talked only about three of them.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: No, you get to know only three of them. There are many others whom the media did not catch up.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: You mentioned about them.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: I only said that you got to know. It may be through me; it may be through media. Why are you immediately getting back?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: I mean, whatever other company the Minister may keep. That is not an issue.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: It is absolutely an issue.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: The other company is her prerogative. I am talking about the company she is having, as far as the WTO is concerned.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: It is not my prerogative. I am representing

4.00 P.M.

India. ...*(Interruptions)*... No, I am not yielding. Yes, the company I will keep is mentioned there and it is not my prerogative. I am speaking on behalf of the Government of India. I don't want that liberty given to me. Other countries, which were sympathetic to India...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, the Minister should be polite.

SHRI P. RAJEEVE: The Minister is addressing the House. Why is the Minister so aggressive?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All of you take your seats. ...*(Interruptions)*... You have mentioned it. That is okay. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: With due respect, Sir, I have said, I am not yielding. I have also said, it cannot be my prerogative. So, I don't want that concession given to me because I am speaking for Government of India at the moment. ...*(Interruptions)*... Excuse me, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*... Excuse me, Sir. The hon. Member has not got an objection. To others, it seems that I have been aggressive. I have not used any unparliamentary word here. I only have said that I do not want that prerogative extended to me because that is not even right. And, where is the aggression here? I am sorry, I have only said two lines in response, and, if you say, that is aggression, I want it to be corrected, it is not aggression. Now, I am being a bit aggressive about it.

The countries, openly in the media, and, otherwise, even mentioned in my Statement, which I have made, are certainly countries, which the media have also captured as supporting us. But we have had several countries which also seem to be running administered prices, telling our representatives in Geneva that they were also doing this. I would just like to give you an idea of the number of countries which are using administered prices. They may not speak out openly but they are also giving administered prices. Besides India, Zambia, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Senegal, Kenya, Nigeria, Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia, Botswana, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Nepal, Jordan, and, Saudi Arabia use Minimum Support Price. So, if we have spoken on Minimum Support Price, there are so many other countries, which are also doing it. Some of the other countries procure foodstuffs for food aid programmes. Even that is a kind of procurement which is meant for an inclusive developmental agenda. Indonesia has a procurement programme for rice purchased at administered prices. So, I am coming up with countries, which have a common cause with the issue that we have taken up. China started to set Minimum Procurement Prices which they call, MPP, in 2004. When market prices are lowered, the MPP comes into play. The MPP is issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and the State Council aim to safeguard farmers' livelihood by increasing their incomes plus ensuring national food security covering wheat and rice. Kenya also has a procurement programme. Therefore, if we think, we are isolated, let me assure the hon. Members ...*(Interruptions)*... Sorry.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: These countries have the programmes.. *...(Interruptions)...* Please. What I would like to add *...(Interruptions)...* No, no. I am just adding.

SHRI NARESH GUJRAL: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is not the...*...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: She is yielding. *...(Interruptions)...* I am just adding something. After all, Parliamentary debate is sometimes very healthy when Parliament functions. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI NARESH GUJRAL: It is not fair. Every five minutes, he *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Are you the Chair ? *...(Interruptions)...* Just one thing, which I want to mention...*...(Interruptions)...*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister has yielded. *...(Interruptions)...* No, no. *...(Interruptions)...* The Minister has yielded. You cannot question. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI TARUN VIJAY: Sir, he has become a very privileged Member *...(Interruptions)...*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. The Minister has yielded.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Thank you. Sir, I just want to share one thing with the Minister. I am not saying anything where any offence should be taken. I think, the House should know it and it is my duty to inform this. She is right when she speaks about the countries, which are running the same food security programme, and, I would like to share something very important with this House. As we were in the final stages of negotiating in Bali, at about 2.45 in the morning, we were called in, and, offered a country-specific 'carveout' for India so that we could have a breakthrough. India rejected the country-specific 'carve-out' and we also made it very clear, which is part now of Bali, that the right of even those countries, which do not have resources today, but may have resources tomorrow or in future to start food security programmes, also must be protected. That is what I am sharing with the House.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: Thank you. So, the question of administered prices or procurement policies based on which we went to the WTO to have an impression that we have got isolated, is absolutely not correct. For whatever reason, if countries have not spoken, many of them have been in touch with us saying we are unable to speak out, which is what I exemplified by saying what the South African Trade Minister mentioned to me. So, it is not just my perspective; it is not just my feeling. It is also corroborated by another BRICS country's Trade Minister. The entire peace clause debate is the argument on which we are very clearly saying public stockholding, procurement and related issues, whether you want to keep them separate or tenuously you want to link them to have a mutually-linked relationship. In that, the Damocles Sword, which is hanging on India's head and the sword which is hanging on

all these countries over their heads, is the end of 2017, when the western countries or WTO said that we will find a permanent solution. Our argument is, you don't have to wait till 2017. At least, let the process begin. Since post-Bali, no movement has taken place, except for the three meetings which were held, and those three meetings did not go into the substantial issue of getting a permanent solution. We were increasingly worried that once the 31st July Trade Facilitation Agreement was signed, to which we are committed, let me repeat, to which we are committed, there would not be one more reason for them to come back to sit with you and say 'let us talk a permanent solution'. We were worried. When Mr. Yechury spoke about it, he very clearly said: Are you using this to ensure that they will come back to talk to you about a permanent solution? Yes, it is one of the ways in which we want to ensure that the western developed countries -- and it was observed rightly by Shri Anand Sharma in his Press-related matter -- are now looking at plurilateral agreements and they are moving away from the central philosophy of WTO, which is multilateral. So, if they are going away to a plurilateral platform, they would not have a reason to come back to WTO to say we want all these issues to be addressed; we want your food stockholding to be addressed. They won't have a reason to come back to us. So, we were worried and, therefore, we wanted to ensure that even as we do the trade facilitation, they would understand that the issue relating to public stockholding will also have to be addressed.

I would very quickly move on to the others who have spoken. Yes, there are issues of non-tariff barriers which have been created and which we need to address. We are constantly working and in reducing and disciplining agricultural subsidies as a part of the Doha Development Round, we ensured that other aspects of trade constraints are also going to be equally addressed. So, that is not being forgotten and we shall take that forward also. Shri Bhupinder Singhji from BJD had addressed the issue that should the WTO decide our MSP, which is also a point which was raised by hon. D. Raja. Certainly, not. We are fighting for the cause of India retaining its sovereign right, and the sovereign right is to be sure that you are able to hold on to those decision-making powers which are entirely your right.

Dr. K.P. Ramalingam also raised the issue about the decisions in the WTO. They are normally done by consensus and, therefore, we will seek to negotiate on the various Committees in WTO for the establishment of a fast track dedicated system so that a permanent solution is arrived at. Dhindsaji can be assured that we are not going to let away the right for deciding on MSP to the WTO. It is going to be entirely an Indian issue and we will have full right on that. I have a feeling that most of the questions have been addressed. I don't mean to ignore anyone but, I think, largely, most of the issues have been covered.

[Shrimati Nirmala Sitharaman]

Shantaram Naikji asked whether it is an indirect way to sabotage food security. No. If all this fight is going on, why would there be any sabotage to food security? Sir, you may rest assured that we are not going to let that happen. Naikji, I assure you, through Mr. Deputy Chairman, that India is not humiliated. It hurt me to hear from you, a senior Member, 'Is India humiliated?' Not at all, and I think we have stood by our principle and reinforced what happened in Bali. That Agreement is fully honoured. And we are tightening up on it. Therefore, there is no humiliation. We have proudly stood by our principle.

I suppose, with all that, I have given the clarification which the hon. Members sought. If I have ignored anybody, it's not intended. You are very welcome to approach me. I will certainly give you necessary clarification. Thank you very much.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, there are two clarifications that have been left out. One is this. I talked about non-price subsidies that the West gives. Are you going to bring those on the agenda? The second one is regarding the practical solutions that we, India, have proposed which your statement refers to. Are you willing to share that with us?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you can't answer now, you can write to him.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: Sir, one thing, which I would like to say about the non-price barriers, about the subsidy, which the western developed countries are giving, is this. We have, periodically, in bilateral talks, in the WTO and in the G-20 asked them to come up with figures to say how much the United States of America and the European Union are giving as subsidies to their farmers. We have also said that post-Uruguay Round, those subsidies have been kept out of the discussion in the WTO. We have repeatedly asked as to why those have been frozen and why only the issue of developing countries' subsidies is being raised. Every attempt is being made...
(Interruptions)...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: The boxes keep on changing.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: Those boxes are the reasons...
(Interruptions)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. That is okay.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: Green box, amber box and blue box are all the latest ways...
(Interruptions)... But we are making every attempt in every forum to say why that should not be brought on the agenda. We assure you that we will keep

coming to that. Thank you. ...(*Interruptions*)... Some of the solutions have been mentioned in the answer about the dynamic average that we want to bring in so that ten per cent is going to be a realistic ten per cent rather than the false base year of 1986-88.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN) *in the Chair*.]

We have also spoken about giving a timeline so that activated discussions will happen for agriculture and permanent solution does not wait till 2017 and it happens earlier. Thank you.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF POWER – *Contd.*

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF POWER; THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COAL; AND THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF NEW AND RENEWABLE ENERGY (SHRI PIYUSH GOYAL): Sir, now that we have discussed enough about the world, I think it is time we discussed mother India. Sir, I am very privileged that you have given me this opportunity to conclude a very important discussion on power sector which we started yesterday. Nearly 28 hon. Members participated in the discussion.

At the outset, I must mention that it was indeed a privilege to know the concerns of the hon. Members, to hear their very, very valuable suggestions and also for a new Minister like me who's only been in office for 67 days it was very redeeming to see the interest that this sector has amongst all sections of the House. मुझे इस बात की बहुत खुशी है कि सदन ने इस विषय पर राजनीति नहीं खेली, सदन ने साधारणतया इस विषय को एक गंभीर मसले की तरह देखा, इस विषय को देशहित और जनहित के साथ जोड़ा। मुझे लगता है कि पूरे सदन की भावना यह थी कि मेरा सहयोग करें, मुझे अच्छे सुझाव दें। मेरे काम में मैं कैसे और गति ला सकता हूँ, उसके लिए मैंने बहुत गंभीरता से आप सबके सुझाव सुने हैं, नोट किए हैं। मैं विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि भारत के प्रधान मंत्री श्री नरेंद्र मोदी जी का जो सपना है, जिसे कार्यान्वित करने के लिए जनता ने हमें एक मौका दिया है, जनता ने हमसे उम्मीद रखी है, हम पर विश्वास रखा है, उसको हमारी सरकार, एनडीए की सरकार, मोदी जी के नेतृत्व में अच्छे तरीके से कार्यान्वित करेगी, उसके लिए हम वचनबद्ध हैं। जब डिबेट शुरू हुई थी, तो डा. साहनी ने कुछ अंधेरे की बात कही थी। वैसे तो डा. साहब आपके क्षेत्र में अंधेरा कुछ ज्यादा है बाकी प्रदेशों से, बाकी देश से। आपकी कविता में शायद आपकी खुद की कुछ समस्या भी झलकी थी, आपके दल की। आपने कहा कि अंधेरे में आ गए हैं हम, यहां जवां जिन्दगी की। मैं समझ सकता हूँ कि जिदगी में जब पूरी जनता ने आपका हाथ छोड़ दिया, तो आपके लिए अंधेरा जरा ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण है। ...(*व्यवधान*)...

श्री के.सी. त्यागी (बिहार): यह कहना ठीक नहीं है। ...(*व्यवधान*)...

SHRI PIYUSH GOYAL : Tyagiji, take it in a lighter spirit. ...(*व्यवधान*)...