

STATEMENT BY MINISTER CORRECTING ANSWER TO QUESTION

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI BANDARU DATTATREYA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, a Statement (in English and Hindi) correcting the answer to Unstarred Question No. 411 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 26th November, 2014 regarding 'Amendments in Labour Laws by State Governments'.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned till 2.00 p.m.

The House then adjourned at one minute past one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at two of the clock,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair.*

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री (श्री एम. वेंकैया नायडु): लोकतंत्र में राजा पीछे, प्रजा सामने है ।

श्री उपसभापति : हां, हां, प्रजा सामने है, वह तो ठीक ही है । आजकल ऐसा ही है ।

श्री एम. वेंकैया नायडु : सर, मैंने वही कहा कि लोकतंत्र में ऐसा है । लोकतंत्र का महत्व है ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, clarifications on the Statement made by the Minister on 'India's Stand in WTO'. Shri Anand Sharma.

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE STATEMENT BY MINISTER**India's stand in WTO**

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to seek certain clarifications on the Statement made by the Minister of Commerce and Industry in this House on the WTO Agreements reached in the General Council in Bali.

Sir, it is a 19 paragraph-statement in which the Minister has laboured to give an impression that because of this Government and the Prime Minister's dynamic leadership, a new breakthrough in WTO has been achieved. I would say, in all humility, that this Statement should have been very carefully read before it was made in this august House, because the Statement is long – we have no objection; the statement is confusing, for those who have not followed the entire trade agreements and the history of international trade agreements, going back to the Uruguay round, the GATT agreement, the Marakesh Agreement, leading to the establishment of the WTO. The time when the nine Agreements were negotiated and reached in Bali, was the first time since 1995, after the WTO was established, that the WTO Ministerial reached any agreement, in MC-9 in Bali, in December, 2013.

Sir, why I am saying that it is confusing, and initially I found myself confused a bit, is, on the 18th of December last year, I had made a statement in this House about the agreement reached on public stockholding for food security purposes, making it abundantly clear that the issue was simply with regard to the external reference price. Food security, as such, is not part of the WTO agenda; it is a sovereign space. So, when it came to the external reference prices, India had taken a very firm position. India had tabled a proposition which was not accepted at that time by the US and EU. India had succeeded in putting together a big coalition of countries. Finally, the meeting got extended and there was a breakthrough. The impression which has been sought to be created by the Minister and the Government is that a new agreement has been reached in Geneva.

Now, Sir, I would like to read para 5 of the Minister's statement before I seek clarifications on that: "The general Council decision on public stockholding for food security purposes is a new, unambiguous decision." It makes it clear that a mechanism, under which WTO members will not challenge the Public Stockholding Programmes of developing country members for Food Security Purposes, in relation to certain obligations under the WTO Agreement on Agriculture, will remain in place in perpetuity..." I have no quarrel with these words. Then comes, "...until a permanent solution regarding this issue has been agreed and adopted." Now, Sir, I checked and went through the Bali Ministerial and I went through WTO General Council Declaration which is in my hand. This is a Declaration of 27th November, 2014. I straightway come on this whether it is a new Agreement because it is a wrong claim which I say with full sense of responsibility. Sir, I am reading the statement of Ambassador, Jonathan Fried, who chaired the General Council in Geneva. His statement on this subject says, "With respect to the Decision on Post-Bali work, circulated in document WT/GC/W/690, Members are collectively acting on the premise — I put an emphasis on the words 'Members are collectively acting' — that the entire Bali Package can and must be pursued and that all Members will engage constructively on the implementation of all the Bali Ministerial Decisions in the relevant WTO bodies, and on the preparation of the clearly defined work program on the remaining DDA issues — about which there is a paragraph, I will come to that — mandated in para 1.11 of the Bali Ministerial Declaration, with a new deadline to agree on the work programme — which Minister refers to in her statement — by July 2015."

Second para, "Therefore, in adopting the three Decisions on Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes, on the Protocol of Amendment for Trade Facilitation, and on Post-Bali work simultaneously — now this should be very attentively heard — we are 'reaffirming' the entirety of the Bali Ministerial mandates, including the priorities that Ministers identified at Bali."

[Shri Anand Sharma]

Now, I would like the Minister to shed some light and educate the House that who is right — the Chairman of the General Council or this document. I will go further. Sir, the Director-General of the WTO, Roberto Azevedo, had a Press Conference the same day. Our Minister also had a Press Conference and our Government has publicised this as a major victory. What does the WTO Director-General say? He says, "WTO Members came together at the General Council this afternoon and took three decisions. I will just say a word or two about each one. The first decision clarified the Bali Decision on Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes." It is clarificatory. It goes on, "It makes clear that peace clause which was agreed in Bali will remain in force until a permanent solution is found." Now, Sir, I will read further. "It also states that Members shall make all efforts to negotiate a permanent solution by 31st December, 2015", which the Minister referred to and definitely it is an advancement of the earlier targeted date of 2017. I will explain that also. Now, it goes on to say, "If no solution is reached by this new target, that is, MC 10, which will be in 2015, by this new target date in December 2015, the Peace Clause will simply remain in place and in effect until negotiations do conclude and a permanent solution is adopted."

Now, Sir, the Minister, in para 6 of her statement — I will read it so that it is understood by the Members of this august House — says, "This would do away with any ambiguity on this aspect as well as guard against the possibility of no cover being available after 2017 in case a permanent solution on public stockholding for food security purposes is not arrived at by then. It, therefore, strengthens the safeguard available for continuing the Minimum Support Price policy which is a lifeline for millions of our low income, resource poor farmers." We all know it and we are on the same page on that. Now, Sir, this is much-maligned and less-understood. The rest of the world understood, as I will show further, these statements and declarations. It was simple English language which was understood even by non-English-speaking member countries of the WTO. The only country, which had difficulty in understanding the Bali Formula, which is referred to as the Peace Clause, was India. Now, what is this Bali Formula? It says, "Para 1 to read as under:- Members agree to put in place an interim mechanism, as set out below, and negotiate an agreement for a permanent solution for the issue of public stock holding for food security purposes for adoption definitely by the 11th Ministerial Conference." Now, Sir, each Ministerial Conference takes place after two years. The 11th Ministerial Conference will be in 2017 and the 10th Ministerial Conference will be in 2015. Now, this was interpreted by this Government and the Minister, and statement was given to this House not once but twice, that it is only for four years. That is why I said, "Minister, you were factually

wrong.” I will proceed further. The Minister should have read, before this House, para 2 of the Bali Agreement, which says, “Para 2 to read as under:- In the interim, till the permanent solution is adopted and provided that conditions set out below are met, member shall refrain from challenging, through the WTO Dispute Settlement Mechanism, compliance of a developing member with its obligations under articles 6.3 and 7.2(b) of the Agreement on Agriculture. Any developing member seeking coverage or programmes under paragraph 2 shall ensure that stocks procured under such programme shall not be used for export to adversely affect trade.” Now, Sir, in this clarificatory statement, which I refer to, the Chairman, Ambassador Jonathan Fried — the Chairman of the General Council and the General Council declaration, which I will put on the Table of the House — has categorically stated that it is a re-affirmation in entirety of the Bali Ministerial decisions. The DG, WTO, has said, “It is merely a clarification of what the Ministers had agreed to in Bali.” I just read the Bali Formula. If there is anybody, a scholar of English language, who can tell me that I, all the other Ministers, the WTO Director General, and the Chairman of the General Council, were wrong in their understanding of the English language, and they have said that it is only for four years. That is misleading this House and the country. (*Time bell rings*) Sir, please, I have two more clarifications.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please be brief.

SHRI ANAND SHAMA : What have they written? It says, "Paragraph 2 of the Bali decision shall be read as follows." This is the clarificatory statement and I am reading from the document. 'In the interim' is removed; para 1 remains the same. It further says, "Until a permanent solution is agreed and adopted, and, provided that the conditions set out in paragraphs 3 to 6 of the Bali decisions are met, Members shall not challenge through the WTO Dispute Settlement Mechanism, compliance of a developing Member with its obligations under Articles...". Except in place of, 'in the interim, till a permanent solution', here, it says 'until a permanent solution'. The rest is the same, even its wording. There is no comma, full stop, which is different.

Now, Sir, equally important it is to say that though I will appreciate and acknowledge that there is one categorical statement that the Member shall try as the best endeavour to have a permanent solution by 2015 but the Declaration keeps both. And, I will read that also because it is very important. If a permanent solution for the issue of public stockholding for food security purposes is not agreed and adopted by the 11th Ministerial Conference, the mechanism referred to in paragraph 1 of the Bali Decision, as set out in paragraph 1 of this Decision, shall continue to be in place until a permanent solution is agreed and adopted.

[Shri Anand Sharma]

Now, this is the Declaration. They are referring to both together, what you are claiming to be a new decision. Now, Sir, next paragraph to this reads, "In accordance with paragraph 1.11 of the Bali Ministerial Declaration dated 11 December, 2013, the negotiations on a permanent solution on the issue of public stockholding for food security purposes shall be pursued on priority." The Minister's statement has also claimed that to be a new thing which has been achieved, particularly saying that this will be pursued on a priority basis.

Now, Sir, I will just recall from my memory and correct this part. The Bali Declaration is with me. In para 10 of her Statement, the Minister has said, "The General Council has also unequivocally agreed to delink the negotiations for a permanent solution on public stockholding for food security purposes from the agriculture negotiations on other issues under the Doha Development Agenda. This would ensure that the negotiations for a permanent solution would continue even if the negotiations on such other issues are delayed."

Next is the claim that the work programme will be put in place by July, 2015. I would like the Minister to either accept or deny or reject that this decision of delinking and the work programme to be prioritized is part of the Bali declaration. Delinking the negotiations on public stockholding for food security purposes from the other issues of the Doha Development Agenda negotiations, including the negotiations on agreement on agriculture, was done clearly in Bali.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, please conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, these are two very important points. And, this was agreed to. The post-Bali work programme is part of the Bali Declaration, and, it is very important for me to put it on record here.

SHRI SATYAVRAT CHATURVEDI (Madhya Pradesh): It is merely reiteration of the Bali agreement.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Yes, I have said so. Now, Sir, I am going to refer what the DG says. What does he say? Sir, the Director-General states, "The third decision taken today concerns the post-Bali work programme. With this decision, Members committed that this work will resume immediately and that they will engage constructively on the implementation of all Bali Ministerial decisions, including the work programme. Now, this is what the DG says. I have read what the Chairman has said. What actually, I will say with all respect, we have achieved as a country is this. Sir, the deadline for the work programme to be put in place as per the Bali Declaration, which is here, was within twelve months, that was December, 2014. The

great achievement that is being claimed is that now the new deadline for the work programme is 2015, July, that is, we have succeeded in making one achievement of delaying the work programme by seven months. (*Time-bell rings*).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: No; I still have more to say. Please, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: This is very important. This is a nineteen-paragraph statement. I am just going to conclude. I am not going to take that much time as was taken by the then LoP and the Leader of the House on the 18th of December. Please, you cannot have different standards for me or for him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no; you cannot claim like that. There is nothing to do with that.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, record is there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, please. The Chair should allow me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why do you want to compare? ...(*Interruptions*)... Why do you want to compare?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Why? ...(*Interruptions*)... Don't you want me to clarify? ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why do you unnecessarily bring into that?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, please. I am very much right.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The data is with me. Why do you bring in unnecessary things?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, please. I am only requesting.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay; all right.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, now the last point which I need to make, and it is equally relevant and important, is with respect to para eleven of the Statement. Para eleven of the Statement has claimed that "As per the relevant provisions of the WTO Agreement, a General Council decision on these elements has the same legal status as a Ministerial decision." Now, Sir, I am astonished. It is like the Minister informing this House that a decision is taken by the Cabinet Ministers or Cabinet

[Shri Anand Sharma]

of the country and later on -- some clarity is not there; some ambiguity is there which was only confined to one country in understanding the simple English -- the Committee of Secretaries changed the decision of the Cabinet. Now, it is very clear, if the Minister's attention was drawn to the Marrakesh Agreement which led to the establishment of the WTO. I read for your benefit. The Ministerial Conference is the supreme legislative body of the WTO and its powers flow chiefly from Articles 3, 4, 6 and 9 of the Marrakesh Agreement establishing the WTO. According to article 4.1 of the said Agreement... (*Time-bell rings*) I am concluding. the MC shall meet at least once every two years. According to article 4.2 of the Agreement, in the intervals between the meetings of the MC -- it goes on to say that only the Ministerial Conference has the exclusive authority to amend its decisions, to revisit its decisions -- in the interim, because the two-year gap is there, the General Council can only interpret. So, the entire claim of a new decision, a major break-through, Prime Minister's meeting with President Obama and all, I would urge the Minister, either you reject these two Declarations and the Statements of the DG, WTO, the Chairman of the General Council, or if you accept that, then please correct your Statement. This House must not be mislead, nor the country because this will become a serious matter. It could have been inadvertent in that Statement. Now, it would be deliberate. I am making that fundamentally clear. Now, Sir, the last thing is, and I say it again, with all responsibility, my Statement as the Minister of 18th had a finality and I would like to say these two Statements cannot be correct. Either my statement was wrong or this statement is wrong. If my statement was wrong, there should be a Privilege motion against me. If my statement was correct, the Minister should accept in all humility that she is wrong.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Anand Sharmaji, for your information, the then LoP on that day took eighteen minutes. You have taken twenty-three minutes! Since you brought it, I have to say that. Shri Derek O'Brien.

SHRI DEREK O'BRIEN (West Bengal): Sir, I am very nervous today because I have been inspired by my friends from UP and Bihar, from the BSP, the SP and the JD(U), to try and speak a little in Hindi. So, if I make some mistakes, you must not laugh at me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But, it will be better than my Hindi! Do not worry.

SHRI DEREK O'BRIEN: Sir, I have two questions. I will take three-four minutes only.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will be very grateful to you.

श्री दरेक ओब्राईन : भारत ने बाली में ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सतीश चंद्र मिश्रा (उत्तर प्रदेश): सर, हिन्दी में ये बहुत मधुर बोलते हैं, अंग्रेजी में कुछ कटु हो जाते हैं ।

श्री दरेक ओब्राईन : भारत ने बाली में जो हासिल किया था, वह WTO समस्या का आधा solution था, पूरा नहीं, क्योंकि 10% सब्सिडी कैप का उल्लंघन करने की immunity सिर्फ चार साल के लिए दी गई थी । अब immunity पर समय की कोई पाबंदी नहीं है, लेकिन यह भी सम्पूर्ण समाधान नहीं है ।

जब इसका पूरा हल निकल आएगा और डोमेस्टिक सपोर्ट के लिए नया फॉर्मूला अपनाया जाएगा, तो भारत को WTO में कुछ और concession देना होगा या नहीं देना होगा, that is the question. While the Government and the earnest and hardworking Minister has seemingly helped improve the deal from Bali, the current situation, let it be said, has been on the Table since it raised the red flag in the summer. But, it stopped half way. My question is: Why did it not press for a final solution, something it had argued for and agreed to endorse the TFA? So, am I to conclude? ...(Interruptions)... No, I have moved now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is Hindi !

SHRI DEREK O'BRIEN: It is my first day, Sir. I have only two paragraphs. ...(Interruptions)... Now, Kanimozhi is asking me to speak in English!

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What Hindi it is?

SHRI DEREK O'BRIEN: Sir, on a serious note. ...(Interruptions)... On a serious note, short-term gain but long-term pain. I have two specific questions on this short-term gain and long-term pain. The first question for the Government is that the TFA will enhance the developed countries' access to Indian markets; we know that. India is losing out in competitiveness in all product lines as there has been a Hollowing out of industries. So, my straight question to the Minister is that please tell us: How is the TFA going to impact growth in the manufacturing sector? My second clarification is to do with what the Minister said and I quote: "Continuing the minimum support programme is the lifeline for millions of our low income resource farmers. We have a right to distribute food to the poorest of the poor." Then, I have to ask the Minister, through you, Sir: What about MNREGA; then what about cutting back on subsidies for petroleum products; then what about cutting education subsidies; then what about cutting health subsidies and then what about cutting all social sector expenditure? So, I am totally confused because they need to clarify this. On one side, they make all these statements about distributing food to the poorest of the poor, and on the other side, they go and cut all these subsidies.

[Shri Derek O'Brien]

I will end, Sir, with a quote, and it is a nice and appropriate quote. Guess who said this: Hon. Mr. Arun Shourie. This is what he said three-four days ago. "When all is said and done, more is said than done!" What does the Minister have to say about her statement in relation to this statement? Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY (West Bengal): Sir, it is a matter for seeking clarifications and many such issues have been raised by the Deputy Leader of the Congress Party. I do not wish to repeat them.

Sir, my first point concerns the statement made by the hon. Minister. It is contained in point No.10 of the statement of the hon. Minister. It states, "The General Council has also unequivocally agreed to delink the negotiations for a permanent solution on public stockholding for food security purposes from the agriculture negotiations on other issues under the Doha Development Agenda. This would ensure that the negotiations for a permanent solution would continue even if the negotiations on such other issues are delayed."

Sir, the whole concern about this agreement and about our food subsidies arises from the fact that India follows a subsidy programme that is price related. We give subsidies to our farmers through our minimum support prices and then we subsidise through our ration shops. We used to do it, I don't know if that will continue. We used to subsidise it through our ration shops for the consumer at a reasonable rate. Since these are price related, the argument internationally and particularly from the USA was that this distorts the pricing mechanism and therefore distorts world trade. Therefore, these have to be done away with.

My first objection to the fact is this. We have chosen this mechanism. They may not like it because, according to them, it distorts international commerce. They continue to give subsidies outside of the price mechanism sometimes to the phenomenal extent of 80 per cent to their farmers. And these highly subsidised agricultural and dairy products are wishing to come and penetrate into the Indian market and thereby destroying our farmers who are already victims of an agrarian distress. This is the anomaly that needed to be corrected. Why did we accept that pricing mechanism subsidies, through a pricing mechanism like the ones we have, are related to the overall package? Why was that not argued for the sake of India and developing countries? Our critique of the then Commerce Minister, Mr. Anand Sharma, was precisely this. Why did you talk in terms of an interim period? It has now been clarified. What he was saying, which I was disputing then from this very place, was that this interim period is not a timeframe for a permanent solution. It has now been clarified that interim period is till a permanent solution is evolved.

Now this evolved permanent solution is very critical to our country's future, our people's future and our economy's future, because this country rests on its rural areas, on our farming community and on our agriculture.

You have already seen in this House and in the earlier Government when the Minister for Agriculture was giving us information based on the data collected by the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Pricing that the cost of production in agriculture has always grown at a higher rate than the growth in the Minimum Support Price. And that is what explains your farmers committing suicide. The subsidies that you are giving are not adequate to even allow the farmers to live. If you are going to contain subsidies until a permanent solution is found -- these are the words that I used -- and the permanent solution finding is something that we are very, very concerned about, because if it's got to be delinked from the pricing mechanism and therefore that will be used as an excuse to move towards cash subsidies that will be given instead of a pricing mechanism, that will cause havoc in the existing system of our subsidies to our agriculture. Without these subsidies, I again repeat, neither can millions of our people survive nor can agriculture continue to grow which is still the backbone of our country's people. It may not be in terms of GDP figures, in terms of the contribution to the GDP, but for people's livelihood, it is the backbone. Therefore, this particular issue of accepting this linkage of our subsidies, through the price mechanism as being something alien in the world trade negotiations, is something that I have serious objections to. I want this Government to assure that nothing of that nature will be done which will put our farmers in jeopardy.

The second clarification which I seek is that at the WTO our ambassador to the WTO has said something. After these negotiations, the ambassador said something. What did he say? I quote, "Till we have an assurance and visible outcomes which convince developing countries that members will engage in negotiations with commitment to find a permanent solution on public stockholding and all other Bali deliverables, especially those for the LDCs, India will find it difficult to join the consensus on the protocol of amendment". I repeat, "...India will find it difficult to join the consensus on the protocol of amendment". Now, what does the hon. Minister state here? It is stated that the General Council has agreed to de-link the negotiations for a permanent solution on public stockholding. Now, if a general agreement is found other than the public stockholding, I presume what the Minister means is that we will be a part of that. While our ambassador's and our stated position is that until this issue on public stockholding is resolved and resolved favourably as far as we are concerned, we will not be part of that protocol. There is a blatant contradiction in this and this contradiction itself exposes the chinks in the armour and that is my concern. My third point of clarification is that in today's conditions, we are moving

[Shri Sitaram Yechury]

towards lower procurement of agricultural products by the Government and moving greater towards market mechanisms which are fluctuating and unstable, and on that basis, given one bad monsoon or one inadequate monsoon, the fate of millions of our farmers will be in jeopardy. Now, this cannot be allowed. Therefore, there is no question of India signing any general agreement on agriculture till this issue is finally settled in our favour. That assurance does not come. (*Time-bell rings*) Now, that is the assurance which I think will have to be given here. There are many other points which are connected and which other Members have raised. This will open the door for other sort of concessions in non-agricultural areas in the WTO. The Doha Round is still on. Various issues are also at stake like whether to include education in the services, whether to include culture in the services, etc. In health, it is already there. Foreign participation is coming in. But, all these are connected with the security of the Indian people. Therefore, I seek clarifications on these three points – first, the contradictory statements of the ambassador and the Minister; second, the point that till we find a permanent solution which is acceptable through the pricing mechanism, we will not be party to final agreement on agriculture; and, third, this Government will not move towards abandonment of the Minimum Support Price and the pricing mechanism towards direct cash subsidies and lowering procurement. These three are very important for the people and the country, and these must be adequately clarified. Thank you.

SHRI D. RAJA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I wish to seek clarifications with regard to three paragraphs – para 3, para 8 and para 10 of the statement made by the Minister. Sir, since the inception of WTO, India is a part of WTO, a member of WTO. India is well aware and the Minister knows that the struggle within the WTO is between the developed countries and the developing countries as far as subsidies to agriculture are concerned and as far as food security and procurement of foodgrains is concerned. Now, in this background, I would like to ask the Minister what is the role that India has been playing to unite more developing countries in the struggle to protect the interests of the developing countries. For instance, I raise this question India and the United States reached an agreement on the issue of Public Stockholding on foodgrains on 13th November, 2014. The Minister's statement says "We were able to resolve our differences with the United States, and persuade them to support us in the WTO on our requirements." What is this? I would like to know whether we are giving in to the pressure of the United States, or, the United States is succumbing to India's requirement, and whether we are leaving our allies, developing countries in the WTO forum. We are leaving them behind and going along with the United States of America. Is the Government clear on what it is doing? Is it just a concession to

Mr. Obama who will be our chief guest at the Republic Day celebration? What is the position of India? India should be clear what it is doing in such a multilateral forum. It shows lack of clarity or hidden positions that India is taking. One can doubt India's position because we used to be with the developing countries. Now, all of a sudden, we move closer to the United States. This is number one which the Minister should clarify.

Para 8 of the statement talks about "The Decision includes a commitment to find a permanent solution on public stockholding for food security purposes by 31st December, 2015 on the best endeavour basis." What is the best endeavour basis? This introduces a sense of urgency. What is the best endeavour basis which introduces a sense of urgency in the process and would encourage other developing countries also to join the effort in pushing forward for a permanent solution at the earliest? So, there are developing countries which are not with us now. You expect that they will join us at some point of time. Which are those countries? What is India doing to unite those developing countries? Finally, it is going to be a battle between developing countries and developed countries. India being the number one developing country among the developing countries India has to play a pro active role, a positive role in uniting these developing countries. Would the Minister share with the House which are those developing countries with whom India is negotiating?

Then, finally, para 10 talks about " a permanent solution on public stockholding for food security purposes from the agriculture negotiations on other issues under the Doha Development Agenda. This would ensure that the negotiations for a permanent solution would continue even if the negotiations on such other issues are delayed." Now, negotiations are important. What are the negotiations actually going on? Would the Minister share with the House on what issues these negotiations are going on, or, what concessions we are making, or, what gains we are getting through these negotiations? ..(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA MISRA: When Raja speaks praja walks out!

SHRI D. RAJA: One last issue. India is also negotiating simultaneously Free Trade Agreements with a group of countries, with individual countries, with the European Union, with the ASEAN and with countries like Sri Lanka also. So, how do you integrate all these Free Trade Agreements with the multi-lateral agreement within the framework of WTO? The whole point is, whatever Government does, it should not be detrimental to the interests of the nation, the nation's agriculture and the farming community.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri K. C. Tyagi.

श्री के.सी. त्यागी (बिहार) : सर, मैं पहले आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो आपकी घंटी है इतनी बार बजाते हो कि आपको इसे कई-कई बार चार्ज करना पड़ता है। मैं अपना वक्तव्य दूंगा तो उम्मीद करूंगा कि आप इसको कष्ट नहीं देंगे।

श्री उपसभापति : आप ऐसा करो, तीन-चार मिनट में खत्म करो। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : सर, इनका आज बर्थडे है, इसलिए आप घंटी न बजाएं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI DEREK O' BRIEN: Happy Birthday, Sir!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Happy Birthday, Tyagiji!

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Happy Birthday! ...**(Interruptions)**... The whole House joins in wishing you a Happy Birthday! So, you can speak for one minute more.

श्री के.सी. त्यागी : सर, मैं टी.एम.सी. के अपने मित्रों को धन्यवाद करना चाहता हूँ कि आर्थिक सवाल पर ये हम लोगों के बहुत करीब हो गए हैं और आशा है कि हम लोगों की एकता बनी रहेगी।

सर, इकोनॉमिक्स में जिसको नोबल प्राइज मिला है, मि. जोसेफ, वे वर्ल्ड बैंक के चेयरमैन भी रहे हैं। The centre of looting the Third World countries, thy name is the World Bank! चीफ एडवाइजर भी रहे हैं क्लिन्टन गवर्नमेंट में। सर, उन्होंने लिखा है globalization और जो डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. की शर्तें हैं इनको मानते-मानते थर्ड वर्ल्ड कंट्रीज की जो इकोनॉमी है वह खराब हो जाएगी। उसको नोबल पुरस्कार मिला हुआ है। सर, इस देश के लक्षण देखिए, कैसे हो रहे हैं। डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में जो हिन्दुस्तान के इंटरैस्ट के खिलाफ वकालत करके आए हैं मि.सी. रंगराजन, वे इस समय भारत सरकार के एडवाइजर हैं। यह ऐसे ही है जैसे मछलियों की रखवाली के लिए आप बगुलों को बैठा दें। सर, ये जो शर्तें हैं, चाहे यू.पी.ए. के टाइम की हों या एन.डी.ए. के टाइम की हो, जिस बाली को लेकर हमारे मित्र, though he is from the Left, he is on my right side and though they are right, they are on my left side, बाली समझौते को लेकर के जो इनके सजेशंस हैं, वे ऐसे ही हैं जैसे फांसी की सजा का दिन टलने का मतलब माफी नहीं होता। सर, इस देश के अंदर इस साल खास तौर से, पिछले साल से शुरू है, डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में आनन्द शर्मा जी, बचा क्या है लगाने के लिए जो बाली का जिफ्र आप और आप कर रहे हो। ये तीन शर्तें हैं, मैं पहले तीनों शर्तें पढ़कर आपको सुनाना चाहता हूँ। जो फॉर्म प्रोड्यूसिज है, खबरदार अगर उनके दाम बढ़ाए तो। केंद्र सरकार का नोटिफिकेशन है कि इस साल फसलों के दाम नहीं बढ़ेंगे। सिर्फ तीन परसेंट की बढ़ोतरी हुई है और यू.पी.ए. की गवर्नमेंट, ये तो अपनी तारीफ खुद भी नहीं करना चाहते, पता नहीं किन जालों में फंसे हुए हैं, पांच सौ रुपए तक के इनके यू.पी.ए. के शासन काल में किसानों को फसलों के दाम ज्यादा मिले। लेकिन ये भी इन्हीं जालों में फंसे हुए हैं आजकल, नम्बर-1, नम्बर-टू - भारत सरकार का सरकुलर है, यह डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. की शर्त भी है, यह बाली के पैक्ट का भी नतीजा है, जिस पर ये कह रहे हैं यह कर दिया, ये कह रहे हैं हमें बड़ी तसल्ली मिल गई। दूसरा है कि सब्सिडी खत्म करो। कितने लाख, कितने करोड़ विंटल चावल पैदा होता है? आप हिसाब लगाइए, कितना गेहूं पैदा होता है और आपने तो देश को बेच दिया था डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में नहीं,

उसमें वहां से आता था अनाज पी.एल.-480 का और अमेरिका शर्तें लगाता था। यह हम थे, हमारे पुरखे थे और कृषि वैज्ञानिक थे, जो भारत को आज इस स्थिति में लाए कि दुनिया का नम्बर-2 चावल पैदा करने वाला, नम्बर-1 गेहूं पैदा करने वाला और नम्बर-3 का शक्कर पैदा करने वाला मुल्क आज हिन्दुस्तान हो गया। लेकिन इस पर किसी को गर्व नहीं है, इसका कहीं जिक्र नहीं है। सर, दूसरा है सब्सिडी खत्म करने वाला। मैं इनकी सरकार की भी कहना चाहता हूँ और उनकी सरकार की भी। इनकी सरकार के दो मुख्यमंत्री हैं, एक है रमन सिंह जी, इस समय हिन्दुस्तान में जो सबसे ज्यादा चावल पैदा हो रहा है उनमें से छत्तीसगढ़ अकेला है। जहां सबसे ज्यादा गेहूं पैदा हो रहा है वह है मध्य प्रदेश। दोनों सूबे के मुख्यमंत्रियों ने चिट्ठी लिखी है प्लीज, भगवान श्रीराम के लिए यह सब्सिडी खत्म करो, हमारे यहां के किसान मर जाएंगे। लेकिन सब्सिडी भी खत्म हो गई। तीसरी डब्ल्यूटीओ की शर्त है कि पीडीएस सिस्टम खत्म करो। तो सर, 25 परसेंट राइस और व्हीट इस साल पीडीएस के लिए लिया जा रहा है, बाकी पूंजीपतियों, होर्डर्स और एक्सपोर्टर्स के लिए खुले मार्केट में छोड़ा जा रहा है कि बाकी तुम जो है सस्ते दामों पर किसानों से ले लो। तो अब डब्ल्यूटीओ से नेगोसिएशन के लिए बचा क्या है? आप बाली में जो करके आए थे, उससे कोई बड़ा करिश्मा नहीं हुआ। अब इसको इन्होंने बढ़ाया और इसमें कुछ भी नहीं है। इन्होंने फांसी की सजा चार साल और बढ़ा दी है और कह रहे हैं कि हमने रिलीफ दे दी है।

सर, मैं पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ। परमानेंट सॉल्यूशन के लिए इन्होंने भारत के किसानों के लिए कल की तारीख 31 दिसंबर, 2014 तय की थी, शायद वह बढ़ जाएगी, लेकिन हर हाल में 26 जनवरी से पहले, चूंकि मालिक आ रहे हैं, जो पूरी दुनिया को चलाते हैं, ओबामा साहब, उनके लिए यह 26 तारीख से पहले पैक्ट होना है। यह आप किसी कागज पर लिख लीजिए। यह उनके लिए होना है। एक यह भी डॉक्ट्रीन चल गया है, रीगन डॉक्ट्रीन चल गया है, थैचर डॉक्ट्रीन चल गया है, Peng Xiao Ping डॉक्ट्रीन चल गया है। सर, अमरीका का जो सबसे बड़ा बैंक लेहमैन बर्दर्स है, वह डिफॉल्टर हो गया है, अमरीका के 35 और बैंक डिफॉल्टर हो गए हैं। साढ़े आठ लाख अमरीकी लोगों ने कहा कि हम डिफॉल्टर होना चाहते हैं, even then we are proud of their economy. इंग्लैंड में थैचर ने जो डिनेशनलाइजेशन किया था, अब उसमें सभी संगठनों ने मांग की है कि रेल को दुबारा नेशनलाइज करो। उनका सिस्टम कॉलेप्स कर गया, लेकिन हमारे मित्र खोजते रहते हैं कि कैसे विदेशी पूंजी आए। सर, इससे बहुत डर लगता है। एक फिल्म आई थी कि थप्पड़ से नहीं प्यार से डर लगता है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please try to conclude.

श्री के. सी. त्यागी : सर, मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर जो गरीब गुरबा लोग हैं, जो किसान लोग हैं, एक भी बार उनके लिए इस तरह का आपकी तरफ से प्रयास नहीं हुआ। मैं बधाई देना चाहता हूँ, अकेली बिहार की सरकार है, जिसने इस काले कानून को मानने से मना कर दिया है और हम अपने प्रदेश के किसानों को तीन सौ रुपए क्विंटल चावल पर और तीन सौ रुपए क्विंटल गेहूं पर सब्सिडी दे रहे हैं। देश के अंदर सबने मना कर दिया। ऐसा कभी नहीं हुआ। सीतारमण जी हैं, अब इनकी अंग्रेजी और आनन्द जी की अंग्रेजी ऐसी है कि हमारे हिंदी के तर्क कमजोर पड़ जाते हैं। मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने इस पर हमें समय कम दिया और मैंने मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन किया था, मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी को चिट्ठी

[श्री के. सी. त्यागी]

लिखी कि डब्ल्यूटीओ में जाने से पहले सभी अपोजीशन पार्टी के नेताओं को बुलाइए। यह कोई आपके अकेले का काम नहीं है। How can you sell the country? देश में जितने भी किसान संगठन हैं, जितने भी स्टेकहोल्डर्स हैं, ...(व्यवधान)... भारतीय जनता पार्टी के जितने भी किसान संगठन हैं, मैं मुबारकवाद देना चाहता हूँ, स्वदेशी जागरण मंच, भारतीय मजदूर संघ, भारतीय किसान संघ, ये इनकी आर्थिक और नई नीति के खिलाफ समूचे देश में संघर्ष कर रहे हैं। नागपुर से हमारे साथी बैठे होंगे, नागपुर के अंदर चार दिन से कृषि उत्पादक संगठन, किसानों को मूल श्रृंखला में जोड़ने वाला संगठन, हालांकि जया जी छोटी किसान हैं, इनका दो या तीन एकड़ ही फैजाबाद में, बाराबंकी में जमीन है, अगर ये इनके पुराने मित्रों से बची रहीं तो शायद यह बची रह जाएगी, ...

श्री उपसभापति : त्यागी जी, खत्म कीजिए। Now, please conclude

श्री के. सी. त्यागी : सर, मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। मेरा यह कहना है कि जो डब्ल्यूटीओ की शर्तें हैं, जिनमें तीन का मैंने जिक्र किया। नंबर वन—दाम नहीं बढ़ेंगे, नहीं बढ़ाए। नंबर टू—सब्सिडी खत्म करो, खत्म कर दी और नंबर थ्री—पीडीएस का कोटा खत्म करो, 25 परसेंट पर आ गया। तो आनन्द शर्मा जी और मंत्री महोदया किन बातों से बाली एग्रीमेंट, बाली एग्रीमेंट करते हैं, क्या इसमें यह था कि समय बढ़ा दिया जाए? आपने कलेंडर ईयर 1986 माना है। उस समय आपकी सैलरी कितनी थी? मैं जब एमपी बनकर आया था, हम दोनों साथ आए थे, तब हमें 1985-86 में दस हजार रुपए महीना मिलते थे। अब आप किसानों के लिए तो कलेण्डर ईयर 1986 मानोगे और अपने मुनाफों के लिए 2012, 2014, 2015, 2016 मांगोगे। तो इस देश की कृषि बरबाद होने जा रही है। मैं इन दायें-बायें बाजू वाले मित्रों से कहना चाहता हूँ ...(व्यवधान)... परमानेंट एड्रेस उनके हैं, जिनका वी.पी.ओ. लिखा है। ग्राम व डाकखाना जिनका लिखा है। वे हमारे अकाली दल के दोस्त थे। ये हमारे साथ इन चीजों के लिए लड़ते थे और जब से उधर गए हैं या इन्होंने हमें झर फेंक दिया, तब से हमारे और इनके बीच में भी तकरार हो गई है। तो जिनके वी.पी.ओ. हैं, यानी विलेज एंड पोस्ट ऑफिस वालों से मेरा निवेदन है कि यह काला कानून है, जैसे अंग्रेजों के टाइम में कानून आए थे, यह देश की खेती और किसानों को बरबाद करेगा। मैं समय रहते हुए, चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री बलिवदर सिंह भुंडर (पंजाब): सर, किसानों के मामले में हम सभी इनके साथ हैं।

SHRI SUKHENDU SEKHAR ROY (West Bengal): Sir, first of all, what I am going to submit should not be taken as a criticism of or as opposition to the Government's policy, but it should be treated as a concern because, I think, it is a national concern. With the advent of WTO and the way the economic expansionism of developed countries is being perpetuated through WTO, it is very difficult for developing countries like India to withstand the onslaught. So far as the clarification made by the hon. Minister is concerned, before her, Shri Anand Sharma, when he was the hon. Minister, tried to make some headway. He made some headway but not to the extent that it was expected. Similarly, even after the hon. Commerce Minister,

Nirmala Sitaramanji, doing overtime, the expected result is very much gloomy, and I am giving two or three points to that effect.

Though the present Agreement with the U.S.A. is an improvement over the WTO, the Bali Agreement, there are many issues remaining which are not good for India. For instance, the formula for calculating support for public stockholding called 'food security' is unreasonably loaded against the developing countries. As rightly pointed out by Mr. Tyagi, when we look at the 1986-88 prices, – we are in 2014 – since 1986-88, the price of foodgrains had gone up manifold. Now if the Government of India raises it to ₹1,400 per quintal to farmers for procurement of wheat, and the price of wheat was ₹385 in 1985-86, then, what will be the consequence? It will be assumed that the Government is giving a subsidy of ₹1,015 per quintal of wheat. Thus there is a need to change the WTO rules. But this price mechanism cannot work. This is my first point.

The second point is that the member countries, through a process of consultation, will also have the right to scrutinize the Food Programmes of India or, for that matter, of any country. So, the member countries will invade into India to assess the fall-out of the price mechanism and, in case of any breach, the same could be disputed. All these provisions of the Agreement clearly suggest that internal policy matters within India will be subject to foreign scrutiny and, hence, add up to erosion of our sovereignty. This is highly objectionable, Sir. This is a matter of great concern for us that India's sovereignty will be compromised in that way.

Thirdly, Sir, the final Draft agreed in Bali mandated developing countries to ensure various measures of trade facilitation. Now it is unfortunate that no cost assessment has been made by the Government about implementing the provisions of trade facilitation. What is happening is that by providing trade facilitation, imports from the rest of the world may flood India, further worsening the already difficult external payment position. This is another area of concern for India.

And, finally, in reality, this agreement reached by the BJP Government has, actually, eroded the sovereignty of the nation on the one hand and put a ceiling on the freedom of future regimes to announce any such food security programmes. Because, in the Trade Facilitation Agreement that I have mentioned, the entire money will be cut from the prime allocation on health, on food and other areas and that will be adjusted with the trade facilitation arrangements. Therefore, Sir, I would submit and I would appeal to the hon. Commerce Minister to clarify these points in this august House so that the nation can have a clear picture on this issue. Thank you.

SHRI A. NAVANEETHAKRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I would like to quote the great poet Bharatiyaar* That means even if a single person does not get food, the entire world must be destroyed. So, I hope the Central Government is taking proper steps to protect the Indian farmers. Now the general opinion is — subject to correction and approval — the WTO is helping the rich countries to exploit the poor countries. So, that impression must be removed. Now, because of World Trade Organisation, our Government is not able to provide subsidies to the farmers and they are not able to give relief to the needy people. In this context, I would like to mention one point that in Tamil Nadu, the Public Distribution System is functioning very well. Another important fact I would like to refer to is — *Amma Unavagam* — *Amma* Canteen that is providing quality food to the needy people. That is the brainchild of our *Amma*. I hope, like our *Amma*, the Central Government would protect the poor farmers and the poor people. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA MISRA : Sir, I would not repeat what has already been said by all the Members. Instead of that, I will straightaway come to one clarification which I want to seek from the hon. Minister with respect to para 10. Para 10 says that “The General Council has also unequivocally agreed to delink the negotiations for a permanent solution on public stockholding for food security purposes from the agriculture negotiations on other issues under the Doha Development Agenda. This would ensure that the negotiations for a permanent solution would continue if the negotiations on such other issues are delayed.” Now, I would only like to ask the hon. Minister whether there is a special and any differential mechanism for the other issues and what these issues are. Are they industrial goods or the market excesses? I would request the hon. Minister to clarify this.

DR. E. M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I just want to quote US trade representative Michael Froman who read the statement after meeting of the USA President and the Prime Minister of India. I am just quoting. “Efforts to put the TFA in place were dealt a setback in July, when a small group of countries, led by India, raised concerns about the status of the WTO’s work on food security issues and blocked consensus on implementing the TFA. We have overcome that delay and now have agreement with India to move forward with full implementation.” Further, in the last paragraph, in the Statement, he says, “This has been a good week for trade and the growth and jobs it supports here in the United States. The U.S. worked with China to achieve a breakthrough on the Information Technology Agreement, worked with India to move forward with the implementation of the Trade Facilitation Agreement, and worked with our TPP partners to bring the end of these landmark negotiations clearly into sight. Together, these will provide a

* The Hon. Member spoke in Tamil.

major boost to the global trading system at a critical time in the world's economic recovery, a central focus of the upcoming G-20 Summit." This is the intention of USA. When Shri Anand Sharma was leading the team to Bali, 93 countries were supporting us and when we raised this issue in the Parliament, your negotiation deadline was going to be over. You were waiting for the clearance of the new Prime Minister. For one man's clearance you have lost your time. Therefore, you have lost your friends. Finally, you end up with – I quote the US word – 'small group of countries.' You have come down from 93 countries to a 'small group of countries!' Now, there is no one else to support us in the WTO talks; we have to act only at the command from the USA. There is no doubt the USA's friendship is needed. But, we should not be at the command of the USA. We should not surrender our sovereignty to any country.

Secondly, Sir, in the name of public stockings and not taking the issues to the WTO's Dispute Resolution Forum, you are going to allow 75 per cent of Indian market to be flooded with agriculture produces from all other countries and you are going to make agriculturists in India to suffer. They are not going to have the competitive price. The flooding is going to happen, because the TFA allows you to have 'allowed tariff' and you are allowing in and out flow without any hesitation. Therefore, within a year, you are going to have a catastrophe on agriculturists in India. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister in which way are you going to protect the interests of the agriculturists, their produce and also the labourers who are depending on agriculture. Thank you.

SHRI ANANDA BHASKAR RAPOLU (Telangana): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is the time know from the hon. Minister on her 19 point statement what are the escape channels and routes we have to come out of the complications of the cobweb - चक्रव्यूह - which is called the World Trade Organisation.

Our nation's GDP covered by trade is to the tune of 35 per cent. A great shift has taken place between 1950s and now. Sir, services are now having a greater role by almost 55 per cent. Those were the days in 1950s when agriculture was ruling the roost with 58 per cent. We are on the stronger side as far as services are concerned. We are authority in export of services. In the recent one decade, our export capacity in services has grown to 40 per cent. But, at this juncture, we are an infrastructure-deficit nation. We are having population which depends on agriculture to the tune of 50 per cent. Given the ground reality, it is quite impossible to have any sort of compromise on food security and agrarian platform. Still, we are yet to attain, as mentioned by our hon. Deputy Leader and our senior colleague, Natchiappanji, them and are friendless. We are almost something like Abhimanyu in the पञ्चव्यूह. In this चक्रव्यूह, how are you going to enlarge your capacity to come out of the escape

[Shri Ananda Bhaskar Rapolu]

channels without compromising interests, particularly agrarian interest, of our nation? This is the first clarification I wish to seek from the hon. Minister.

Besides that, Sir, we are having economic growth and we are getting complication not only from the WTO but also from the Multilateral Agreements and the FTAs. These complications are eating into the question of sovereignty of our nation. For that, even at global platforms, discussions are going on about the utility and the effectiveness of the WTO as far as agrarian sector is concerned. On this front, we are yet to attain the proper position since those were the great days of Argentina, Brazil and India -- ABI trio -- but, now, we are a loner. So, how this Abhimanyu -- India -- will come out of the complicated cobweb of the WTO? Thank you.

SHRIMATI KANIMOZHI (Tamil Nadu): Sir, Peace Clause does not come without conditions. The Bali decision on public stockholding requires that countries using this facility should have provided and continue to provide, on an annual basis, information for each public stockholding programme that it maintains for food security purposes. India's food security programme under this would come under strict monitoring by the WTO. The Peace Clause also has conditions attached that the country will have to establish that food procurement programmes being protected don't distort the world trade. It will be difficult for India to prove this when challenged by any other country. How do we protect our farmer subsidies from them and our food security programmes, and protect the local agriculture and food security? Thank you.

श्री भूपिंदर सिंह (ओडिशा): डिप्टी चेयरमैन सर, इस मुद्दे पर पिछली बार भी 5, अगस्त को जब मंत्री जी ने यहां बयान दिया था, उस वक्त भी चर्चा हुई थी। इस हाउस में जब चर्चा हुई थी तब कहा गया था कि हम एक कृषि प्रधान देश हैं। हमारा स्वाभिमानी किसान आज हमको इतना ज्यादा अनाज दे पाया है कि हमें आज किसी देश के सामने जाकर हाथ फैलाने की जरूरत नहीं है। इस मुद्दे पर, इस हाउस में सभी पार्टियों की एक राय है, वे चाहे आज सरकार के सदस्य हैं, सभी की एक राय है। इसी को लेकर हमने एक बात पूछी थी कि हम किस मुद्दे पर मिनिमम सपोर्ट प्राइस देते हैं? हमने आपका पिछली बार का स्टेटमेंट देखा था यूएसए में 80 परसेंट तक सब्सिडी किसानों को देते हैं, वे लोग 80 परसेंट तक अपने किसानों को सब्सिडी दे सकते हैं, लेकिन वे हमारे ऊपर सब्सिडी देने के लिए प्रतिबंध लगाते हैं, हमारे लिए hurdles तैयार करते हैं कि आप अपने किसानों को इससे ज्यादा सब्सिडी नहीं दे सकते।

सर, आज आपने हाउस में देखा होगा जब पेट्रोल और डीजल के ऊपर चर्चा चल रही थी। हमारा किसान जो भी फसल पैदा करता है, जो भी पैदावार करता है, उसकी वजह से हम देश की जरूरतों को पूरा कर पाते हैं। जब हम मिनिमम फूड सिक्योरिटी की बात करते हैं, तो वह भी किसानों की मेहनत के जरिए से हो पा रही है, उसमें हमारी कोई मेहनत नहीं है,

इसमें हमारे लिए उनका सपोर्ट है। इसके लिए हम सब की एक ही दृष्टि होनी चाहिए। जब किसान रोता है, तो सारा देश रोता है और जब किसान हंसता है, तो पूरा हिन्दुस्तान हंसता है, जब किसान की रीढ़ टूटती है, तो पूरे देश की रीढ़ टूटती है, अगर देश की रीढ़ टूटती है, तो कोई सरकार भी नहीं रह पाती है और सरकार की भी रीढ़ टूट जाती है। इसीलिए मैं एक बार फिर से निवेदन करूंगा कि मिनिमम सपोर्ट प्राइस में जो इनपुट्स वे लोग आज देते हैं, उनकी इतनी ज्यादा कीमत बढ़ गई है, वह चाहे फर्टिलाइजर हो, चाहे डीजल हो, चाहे केरोसीन हो, चाहे ऑयल हो, चाहे सीड्स हो। डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, हम एग्रीकल्चरल लेबर की बात तो कल करेंगे, परन्तु इसके बारे में, मैं यही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार को आज जो मॅडेट मिला है, जब आप WTO में अपने देश का तिरंगा लेकर बैठते हैं, तो उस वक्त वहां कोई पार्टी जाकर नहीं बैठती है, किसी पोलिटिकल पार्टी का रिप्रेजेंटेटिव वहां जाकर नहीं बैठता है, वहां इस देश का रिप्रेजेंटेटिव जाकर बैठता है। इसके लिए यह हाउस और सारा देश उसके पीछे रहता है। इसीलिए हमें किसी के सामने झुकने की जरूरत नहीं है। एक ज़माना था जब हम जाकर अमेरिका के सामने गेहूँ के लिए हाथ फैलाते थे। आज हमारा देश, हमारा किसान, हमारे लोग उस स्तर पर नहीं हैं, उससे काफी आगे पहुंच चुके हैं। मैं आपके माध्यम से प्रधान मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब वे पहले रोज इस हाउस में आए थे तब मैंने उनसे कहा था कि आप किसान की तरफ नज़र रखिए। अगर किसान दुखी रहेगा, तो इस देश में कोई व्यापार नहीं चल सकता है।

सर, आप देखते होंगे कि आज गांव में जहां पर वीकली मार्केट होता है, जब तक किसान के घर में पैदावार होती है तब तक वीकली मार्केट के छोटे-छोटे व्यापारियों का काम चलता है, अन्यथा वहां भी काम ठप हो जाता है। वहां पर भी व्यापारी का काम नहीं चल सकता है। अगर आज स्कूल और कालेजों में हम बच्चों को पढ़ने के लिए भेज पाए हैं, तो भी वह किसान की मजदूरी और उसके पैसे से ही भेज पाए हैं। उस किसान के पास जब पैसा नहीं होता, तो उसका बच्चा ट्यूशन की फीस भी नहीं दे पाता है। इसीलिए मैं उम्मीद करूंगा कि आप minimum support price को बढ़ाएं। अगर आप सब्सिडी के तौर पर अपनी सुरक्षा नहीं कर पा रहे हैं, तो आप minimum support price को बढ़ाइए। अभी जैसा माननीय त्यागी जी और दूसरे माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि कुछ राज्य सब्सिडी देना चाहते हैं। आपने छत्तीसगढ़ में election slogan में बोला था कि हम 300 रुपए देंगे। ...**(समय की घंटी)**... आप इलेक्शन के टाइम तो बोलते हैं कि हम किसान को इतनी सब्सिडी देंगे, लेकिन उसके बाद आप क्यों भूल जाते हैं? सर, ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। जब हम बाहर जाते हैं, तो वहां पर लोग हम से इसका जवाब मांगते हैं कि आज आपने राज्य सभा में इसके ऊपर बात क्यों नहीं की, आपने इस पर चर्चा क्यों नहीं की? हम सरकार को सपोर्ट करते हैं, हम सरकार के पीछे खड़े हैं। सरकार जब international forum में जाकर बैठती है, तो अपना human rights ...**(समय की घंटी)**...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Okay, all right.

श्री भूपिंदर सिंह : आज सरकार सारे देश के human rights को बचाने के लिए WTO में मजबूती से बात करे। धन्यवाद।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, hon. Minister.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN): Hon. Deputy Chairman, Sir, thank you for giving me this opportunity to respond to the questions and seeking of clarifications by hon. Members. Let me, at the outset, say a very big 'thank you' to every Member who chose to spoke because the interest with which they have gone into the details of the Statement made, Bali Agreement before this, and also on the issue of our rights as a nation to protect our poor farmers and also to ensure the decisions, as critical as those which affect agriculture have got to be the sovereign right and that has to be protected. Sir, I am indeed very grateful to all Members who have taken part in this debate passionately and raised very many issues on which I would seek to give as much as I can, and if there are any, which I have missed out, I hope, I will, still be able to be reminded and I can answer all of them. My predecessor, hon. Member, Shri Anand Sharma, has gone into great details to say either he is right or I am right. I think what is important here is, India has got to be right and we have only tried to keep Indian position strong, building on what possibility. If I can just crisscross and go to hon. Members, Dr. E.M. Sudarsana Natchiappan, who said, and also Shri Ananda Bhaskarji said, "Oh! is India like Abhimanyu, getting into a Chakravyuha, not able to come out." In fact, Dr. Sudarsana Natchiappan had very clearly said, we had 93 friends then, we have none now. I just want to respond and begin with that; if you want to compare India with Abhimanyu, who got into a Chakravyuha, I would like to tell you here in no uncertain terms, under the leadership of Shri Narendra Modi, the Prime Minister, we have gone in as an Abhimanyu, but we came out successfully with 160 friends, building on our predecessor, who had 93 friends. So, Sir, the approach here is, yes, we are not talking about party politics when we are outside the country; we are ensuring that our sovereign right, which is being taken care of by either so many Governments before us, now is being strengthened, and if there are any corrections to be made in the process, we, as a Government, representing the people of India, have a sovereign duty to do the course correction and ensure that our farmers or any such interests are kept intact and protected. So, we may be Abhimanyu, but that Abhimanyu, successfully came out of the Chakravyuha with more friends and not less. So, let me be sure that the track of our argument is not to say, 'that was terrible and this is better.' No; we are very clearly saying, Bali was imperfect and there is no way that I am retracting that statement. It was an imperfect agreement. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: This is a new agreement. That is all. Please confirm that you have reached a new agreement.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: I will come to that. That is one of the points that you have raised, and I will certainly come to it. I am only beginning

my answer. Bali was an imperfect Agreement, and it required a course correction, and it was that course-correction that this Government had engaged in from July. And in doing so, we ensured that a new decision, I am addressing your answer...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: You address the Chair, and the rules of this House...
...(Interruptions)...

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: I thought, I started with you, Sir. I thought, I started by saying, "Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir,...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, problem; you proceed.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Okay; बोलिए, बोलिए, कोई इश्यू नहीं है ।

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: It is a new decision, and I would certainly underline the fact that it is a new decision because the WTO's General Council said very clearly, and I will read it. What was done in Bali is read like this, Bali Ministerial Decision of 7th December, 2013, and I quote; "Members agreed to put in place an interim mechanism, as set out below, and to negotiate on an Agreement for a permanent solution for the public stockholding for food security purposes, for adoption by the 11th Ministerial Conference", which, if I may remind, it is not mentioned here, it is 2017. And the next paragraph, which is paragraph 2 says, and I quote, "In the interim", the word 'in the interim' is used there, "In the interim, until a permanent solution is found, and provided that these conditions and so on..." So, it goes on like this. This is Bali 2013.

What is now? Again, I am reading; I am quoting from Decision of 27th November, 2014. The General Council having regard to paragraph 1 of article 9 of the Marrakesh Agreement, establishing the World Trade Organization and so on, conducting the functions of the Ministerial Conference in the interval between meetings pursuant to paragraph 2 of article 4 of the WTO Agreement, and recognizing the importance of public stockholding for food security purposes for developing countries, mooting the Ministerial decisions, so and so, 7th December, 2013 on public stockholding for food security and so on, decides that", please note the word, "decides". Therefore, let us be clear, this is a new decision with a new date, and I am quoting it. It is not as if I am giving an interpretation. So, that issue, which was raised by Shri Anand Sharma is answered. What did we achieve out of this? The Peace Clause extended not just for four years, but for perpetuity. So, is that ambiguity which prevailed going to be till the 11th Ministerial which is in 2017? Is it only for four years from 2013, when the Agreement was signed? Is it just interim? And, after the interim, if a permanent solution is not found, what is going to happen? All that has been very clearly said; the ambiguity has been removed. The new decision, as I very clearly...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, through you, can I just ask one thing from the hon. Minister?

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: Can I just finish? ...*(Interruptions)*... I am not yielding.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Because she said,...

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: I am not yielding here; I am not yielding here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: She is not yielding.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: I think, courtesy requires that I finish and answer.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: After she finishes. She is not yielding.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Let her complete.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: The ambiguity which prevailed has been removed, and for that, I will just take two pointed examples. The language, the hon. Member, my predecessor, repeatedly spoke about, is simple English. I am a student of English; I try to keep learning English. I submit here that English here now, to me, and to my understanding, is unambiguous. Please correct me, if I am wrong. Unambiguous language, I just want to put it in front of the hon. Members. 'I shall not take to dispute' is the word which is being used now instead of 'in the interim will exercise due restraint'. I am quoting from 2013 Bali. 'In the interim will exercise due restraint' were the words used whereas what is now being used is 'shall not take to dispute'. To me, this seems to be fairly unambiguous. ...*(Interruptions)*... Second, unambiguous again, in 2013 the language which was used was 'in the interim till a permanent solution is found'. Now the language which is being used, which many Members, of course, do remember highlighting that what if a solution is not found. 'Found' is the word on which we were playing; therefore, I am trying to tell you that 'found' is not the word any longer used. It is now 'till a permanent solution is agreed and adopted'. And here I would immediately like to draw your attention, many of the Members who have raised that legitimate question, what if a solution is imposed on us, or what if a solution is going to encroach into the sovereign rights of Indian decision making. There cannot be a solution found which is 'unagreeable' to us. The solution which is going to be found now is a permanent solution whenever it is found for, which Mr. Raja referred to it, what is this best endeavour, maximum, all of us have to work for it. But when a permanent solution is going to be worked out it has to be 'agreed upon' by all us and then adopted. It

is not a permanent solution which is going to be found from somebody's hat as it were like a rabbit in a magic show and given to us. It is something which all of us will be working on and that which will be agreed upon and then subsequently adopted. So, my simple English tells me that the ambiguity is largely removed. If there is still any ambiguity in anybody's mind, I would like to be informed about it. So we will work on it after that. So, there is no ambiguity in the language. What is better now again between 2013 and 2014? 2014, Sir, has an accelerated mechanism to get a permanent solution in the sense dedicated sessions are going to be held of the Special Session of the Committee on Agriculture, supervised by the TNC, in the sense by the General Council. So, there are going to be mechanisms which are very well in place through which accelerated processes will work out for a solution for agriculture related matters. Therefore, this new decision has improved upon the Bali of 2013. Then again the negotiations for a permanent solution are now certainly on a separate track. Many hon. Members referred to paragraph 10 of what I had spoken in August, separate track from the agriculture negotiations so that under the Doha Development Agenda, it ensures priority, it brings in greater focus and it brings in continuation for negotiations for a permanent solution. This 'interim' is no longer being there, we have a peace clause given in perpetuity, and, therefore, this is much better, improved and a new decision. There are no conditions, no new concessions and no new compromises made. That in passing I want to ensure the House. So, any question about this is no good, this is no different, it is this, it is that, no, I am making it very clear on what course we are very clearly improved upon the 2013. On the issue of General Council and its role, I just want to be sure that I read that paragraph so that there is no ambiguity on it. 'The General Council..' again from the World Trade Organisation's document, '..is fully acting as the Ministerial Council conducting the functions of Ministerial Conference in the interval is completely mandated.' So, we do not need to worry. The need for me to state it in my August statement was to inform the House that we are not going to the General Council which may not have the powers to ensure the Members of the House that the General Council is not being approached which does not have a mandate and the Ministerial Council is what has to be approached. No. We knew, we worked on it, we understood and the WTO has also confirmed it. Therefore, they are fully in a position to take a decision, which is happening between two Ministries. So, I wanted to assure my predecessor that we have certainly not done anything that is very differently placed.

I would not have the courage to speak in as much Hindi as the hon. Member, Shri Derek O'Brien, has spoken. But I would certainly say सम्पूर्ण सॉल्यूशन has not been obtained. बिल्कुल । सम्पूर्ण सॉल्यूशन की ओर ही हम जा रहे हैं । जो बात आज हुई और जो जनरल काउंसिल में अभी एग्री हो गया है, यह उस रास्ते में ही जा रहा है । बात

[Shrimati Nirmala Sitharaman]

सिर्फ यह है कि सिर्फ 2017 तक सीमित नहीं है, जब भी परमानेंट सॉल्यूशन आएगा, हम भी उसके लिए कोशिश करेंगे, मगर जब आएगा, वह आएगा, तब तक हमें राहत है, क्योंकि peace clause perpetuity के लिए दिया गया है। इस तरह हम सम्पूर्ण सॉल्यूशन की ओर ही जा रहे हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**... हमारी कोशिश जारी रहेगी। ...**(व्यवधान)**... On the TFA, hon. Member, Shri Derek O'Brien, has raised a question as to what is the benefit of the TFA. The TFA would give us reduction of cost of our imports into India, making Indian manufacturing slightly more competitive. It will also lower the cost of our exports in our export markets. More than that, our ports will be lots more transparent. The arbitrage, which happens in the ports because of the delay, will be cut down. More frequency of ships, which come to the ports, will mean that there is more earning for the Customs. And, all this happening in a real time with data available on the net and so on. It is going to lead to transparency. So, trade facilitation has benefits for our country and it makes sense to go through the trade facilitations because it also does not immediately open up without conditions. The hon. Member also referred to much respected Shri Arun Shourie's statement, almost as if to conclude his own presentation. I would like to build on that. Quoting Arun Shourieji, he said, "All is said and done, but at the end more is said than done." I would like to assure the hon. Member, through you, Sir, that all will be said and all will also be done under this Government. So, let us be sure that that will be fully taken up.

Now, I move to hon. Member, Shri Sitaram Yechury. He had raised very important issues. He referred to an Ambassador's statement and said that probably that statement of the Ambassador and the Minister's statement in this august House do not have anything in common. They, probably, have some contradictions. I would like to assure the hon. Member by only reminding him that that statement was made by the Ambassador on 2nd July, when this whole position was taken by this Government. Post that statement, we have negotiated, we have worked, we have come up with solution. And, my statement, which was made in November this year, has definitely moved from the statement made by the Ambassador at the beginning of this whole issue. So, if it did not have a concurrence then, the position has been made clear through my statement. Therefore, the statement made by the Ambassador then, saying that India's position on permanent solution and the 'peace clause' is not dealt with by the WTO, we may not be able to move along with the consensus on the trade facilitation. The position has changed subsequently and we have, at least, a certain sense of getting relief in terms of 'peace clause'. He also raised this issue about Western countries giving a whole lot of subsidies that are never discussed. Yes, I agree. Since Uruguay Round, we have been raising this and I am sure most often the Indian Ministers of Trade — several of them who had gone to different places to negotiate, whether in Cancun or, later on, in Bali — have periodically raised the

issue that — I have also raised it in every one of the meetings that I have had — the US spends more than 120 billion dollars. This is an approximate figure that I am giving you. And, so does the EU. We have raised this issue as to why those subsidies that are being given to farmers are never on the agenda to be discussed. We should be discussing them, as has been raised by us, and we should continue to raise them in the forthcoming negotiations also.

On the direct benefits' transfer, it is not just me, I think the other Ministries also will have to talk about whether that kind of a transfer is happening, how and when it is happening, etc. So, I won't take the liberty of taking this debate as an opportunity to talk about it. But I am sure my senior colleagues will do that a bit later.

Hon. Member, Shri D. Raja, raised questions based on my paragraphs 3, 8 and 10. For seeking a permanent solution, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, negotiations will have to happen. Now, it will be happening. Sir, there is no commitment to a particular date, and there is no schedule. Now, of course, we have got institutionalized mechanisms to expedite on meetings of the Committee of Agriculture. So, there will be more frequently sittings and talking about what we want. Sir, the expression 'best endeavour' is more used because we want to work through to get a permanent solution but it is not as if it is tied to the deadline. We shall make all the required efforts for it and not sit back just because we have got a Peace Clause in perpetuity. We will not sit back. We shall, definitely, move forward and work towards getting a permanent solution. I assure hon. Member, Mr. Raja, that we shall put the national interest on the top. There shall never be a compromise from our side on the national interest question which you raised, so genuinely, and rightly so. We have not been isolated and it has never been the case that we did not have the support. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, let me assure you that there were several countries who kept in touch with us. But, for whatever reason, they did not open up or speak loudly in public. But we knew many nations felt that on the public stockholding of foodgrains, people were concerned and nations were concerned. They did not speak up but we were in touch with them. Today, I am happy to say that the entire General Council has agreed to understand the issue, appreciated, and you saw the Press - release. Therefore, it is not as if we have been isolated. You also questioned about the Work Programme for negotiation in the Doha Round. It is to be finalized by 31st July, 2015. It is just the Work Programme and negotiations will be going on on that.

One last assurance for hon. Member, Shri D. Raja, is, we may be dealing with FTAs, we are working on FTAs, because we see some merit in some FTAs, with which we want to work and move forward. But we strongly support multilateralism. We feel that FTAs are a way in which we are further building blocks for the multilateral

[Shrimati Nirmala Sitharaman]

system to survive and continue. So, our commitment to multilateral system continues even if we are going ahead with FTAs, with blocks of some countries. At this stage, I do not need to name each and every country with which we might discuss. But as and when there is an occasion, we will, certainly, talk about it. Shri K.C. Tyagi, as always, very passionately spoke, saying that it should not be a disaster for our *kheti* and *kisan*. I assure him and I am sure by now he would have appreciated that it is in the interest of *kheti* and *kisan* that we have taken this position from July. With the support of the House and with the support of all the Members, we will manage to succeed in the WTO General Council and we shall move in those lines even further. You can be assured, K.C. Tyagiji. Hon. Member, Sukhendu Sekhar Royji, was expressing his concern. I heard him carefully, and I am grateful to him for having said that the present Agreement is certainly an improvement over the Bali. I am very grateful, Sir, that you mentioned that.

The permanent solution that we have to work is definitely a long road in which a lot of details and issues related to India will have to be taken care of. We shall keep that in mind and move forward in ensuring that no compromise is made in keeping up the interest of India.

Hon. Member from Tamil Nadu, Shri Navaneethakrishnan, quoting Bharathiar said*.

SHRI SUKHENDU SEKHAR ROY: Please translate it in English.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: Quoting Bharathiar, Shri Navaneethakrishnan had said that 'if the single individual man doesn't have right for his food, Bharathiar had said that he will destroy this entire world.' That's the seriousness with which Bharathiar, who is a very revolutionary poet, had spoken about the right of an individual man for his food. Of course, he was talking about in the context of some programmes in Tamil Nadu. I assured him by saying 'understanding that fiery spirit of Subramania Bharathiar, BJP and the Government of India, today has chosen to go to the WTO to fight for the right of individual citizens of India for his food and for the farmers of India; and we did not destroy the world, but, before that, we constructively engaged with the WTO and got the right that we need. I assured the Member from Tamil Nadu that we would be inspired by Bharathiar; we certainly went and ensured that.

Satish Misraji had raised issues about Doha Development Agenda. It covers agriculture, industrial goods, services and so on. In every area, there will be special and differential treatment provisions, and this is an integral part of areas of the WTO negotiations. So each area will be negotiated for itself.

* The Hon. Member spoke in Tamil.

And, then, reference was also made to para 10 talking about the delinking of the negotiations for a permanent solution from the rest of the negotiations, and this will ensure that this can continue ever even if other areas are stagnating. There will, of course, be dedicated sessions with regular review. We can keep informing.

I think, I have briefly answered the questions raised by hon. Members, Dr. Sudarsana Natchiappan and Ananda Bhaskarji. I think, majority of the issues raised have been addressed. Shrimati Kanimozhi had raised this issue that the peace clause comes with a certain compromise. No, Madam, there is no compromise as far as I know. Peace clause is certainly something which gives us relief till we find a permanent solution. Till such a time, even if you cross the cap, which is based on 86-87 prices, you are still not going to be able to be drawn to litigation in the WTO courts. Therefore, that peace clause comes without any compromise. And, BJD Member, Shri Bhupinder Singh, very clearly spoke — and I am going to try again in Hindi. हमें किसी के पास जाकर सिर नहीं झुकाना है। भारतीय जनता पार्टी और गवर्नमेंट ऑफ इंडिया आज किसी के पास नहीं गई है और किसी के सामने सिर नहीं झुकाया है। ...*(व्यवधान)*... I want to be sure. Government of India has not done anything ...*(Interruptions)*... ‘Government of India’ is what I have also added there. ...*(Interruptions)*... No. ...*(Interruptions)*... Can I answer? ...*(Interruptions)*... ‘Government of India’ is what I added there... ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Bhupinder Singh. No, no; sit down.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: The Government of India, as I have said, किसी के सामने जाकर के सिर झुका नहीं है, डिप्टी चेयरमैन सर, आपके द्वारा मेंबर भूपिंदर सिंह को मैं यह एश्योरेंस देना चाह रही हूँ।

Sir, I hope, I have answered most of the questions which have been raised seeking clarifications. Thank you very much. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I wish to seek a clarification.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay; I will allow you. ...*(Interruptions)*... Yes, yes; one clarification. Do you want to put a question, Mr. Sharma?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, through you, I thank the hon. Minister, Shrimati Nirmala Sitharaman. I would like to say two quick things. I think there is some mix-up in the papers somewhere. I am just pointing it out. You talked about ‘due restraint’ with reference to Bali-I. I think ‘due restraint’ mechanism was the initial proposition which India had rejected at Bali, and the words ‘due restraint’ are not there in the Bali formula. It is there in the interim — which has been removed now — in the General Council. “Till a permanent solution is adopted, and provided

[Shri Anand Sharma]

that conditions set out below...” and those conditions remain the same, whether in the General Council or the MC-9 decision.

Secondly, Sir, I had specifically referred to one thing. You referred to the WTO documents and I too refer to the same WTO documents. I actually started from the General Council, which you have also read, from 27th November, 2014. I did say that this is the statement by the Chairman of the General Council, Ambassador Jonathan Fried of Canada, and I would read that just to underscore, “With respect to the decisions on post-Bali work circulated in this document, Members are collectively acting on the premise that the entire Bali package can and must be pursued.” I am not going to read the full paragraph because I have read it earlier. Para 2 is very important:

“Therefore, in adopting the three Decisions on Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes, on the Protocol of Amendment for Trade Facilitation, and on Post-Bali work simultaneously, we are re-affirming” – my English may not be so good – “the entirety of the Bali Ministerial mandates” – ‘mandates’, that is the word – “including the priorities that the Ministers identified at Bali”. So, what you have said now, shall we take it – just for my clarity – that the Chair of the General Council’s statement is wrong?

Lastly, the DG, WTO’s statement’s first decision – again, I am reading from the same document which you read from – clarified the Bali Decision on Public Stockholdings for Food Security Purposes. It makes clear that peace clause which was agreed in Bali...” – So, it is clarifying; you have got that clarification “...will remain in force until a permanent solution is found.” I am not going to read the rest of it.

So, what I am saying is, first, the ‘due restraint’ was not there in Bali and secondly, what I have read, and is on record, is part of the WTO documents of the 27th of November, 2014. I had earlier also read the 11th December, 2013 Bali declaration. I did ask, when I was seeking clarification, to confirm, accept or reject, whether the Chair’s statement is wrong or whether the DG statement is wrong. Forget about my statement being right or wrong.

Sir, I thought that I must put this record straight, that there was no ‘due restraint’ and these are the three paragraphs. I have much more of the 27th November documents; I have got all the documents here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now, Mr. Yechury.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, I have one question. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल (उत्तर प्रदेश): महोदय, सदन की ओर भी कार्यवाही है। एक बार पूछने के बाद इस पर मिनिस्टर का रिप्लाय भी हो गया। अब फिर और क्वेश्चन शुरू कर दिए। फिर तो इसमें हम भी पार्टिसिपेट करेंगे। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is an important subject. ...*(Interruptions)*... This is a very important subject.

SHRI NARESH AGRAWAL: Sir, other important ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is an important subject. Don't do that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SUKHENDU SEKHAR ROY: Sir, I have a point of order. Should there be supplementary clarifications? I want a ruling from you. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is only raising a doubt. It is not put as a clarifications. The Minister may oblige. That is all.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, through you, I only want to clarify to Mr. Sukhendu Roy and others that there is no further clarification. All that I am saying is, there are certain points on which we are not satisfied. We want to express that very clearly. When I mentioned the Ambassador at WTO making a statement and the Minister making a statement, I was fully aware that some time has passed and as time passes things change. We are grateful for being reminded of that knowledge or of that fact. But the point at issue is what? The point at issue is, if we agree to allow this discussion on this particular issue of Food Subsidies and Public Stockholdings for Food Subsidies for the poor to be delinked from the rest of the Agreement on Agriculture, the bargaining capacity, that we have to force the rest of the world on the WTO to accept what we are saying regarding our poor and the food security of our poor, reduces. What the Minister confirms is that 'Yes', we may agree to a final settlement on Agriculture but this negotiation will continue. That is what is my objection. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister says that there will be no compromise ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, that is my objection. Once you agree to a General Agreement on Agriculture, then your bargaining capacity on what you want to continue to talk about is lost. That is why the final peroration that was made about the BJP. I don't mind, whatever they want to say, they say. But, in this House, that is about the Government's commitment. Remember, according to our constitutional scheme of things, the only place where the Government is accountable is in the Parliament. So, therefore, we are here concerned with the Government's

[Shri Sitaram Yechury]

concern. If this contradiction remains, if we have allowed our bargaining capacity to be abandoned by saying we will agree on General Agreement on Agriculture, then that is not acceptable.

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : माननीय उपसभापति जी, एक क्लैरिफिकेशन हम भी पूछ लेते हैं ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How can you ask? You are opposing the clarifications. ...(Interruptions)...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : जब आप सबको एलाउ कर रहे हैं, तो हमें भी मौका दें । ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : यह क्या बात हुई, you are opposing clarifications and you are asking a clarification. ...(Interruptions)... पूछिए, पूछिए ।

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : महोदय, मुझे लगा ...(व्यवधान)... हम तो पहली बार पूछ रहे हैं ।

श्री सीताराम येचुरी : इनका सेकेंड राउंड अभी बाकी है। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : जब राजा को दो राउंड, तो प्रजा को भी दो राउंड। ...(व्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This subject is very important. That is why a detailed discussion is allowed. ...(Interruptions)...

श्री के. सी. त्यागी : सर, एक राजा है, एक नरेश है, प्रजा तो इधर बैठी है । ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : अच्छा, नरेश जी, आपको कुछ पूछना है?

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : जी, पूछना है ।

श्री उपसभापति : अगर पूछना है, तो पूछो, नहीं तो बैठो ।

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : सर, मेरे हिसाब से जितने भी सब्जेक्ट साथ में लिए जा रहे हैं, सभी इम्पोर्टेंट हैं, खाली यह इम्पोर्टेंट नहीं है ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I agree. You please stop. The Minister will reply. ...(Interruptions)... I take your point. ...(Interruptions)...

श्री नरेश अग्रवाल : सर, हम तो पहली बार पूछ रहे हैं । मैं इतनी देर से आपका डिस्कशन सुन रहा था, क्योंकि इसमें मुझे बहुत ज्यादा ज्ञान नहीं है । माननीय मंत्री जी, मैं सिर्फ दो चीजें जानना चाहता हूँ । आप जो एग्रीमेंट करने जा रही हैं, आपने कहा कि 30 जून, 2015 तक हमारा एग्रीमेंट फाइनल होगा, तो क्या उस एग्रीमेंट में दो चीजों की गारंटी होगी, एक तो इस देश में जो सब्सिडी किसानों को दी जा रही है, वह सब्सिडी लगातार चालू रहेगी या कहीं आप 30 जून तक उसमें झुकेंगे तो नहीं? दूसरा, किसान की उपज की मार्केटिंग की क्या व्यवस्था करेंगे? आपने बैठकर पूरे वर्ल्ड में संधि की है, तो पूरे विश्व में किसान की उपज बेचने की जिम्मेदारी करीब-करीब सभी राष्ट्रों में गवर्नमेंट के हाथों में है । तो क्या इस एग्रीमेंट के बाद इस देश के किसानों की उपज का मूल्य दिलाने की जिम्मेदारी सरकार की होगी या नहीं?

श्री के. सी. त्यागी : सर, एक क्लैरिफिकेशन मुझे भी पूछना है। पिछले दिनों मुझे हैदराबाद जाने का ...(व्यवधान)... सर, कॉटन के दाम देश के अंदर इतने ज्यादा गिर गए हैं कि नागपुर से लेकर हैदराबाद तक किसानों के सुसाइड करने की खबर आई है। मेरा निवेदन है ...(व्यवधान)... सर, बासमती चावल इस बार बाहर नहीं भेज पाएंगे, अगर कृषि के क्षेत्र में इस तरह का लगा रहा। आप जो कह रहे हैं ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : त्यागी जी आप दूसरा पाइंट पूछिए। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री के.सी. त्यागी : सर, मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। बाली के अंदर भी जो टी.एफ.ए. के लिए दबाव था, उसमें मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि एग्रीकल्चरल डेवलपमेंट के जो कोर इश्यूज थे, वे आगे के लिए छोड़ दिए गए थे, तो जब भी कभी आपकी मीटिंग होगी ...(व्यवधान)... मेरा आपसे सिर्फ इतना निवेदन है ...(व्यवधान)... आधा सैकिड ...(व्यवधान)... सर, श्री जयराम रमेश जी बैठे हुए हैं, कल श्री प्रकाश जावडेकर जी ने बाकायदा एनवायरनमेंट को लेकर, इनकी बड़ी आलोचना की। इसलिए मेरा मंत्री महोदया से यह कहना है कि जब आप हिन्दुस्तान को रिप्रेजेंट करती हैं, या तो हमारी कंसेंसस बन जाए ...(व्यवधान)... मैं आज पढ़ रहा था कि जयराम रमेश जी के टाइम में कानपुर में यह हो गया, फलों जगह यह हो गया ...(व्यवधान)... तो इस तरह का एटीट्यूड हमारे मंत्रियों का न हो। जो बाहर जाएं, वे हिन्दुस्तान की spirit को लेकर जाएं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is a valid point. There should be a consensus on all these issues. Yes, Minister, whatever you want, you can answer.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN : Sir, I just want to give a bit of clarification. Regarding the points raised by my predecessor, I just want to say that what he has read out is correct in so far as it is the Chairman's statement which was made. He is quoting from the Chairman's statement of 27th November which does not have the value of force of the General Council's decision. He comes and says it, but then the General Council's decision is what I have read. So, what has legal sanctity is this statement where it says, "It decides that"? Therefore, I am playing on that word. I just want to make sure that they are not the same. That is just a statement. Then, the statement of DG, WTO, says that it is clarifying the matter. Therefore, it is only a clarification; it is not a dual decision. I just want to say that the clarification given by the DG, WTO, was in a Press conference, and again, it is not the decision of the WTO; it was a Press conference where words can be used. I am not questioning what he said, but it is not the GC's decision, which is what I have read out here.

Then, Yechuryji talked about permanent solution, Ambassador's statement and that time has passed. Sir, time has passed and I brought in that line here because in June, the position was that we would not go ahead with the consensus reached as per Bali 2013 and that if there is a change in the priority by giving the permanent solution and Peace Clause a *pramukhyata*, that is when we would want to consider. ...(Interruptions)... Can I finish?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You finish what you have to say.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: Then, it is the 'Government of India' that I have added here. Let me underline that. On telling us, "Oh no, it is the Government of India and not the BJP", I would like to say that I certainly added that. After having said, 'BJP', I said, 'and the Government of India'. So, let me just draw the attention of the hon. Member that I have not ignored saying 'Government of India' here.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: The Government of India is not an addition to BJP.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: So, that is one thing to which I would like to draw the hon. Member's attention. As regards cotton and other things, they are decisions which are very much being taken by the Government of India now, and as regards WTO's negotiations and about food security, I probably think that it is not directly linked to this clarification, but that is a different issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But that is an important suggestion.

SHRIMATI NIRMALA SITHARAMAN: Yes, it is important and I know the Ministers were all called on an urgent meeting about two or three weeks ago, about which the Agriculture Minister, Shri Radha Mohan Singh, came and gave a statement here. So, that may not be for me to talk about it in this context.

GOVERNMENT BILL

The School of Planning and Architecture Bill, 2014

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, let us go to the next item of the Business, that is, the School of Planning and Architecture Bill, 2014.

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI SMRITI ZUBIN IRANI): Sir, I beg to move:

That the Bill to establish and declare Schools of Planning and Architecture as Institutions of National Importance in order to promote education and research in architectural studies including planning of human settlements, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.

Sir, it is said that planning is to bring the future into the present so that you can do something about it now, but this Bill seeks to address certain challenges that through the past, are presented before our students. I am sure that the esteemed Members of the House are aware that the Schools of Planning and Architecture were