

Note: This is the uncorrected transcript of the Minister's Response in the Lok Sabha. A corrected transcript will soon be available on the Lok Sabha website loksabha.nic.in/

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman Sir. It has been a four hour short duration discussion. I would not have minded had it been of longer duration. I am prepared to sit here as long as the House wants and I am prepared to stand here on any day to explain the Government's stand on climate change.

We have had 18 speakers today on this subject. The opening batsman was a very distinguished physicist himself and one of the tail-enders was a very distinguished mathematician. A Ph.D started the discussion and a Ph.D almost ended the discussion today. I am referring to Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh who is a Ph.D. in Mathematics.

(x3/1815/rbn/hcb)

We have had some excellent interventions. I want to mention specially that today the younger Members have been truly outstanding. By Indian political standards, even I am considered young, but I am not young. But I think, Shri Sandeep Dikshit, Shri Jayant Chaudhary, Shrimati Supriya Sule, and last but not least, Dr. Jyoti Mirdha made truly outstanding presentations and I want to compliment them for this.

Permit me to deal with many of the important issues that have been raised today. There are policy issues that have been raised and each individual Member has raised some specific issues. Today, I will deal with the larger issues of policy. I would like to seek the indulgence of the House to respond to the specific issues of each individual Member separately with the Member concerned, like the Loharinag Pala issue of Dr. Jyoti Mirdha, and the forestry issue of my good friend, Shri Anant Kumar Hegde. My colleague from West Bengal, including Shri Panda,

raised the issue of Sundarbans. So, on specific issues, if I may be permitted I will respond to each individual separately in writing.

I want to spend this evening discussing some of the larger issues of policy that have been raised. I want to begin by saying that today I found remarkable degree of agreement that climate change is a serious issue. This is very important.

1817 hours

(Shri Arjun Charan Sethi *in the Chair*)

You yourself are from Orissa. Your colleague from Orissa has also spoken. Members from Uttar Pradesh and Members from West Bengal have spoken. Cutting across party lines, cutting across States, there was a clear message today that climate change is a very serious issue.

On November 24th there was a Calling Attention Motion in the Rajya Sabha. In the Rajya Sabha, the issue was me. I am glad that in the Lok Sabha the issue is climate change, although some Members have made some reference to me and I will respond to them to the best of my ability. So, climate change is a very serious issue for India. Forget Copenhagen for the time being. Climate change is of great significance to our country. Ever since I became the Minister on 29th of May, I have been trying to spread this single message that the most vulnerable country in the world to climate change is India, not Maldives, not Bangladesh and not America, but India. There is no country that is as much impacted by climate change as India. Now, why do I say this? First, we are dependent on monsoons, the south-west monsoon and the north-east monsoon. They are the lifeline of our country. Two out of every three Indians still depend on agriculture for their livelihood. What happens to the monsoon determines what happens to our economy and what happens to our general mood. We are depressed when the monsoons fail and we are happy when the monsoons are good. Monsoons are not only part of our economy but also part of our culture and part of our civilisation. Now, the uncertainty caused by climate change on the monsoon is of first and over-riding priority for India.

(y3/1820/brv-sb)

Secondly, Sir, we have the Himalayan Glaciers – anywhere between 9000 and 12000 Glaciers. There is a great deal of scientific debate on what is happening to these Glaciers but we do not have to wait for perfect science. The warning signals are already there. Most of the Glaciers are receding. Why are they receding? We cannot say it with hundred per cent certainty. Is it the natural process of cyclical change? Or, is it because of global warming? Scientists are still debating this issue. But what happens to the Himalayan Glaciers will determine the water security of our country. That is the second point of vulnerability.

Thirdly, we have vast critical ecological areas. My friend Shri Anant Kumar Hegde is not here. He also initiated the Short Duration Discussion. He comes from the Western Ghats. What happens to the Western Ghats will determine the future not only of Karnataka, Goa, Maharashtra and Kerala but indeed of the entire country. Take our North East. The North East has only four per cent of India's geographical area but 25 per cent of our forest cover is in the North-East. What happens? People have talked of Chirapunji. Chirapunji used to be the world's rainiest place. It no longer is. What happens to the Western Ghats? What happens to our North-East? What happens to the Andamans? What happens to Lakshadweep? This is the third area of vulnerability.

Fourthly, if you look at the map of India, if you see where the forests are located, if you see where the coal mines are, where the bauxite is, where the iron-ore is, it is in the same region. The more coal we produce, the more iron-ore we produce, the more bauxite we produce, the more forests we will have to give up. We know that giving up forests leads to more green house gas emissions. There is no country in the world which has all these four dimensions of vulnerability. That is why, I have been saying time and again that India, of all the 192 countries in the world, owes a responsibility not to the world but to itself, to take climate change seriously. We are not doing the world a favour. Please forget Copenhagen; forget

the UN. We have to do it in our own self-interest. Our future as a society is dependent on how we respond to the climate change challenge.

Let me go to the second point. Today, the sad fact is that if you ask me what is going to be the impact of climate change on the Sunderbans, I cannot give you a good answer. I can only tell you Aila happened; Aila might happen. But I cannot give you a good answer. If you ask me what is going to be the impact of climate change on our monsoon, I can only say that there is uncertainty; monsoon in the North-West India might increase, monsoon in the North-East India might decrease. So, I cannot tell you. The reason for this is that so far, all the scientific studies on climate change have been done in the Western countries. India has made no investment in studying the impact of climate change on India. This is a very important point. Today, all our knowledge on climate change is derived from the Western publications.

(z3/1825/ksp/rpm)

It is derived from Western media, it is derived from Western political leaders and we have no independent source of information and data. This is a pathetic state of condition. A country like India, with its great scientific expertise, should have invested in climate change research 20 years ago.

Let me give you an example of what happened 20 years ago and Dr. Joshi will recall this example because he has been a distinguished Minister for Science and Technology. In 1990, the United States of America, a country with which I am allegedly very close to, issued a report saying that methane emissions from India's wet paddy cultivation was 38 million tonnes per year. This report caused international headlines. All the newspapers and the media went to town saying that Indian agriculture is contributing to global warming. There was one Indian scientist who disbelieved this figure. He is no more, a very distinguished physicist – Dr. Joshi knows him very well – Dr. A.P. Mitra, who was the Director of the National Physical Laboratory. I happened to work in the Prime Minister's Office at that time and Dr. Mitra came to me and said, 'I do not believe these numbers

and I want to start my own experiment to generate my own data'. I went to the Finance Minister who happens to be our Prime Minister today and I said, 'Sir, we need to give this scientist and his team some money'. The money was sanctioned and a three-year project was started. At the end of three years, Dr. Mitra and his team conclusively established that methane emissions from Indian wet paddy cultivation was not 38 million tonnes per year, but between 2 and 6 million tonnes per year and today I must inform the hon. Members that the internationally accepted figure for methane emissions from Indian wet paddy cultivation is about 4 million tonnes per year, which is the median of 2 and 6. This is what we need to do.

There is a lot of sensationalism that is going on in the name of science. We must, on our own, understand what is going to happen to our own ecosystem on account of climate change. I would like to inform the hon. House that on the 14th of October this year, we launched, what is called, the Indian National Network on Comprehensive Climate Change Assessment and I will circulate a copy of this document to all the hon. Members. We have created a network of 97 research institutions in our country, 250 scientists have been brought together as a team and every year they will conduct and make public an assessment of what is happening on account of climate change. The first report will come in November of 2010 and this will be a report which will give an assessment by Indian scientists on what is going to happen because of climate change to the Sunderbans, to the Northeast, to the Western Ghats and to our agriculture.

This is what India needs to have done 20 years ago. It did not do it for some reason. But I am not taking credit for it. I am only an instrument of policy. But what I want to say is, this is a very important step that we have taken.

(a4/1830/rcp/mkg)

Forget Copenhagen; we must have our own scientific capacity to understand the impact of climate change. We are a very varied country. We can have positive effect in one region and negative effect in another region. Rainfall might increase in Punjab and Haryana but rainfall could also decrease in Assam and Meghalaya. India is very varied. So we must understand the impact of climate change in India in all its eco-diversity.

This is the second point I want to make because Members have raised this issue. One of the failures on my part amongst many other failures has been a failure to communicate to each individual Member of Parliament the full substance of what we have done. I thought that by putting it on our website, it becomes automatically public. I did not bargain for the reluctance of many of my colleagues to spend time on websites. I will now ensure that in the next couple of days all this literature and material will be available to you in hard copy in your residential addresses so that we can establish a constant process of communication. I have also decided that we will now place on the Table of the House many important documents that we release from time to time.

My young friend Jayant Chaudhary referred to forests. Just four days ago, we released the State of the Forest Report in India, 2009. This gives you the most comprehensive assessment of what is happening to forest cover in different States of the country. I have asked for the permission to lay this on the Table of the House. I hope that once such documentation becomes available, many of the questions that have been raised by Members of Parliament relating to the impact of climate change would get answered. This is my second submission.

Thirdly, let me talk a little bit about the Copenhagen process because that is the real issue that everybody wants to hear. All this is a sort of prelude; the real *masala* is Copenhagen. I entirely agree with my young friend Jayant Chaudhary, but my advice to him is: "Do not be too bold at such a young age. It will create many problems for you. Go with the grain of conventional thinking before you

become too much of an out-of-the-box thinker. Thinking out of the box in our country does not pay in the long run. You have to be in the box and occasionally get out of the box and come back into the box.”

On the international arena, when I took over as Minister for Environment and Forests on the 29th of May, the Prime Minister’s instructions to me were: “India has not caused the problem of global warming. But try and make sure that India is part of the solution. Be constructive; be proactive.” That was all he told me. Then I asked myself what is India’s position when it comes to international negotiations. The only position India had: “Our *per capita* is very low; your *per capita* is very high; therefore we would not do anything.” Sir, *per capita* is an accident of history. It so happened that we could not control our population. That is why, we get the benefit of *per capita*. When you divide anything by one billion, and that one billion is increasing by 12 million every year, it is no great credit for us. Our single biggest failure in the last 60 years has been our inability to control our population growth rate. Now the only position we have is: “Do not touch us; our *per capita* is very low.”

(b4/1835/lh-cp)

It is an important point because per capita is the only instrument of ensuring equitable distribution. But it cannot be the only point. That is the point. So, when I first started looking at this international canvass, I was struck by the fact that India’s position was: “Our per capita is low and, therefore, we are entitled to pollute more till we reach your per capita levels. Since you have caused the problem, you must fix the problem”. That was, broadly speaking, our position.

Sir, this is my personal belief, and you can question my judgment but do not question my motives. My personal belief is that India must negotiate from a position of strength; that India must negotiate from a position of leadership. I agree with Dr. Joshi that we must demonstrate an alternative model of growth; we must not follow the prosperity equal to pollution model of growth. I entirely agree with him. I may have political differences with him but on this I am entirely in

agreement with him. It should not remain just a slogan; we have to take many important steps. So, I ask myself this question: Can we go beyond per capita? Per capita is the basic position. Our per capita is low. Our Prime Minister has said that our per capita emissions will never exceed per capita emissions of the developed world. I said that our per capita emissions will remain below that of the developed world. My friends from the Left Parties accused me of compromising the Prime Minister's statement. Sir, this is English language. This is semantics. I had a similar argument in the Rajya Sabha. ... (*Interruptions*)

I have listened to you. Please listen to me, and then we can have another argument. I had a similar argument in the Rajya Sabha. To my simple mind, I do not see any difference between 'will not exceed' and 'will remain below'. It is the same thing. This is all, tearing hair on the English language. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB (CUTTACK): It is a funny language. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: The curse is that, you know, we are experts in the English language. Therefore, that is the starting position of our negotiations.

The hon. Members have asked: आप कोपेनहेगेन को किस आधार पर जा रहे हैं? मूल आधार तो यही है कि, per capita emissions will always remain below/never exceed per capita emissions of the developed world. But, Sir, we have to offer something more to ourselves, not to the world.

Let me now use this opportunity. A lot of Members of Parliament have asked me: "What are the non-negotiables for India at Copenhagen?" Sir, we are all patriotic. We all want to protect India's interests. I hope that much you will grant to me. I am not buying a ticket to Copenhagen to sell India's interest down the drain.

Sir, I have gone out of my way to ensure transparency in this whole process. I have written to all the Chief Ministers on the 1st of October, an eight-page letter on our stand on Copenhagen. I have written to 80 Members of Parliament. I should have written to all the 700 and odd Members of Parliament but I admittedly wrote to only 80 Members of Parliament on what our stand on climate change is. Sir, I

wrote, four months ago, to the hon. Speaker and to the hon. Chairman of the Rajya Sabha: "Please nominate Members of Parliament as part of the official delegation to Copenhagen". Sir, you will be pleased to know today how jokingly, one of my colleagues, who is not here, said that I should take all those who speak today to Copenhagen. Unfortunately, Sir, I cannot do that. ‘

(c4/1840/kkd/nsh)

The hon. Speaker has nominated three MPs from the Lok Sabha; and the hon. Chairman of the Rajya Sabha has nominated two MPs from the Rajya Sabha. So, five MPs are going to be part of our official delegation to Copenhagen. Not only that, in 2030, 2040 and 2050, most of us will not be around, and we are discussing what is going to happen in years when most of us will not be around. That is why, for the first time as part of our official delegation, I am taking two school children and two college going students. We had an essay contest and an essay competition. Call it the new gender empowerment, all the prizes were won by girls... (*Interruptions*) We are taking two school children and two college going girls as part of our official delegation. Not as hangs on, but as part of our official delegation to convey to the world India's seriousness of doing something for the future generation.

Sir, we cannot have 70 years old or 50 years old like me, talking about future generation. We could have the younger people talking about the future generation. That is why in the composition of our delegation, I think, you will see not only political representation but also generational representation.

Sir, there was a lot of confusion and a lot of criticism on the so-called differences between what my position has been and what the Prime Minister's articulation has been. Let me say, I am a Member of the Union Council of Ministers. I am a relatively junior Member of the Council of Ministers and it is inconceivable that I will survive in the Council if I articulate views that are different to that of the Prime Minister. You must, at least, grant me that much common sense that I will not say anything, which does not broadly correspond to

what the Prime Minister believes. Occasionally, I might express it in a language that is colourful, I might express it in a language that more conservative people would not do so. But the thought, the principle, the concept, I cannot make public unless I know that the Prime Minister shares these views. That is the principle of collective responsibility and the principle of leadership.

So, what are these new ideas that we have tried to bring into our thinking? We are going to Copenhagen in a positive frame of mind. Prepare to be – and I am using a word, which my Left friends are never happy with – flexible. I will define for you what flexibility means. We are going with a positive frame of mind; and we want a comprehensive and equitable agreement at Copenhagen. I am realistic enough to know that such an agreement may not materialise. But we will work overtime with likeminded countries, with China and other countries to ensure that there is a comprehensive and equitable arrangement.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI (VARANASI): You have been to China.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: I will come to that.

Sir, I went to China over last weekend. China, South Africa, Brazil and India have tabled a draft in Copenhagen yesterday on what the Copenhagen Agreement should look like. Denmark as the host country also has a draft.

(d4/1845/mmn-rjs)

But we participated in the discussions in Beijing and we came up with what we considered to be a draft which protects our interests. Let me also say for the information of the hon. Members that in the last few months, relations between India and China have had their ups and downs. But on the 21st of October, India and China signed a Partnership Agreement on Climate Change. This was the first agreement for China and the first agreement for India.

Now, China and India are not comparable. China is here with 23 per cent of world Green House Gas emissions. It is the number one emitter. India is here with 4.7 per cent of world Green House Gas emissions. It is number five in the world. So, we are not in the same boat as far as emissions are concerned. They

have to do far more than what we have to do. But on negotiations, we are in the same boat. We have a strong alliance with China, a strong alliance with Brazil and a strong alliance with South Africa. We are also part of G-77.

At the same time, many MPs have said about *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*. What does *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* mean? *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* means, you do not have hostility to anybody. So, we have to engage with everybody. Just because we are members of G-77 does not mean that we do not talk to America, and every time we talk to America does not mean that we are selling our country down the drain. So, I would like my Left friends to please understand the geopolitical realities in which India is. We are a developing country. We have global aspirations. We want to be recognised as a world power. But having global aspirations and assuming global responsibilities are two sides of the same coin. So, we are talking to everybody. We are talking to the Europeans. We are talking to the Americans. We have this agreement with the BASIC countries.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI (VARANASI): Mr. Minister, may I say a sentence? With flexibility, you will show the desired firmness.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: No, Sir. Let me explain. I am coming to this. If you have a little patience, I will explain to you what the contours of the flexibility are. Sir, there are some non-negotiables for us at Copenhagen. Let me categorically state what these non-negotiables are.

My colleague, Mr. Mahtab is joining me in Copenhagen. This has not been fixed by me. This is a choice of the Speaker. He has already quoted what I have said on the non-negotiables. First one is, रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह जी, आप जरा गौर से सुनिये। ...(व्यवधान)

श्री तूफ़ानी सरोज (मछलीशहर): आप उन्हें भी ले जाते । ...(व्यवधान)

श्री जयराम रमेश : अगर मेरे हाथ में होता, तो मैं जरूर ले जाता। ...(व्यवधान) एक पीएचडी काफी है। दोनों पीएचडी आयेंगे, तो मामला गड़बड़ हो जायेगा।

डॉ. मुरली मनोहर जोशी (वाराणसी): आप पीएचडी को ड्रॉप ही कर दीजिए। ...(व्यवधान)

श्री जयराम रमेश: नहीं सर, आपके बिना काम नहीं चलेगा। The first non-negotiable is that India will not accept a legally binding emission reduction cut. कानूनी तरह से हम किसी भी समझौते पर हस्ताक्षर करने को तैयार नहीं हैं, जिसमें कहा जायेगा कि भारत को इमिशन लैवल पर कटौती करनी पड़े। I want to say this absolutely, clearly and categorically. There is no question of India accepting a legally binding emission reduction target.

Second, there are some attempts by some countries to say that developing countries should announce when their emissions will peak. Let me say that this is the second non-negotiable for us. We will not accept under any circumstances an agreement which stipulates a peaking year for India.

(e4/1850/rps/ak)

अगर कहा जाएगा कि वर्ष 2025 या 2030 तक भारत जैसे देशों का एमिशन प्रोफाइल बिल्कुल पीक पर होगा, तो यह हमारे लिए स्वीकार करना नामुमकिन है। We will not accept this agreement. These are the two complete, dark, bright, red lines, and there is no question of compromising on these two non-negotiables.

There is a third non-negotiable. Today, it is non-negotiable, but depends on the concessions that we can get from the western countries. Perhaps, we could modulate our position in consultation with China, Brazil and South Africa. We are prepared to subject all our mitigation actions, whatever we do, which is supported by international finance and technology to international review. There is nothing wrong with it as we are getting money from outside and we are getting technology from outside. The technology-giver and the money-giver is asking हिसाब दो, तो उसमें हमें कुछ आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए। The problem arises on the mitigation actions, which are unsupported, that is, which we are doing on our own. We certainly would not like the unsupported actions to be subject to the same type of scrutiny that the supported actions are subject to. जो हम अपने बल पर करते हैं और जो बाहर की मदद से करते हैं, उन दोनों में कुछ अन्तर होना चाहिए। रघुवंश बाबू, पिछले पांच साल आप निगरानी की बात करते रहे, निगरानी की प्रणाली हम बनाएंगे उसमें जो समर्थित एक्शन है, वह अलग रहेगा और जो हम अपने आप करेंगे, वह अलग रहेगा। पर इस पर हम विचार कर सकते हैं क्योंकि हम एक लोकतांत्रिक देश हैं, हमारी

पार्लियामेंट है, हमारी सिविल सोसाइटी संस्थाएं हैं, हमारी मीडिया है, हमारे देश में जवाबदेही कई देशों की तुलना में ज्यादा है। हमें ज्यादा कुछ आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए अगर हम कहें कि जो कुछ हम करते हैं, वह पूरी तरह से पारदर्शिता से करेंगे।

Hence, Dr. Joshi, very early on I mooted the concept of Nationally Accountable Mitigation Outcome. मैं आपको थोड़ा इतिहास बताना चाहूंगा। बाली एक्शन प्लान के तहत हमारे जैसे देशों की जिम्मेदारी नेशनली एप्रोप्रिएट मिटिगेशन एक्शन की है, सिर्फ एक्शन की है। हमारे देश में मेरा अनुभव रहा है कि एक्शन की कोई कमी नहीं है, नतीजों और परिणामों की कमी होती है। एक्शन के बारे में 500 पेज लिखने में हम बहुत एक्सपर्ट हैं, लेकिन उसका आउटकम क्या है, परिणाम क्या है, उस पर हम मार खा जाते हैं। इसीलिए मैंने सुझाव दिया था कि नेशनली एकाउण्टेबल मिटिगेशन आउटकम हो और एकाउण्टेबल किसको, हमारी पार्लियामेंट को, किसी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय संस्था को नहीं। मैं उम्मीद करता था कि आप लोग मुझे बधाई देंगे कि हमारी जवाबदेही हमारी पार्लियामेंट के प्रति है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम जो कुछ करें, हम हमारी पार्लियामेंट के कानून के तहत करें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो पारदर्शिता हम दिखाएं, जो जवाबदेही हम करेंगे, वह हमारी पार्लियामेंट को करेंगे, हम किसी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समझौते के तहत नहीं करेंगे, किसी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय संस्था को नहीं करेंगे, हम अपनी पार्लियामेंट को करेंगे। इसमें क्या आपत्ति होनी चाहिए, यह मुझे समझ में नहीं आ रहा है। मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ कि यह आइडिया मुझे बीजिंग में सूझा था।

(f4/1855/jr-sh)

जब मैं सितम्बर महीने में बीजिंग गया था,

डॉ. मुरली मनोहर जोशी (वाराणसी): तब जरूर उस समय गड़बड़ हुई होगी।

श्री जयराम रमेश: मैं बताता हूँ कि हमारी सोच में और बाहर की सोच में कितना अंतर है। यह हमें बिल्कुल रिकोग्नाइज़ करना चाहिए, क्योंकि हम समझते हैं कि सारा विज्ञान हम ही हैं और जो हम करते हैं वह सही है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि और भी देश हैं, वे भी सोचते हैं। जब मैं बीजिंग गया था, तो मैंने चीन के मंत्री जी से कहा कि आप क्या कर रहे हैं, तो उन्होंने कहा कि हम नेशनल पीपल्स कांग्रेस, जैसे हमारे यहां संसद है, वैसे ही वहां नेशनल पीपल्स कांग्रेस है, मैं कानून लाएंगे कि चीन एमीशन के मामले में क्या कर रहा है। मैंने सोचा कि चीन और लोकतंत्र, दोनों में जमीन-आसमान का अंतर है, अगर चीन यह सोच सकता है कि उनकी नेशनल पीपल्स कांग्रेस में कानून बनेगा, तो हमारा देश, जो विश्व का सबसे बड़ा लोकतांत्रिक देश है, हमारे देश में क्यों नहीं ऐसा होना चाहिए। तब मेरे मन में यह बात आई थी और तब से

मेरी आलोचना भी शुरू हुई है कि मैं किसी और का स्वर बोल रहा हूँ। लेकिन असलियत यह है कि नेशनली एकाउंटेबल लिटिगेशन आउटकम। आउटकम का तात्पर्य यह है कि हम संसद में आएंगे। अगर हम कहते हैं कि सन् 2022 तक 20,000 मेगावाट सोलर पावर का निर्माण करेंगे, तो हर साल संसद में हमें आना चाहिए और कहना चाहिए कि इसमें क्या आपत्ति आई है, क्या प्रगति हुई है, जवाब दीजिए, आपको इस तरह के प्रश्न करने का हक होना चाहिए। इसके लिए कानून भी चाहिए, मैं इससे भी सहमत हूँ। जहाँ कानून की जरूरत है, हमें वहाँ कानून लाना चाहिए।

मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि हम जो कुछ करें, हमारे घरेलू कानून के तहत वह करें, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समझौते के तहत न करें, वह लीडरशिप होती है। हमारी एक टेंडेंसी है कि हम आखिरी मिनट तक कुछ नहीं करते हैं। हम समझते हैं कि अभी वक्त है, अभी वक्त है। और वक्त गुजरता जाता है। जब भारत कुछ करता है, तो ऐसे लोगों को महसूस होता है कि हम दबाव में आकर कर रहे हैं, हमें इससे हटना होगा। इसलिए हमें एक नई प्लानिंग करनी होगी, ताकि हम सही वक्त पर अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों में अपनी बात रख सकें। इसमें टाइमिंग मायने रखती है। China has announced a 40-45 per cent cut in emission intensity. Brazil has announced a 38 per cent cut in emissions. Indonesia has announced a 26 per cent cut in emissions. हमारा क्या रिस्पॉंस है, हम तो परकेपिटा के नीचे हैं। हमारी क्या जिम्मेदारी है, हम 17 फीसदी आबादी हैं और पांच फीसदी आबादी है ग्रीन हाउस एमिशन की, पर दुनिया जाननी चाहती है कि भारत का क्या रिस्पॉंस है। आपने 200 साल में पोल्यूट नहीं किया, ठीक है, लेकिन अगले कुछ सालों में आपका भी योगदान बढ़ेगा। That is why I think we must be 'flexible' – I am sorry to use this word over and over again – without compromising our basic national interest. Basic national interest means no legally binding emission cuts, no legally binding emission peaking year and, as far as possible, distinguishing between supported mitigation action and unsupported mitigation action.

Let me take a couple of minutes because I know, in the last few days, there has been a lot of speculation. कोपेनहेगन के पहले आप क्या करेंगे। हमारे ऊपर कोई दबाव नहीं है, यह मैं स्पष्ट रूप से कह रहा हूँ। हम कोपेनहेगन में जा सकते हैं, वहाँ जाकर यह कह सकते हैं कि आप जब भी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समझौता करें, अगर उसमें लिखा जाएगा कि per capital emission of India will never exceed the per capita emission of the developed countries.

(g4/1900/ind/kmr)

वह हमें मंजूर था। We are prepared to reflect in any international agreement our *per capita* principle that Dr. Manmohan Singh our hon. Prime Minister enumerated last year. But, Sir, for India to show leadership, for India to have a moral position, क्योंकि आज यहां मोरेलिटी की बात हुई है, गांधी जी की बात हुई है। We are the land of Mahatma Gandhi who is considered to be the *Param Acharya* of the environmental movement. आज तो दुनिया के सारे देश के प्रधानमंत्री और राष्ट्रपति कोपेनहेगन जाना चाहते हैं। रघुवंश जी, 1972 में जब पहला यूएन अधिवेशन पर्यावरण के मामले में स्टाकहोम में हुआ था, सिर्फ एकमात्र हेड आफ स्टेट वहां गई थी और वह श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी थीं। वहां विश्व का कोई और प्रधानमंत्री नहीं गया था, सिवाय स्वीडन के प्रधानमंत्री के, क्योंकि वह मेजबान देश था। ऐसा देश, जिसकी पर्यावरण के मामले में लम्बी विरासत है, ऐसे देश को कूप मंडूक की तरह बैठ रहना और कुछ भी कहते रहना कि हम कुछ नहीं करने वाले हैं। इस पर दुनिया हंसेगी कि क्या यह भारत है। Is this the India that wants to take a global role and a global responsibility? But more importantly, India must show leadership to its own people, to Sunderbans, to Western Ghats, to Uttarakhand, to Himalayas, to the North-East. We must show action. What is that action? That is the issue now.

In the last few months, the Planning Commission has been doing a variety of exercises as part of the Midterm Appraisal of the 11th Plan. हमने भी कहा था कि 12वीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में, जो अप्रैल 2012 से शुरू होगी, उसमें हम लो कार्बन स्ट्रेटेजी अपनाएंगे। जैसा आपने कहा कि हमें नया माडल ढूंढना चाहिए। वह एकदम ओवर नाइट नहीं हो सकता है। एक ट्रांजिशन पीरियड की जरूरत है। अगले दो साल में ट्रांजिशन पीरियड होगा और हम वचनबद्ध हैं कि 12वीं पंचवर्षीय योजना लो कार्बन ग्रोथ पर आधारित हो। ऐसा पहली बार होगा और मैं समझता हूं कि यह हमारे देश के हित में है, देशवासियों के हित में है, हमारे देश के गरीब लोगों और किसान के हित में है। यह लो कार्बन का मायने क्या है, प्लानिंग कमीशन में कई अध्ययन किए गए हैं, कई संस्थाओं से उन्हें आंकड़े मिले हैं और एक विचार बना है, मैं संसद में कहना चाहता हूं, मैंने सदन से बाहर नहीं कहा है क्योंकि यह एक पवित्र जगह है और संसद में मैं जो कहता हूं, वह पूरी जिम्मेदारी से कहता हूं। मैं अपनी व्यक्तिगत राय नहीं दे रहा हूं, यह जो बहस हुई है और हम समझते हैं कि अगर हम लो कार्बन रास्ते पर जाना चाहते हैं, जैसा कि जोशी जी और कई सदस्यों ने कहा है कह अगर हमें लो कार्बन रास्ते पर अगले 10-20 सालों में जाना

है और हमें विश्व को एक नया अल्टरनेटिव डवलपमेंट माडल दिखाना है, तो हमें सोचने की जरूरत है कि हमारी इमिशन इंटेन्सिटी की रफ्तार क्या होगी। **Between 1990 and 2005, our emission intensity declined by 17.6 per cent.**

(h4/1905/asa/spr)

मैं एमिशन की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ। बेफिक्र रहिए। एमिशन बढ़ता जा रहा है। परंतु एमिशन इंटेन्सिटी घटती जा रही है। इंटेन्सिटी का क्या अर्थ है? इंटेन्सिटी एक आंकड़ा है। **Emission divided by GDP.** जो आप एमिट करते हैं और उसको आपके आउटपुट से डिवाइड करते हैं, उसको आप एमिशन इंटेन्सिटी कहते हैं। एमिशन इंटेन्सिटी का क्या अर्थ है? **What does it mean? One of my colleagues said,** आप थोड़ा सिम्पल रखिए। मैं इसे बहुत सरल बनाने की कोशिश कर रहा हूँ। माफ कीजिए, मैं इसमें सफल हुआ हूँ कि नहीं हुआ हूँ पर मैं कोशिश कर रहा हूँ। एमिशन इंटेन्सिटी का क्या अर्थ है? इसका अर्थ यह है कि अगर इमिशन इंटेन्सिटी घटती है तो उसके अर्थ यह है कि एक रुपया जीडीपी के लिए कम एमिशन की जरूरत पड़ेगी और यह भी अर्थ है कि एक यूनिट एमिशन से हमें और ज्यादा जीडीपी मिल सकती है। पिछले 15 साल में 1990-2000 के बीच में 17.6 प्रतिशत इमिशन इंटेन्सिटी घटी है। जीडीपी बढ़ी है, इमिशन बढ़ी है लेकिन इमिशन इंटेन्सिटी घटी है। 17.6 प्रतिशत इमिशन इंटेन्सिटी घटी है। हमारे ऐतिहासिक अनुभव के आधार पर हम विश्वास के साथ कह सकते हैं कि अगले 15-20 साल में इमिशन इंटेन्सिटी और भी घट सकती है। **Based on the exercises that the Mid-Term Appraisal in the 11th Five Year Plan, if the emission intensity has declined by 17.06 per cent between 1990 and 2005, the Planning Commission has concluded that we can have a 20 to 25 per cent reduction in emission intensity between 2005 and 2020.** कानूनी तौर से हम यह जिम्मेदारी नहीं ले रहे हैं। हम यह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समझौते में नहीं लिख रहे हैं। हम दुनिया को कह रहे हैं कि भारत अपने ही बल पर वॉलंटरीली, यूनिलेटरली तैयार है कि अगले 15 साल में 2005 और 2020 तक इमिशन इंटेन्सिटी 20 से 25 प्रतिशत तक घटेगी। पिछले 15 साल में 17.6 प्रतिशत घटी। अगले 15 साल में 20 से 25 प्रतिशत के बीच में घट सकती है। मिनिमम 20 मोस्ट लाइकली 25 हो सकती है। कोपनहेगन का नतीजा क्या निकलेगा? यह हमारी लाइवली सिक्योरिटी के लिए अनिवार्य है और यह हम करने वाले हैं।

हमारे मिडटर्म एप्राइजल ऑफ दि इलेवंथ फाइव ईयर प्लान, हमारी 12वीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में भी, हम इसको दिखाएंगे कि अगले 15 साल में **Our emission intensity will reduce between 20**

and 25 per cent. मैं आपको एक बात बता दूँ कि इमीशन बढ़ेगी परंतु इसकी रफ्तार घटेगी। यह बिल्कुल साफ होना चाहिए अगले 10-15 साल तक जब तक यह ट्रांजीशन नहीं होगा जो जोशी जी चाहते हैं, इमीशंस बढ़ती जाएंगी पर हम यह जिम्मेदारी जरूर ले सकते हैं कि इमीशंस की रफ्तार घटेगी और एक यूनिट इमीशन से हमें और ज्यादा आउटपुट मिल सकता है। यही इमीशन इंटेन्सिटी का अर्थ है। इमीशन इंटेन्सिटी के घटने से हमारी इकॉनोमी को बहुत फायदा हो सकता है। आप पूछ सकते हैं कि क्या यह एक राजनीतिक स्टेटमेंट है? इसमें कुछ होमवर्क किया गया है। ...(व्यवधान) मुझे आपको पूरी तरह से आश्वस्त करना है।

(j4/1910/sk-rk)

डॉ. मुरली मनोहर जोशी (वाराणसी): ये पहले संसदीय कार्य मंत्री रहे हैं इसलिए इनको संसद के बारे में मालूम है।...(व्यवधान)

पर्यावरण और वन मंत्रालय के राज्य मंत्री (श्री जयराम रमेश): असली स्वामी तो यही हैं।...(व्यवधान)

डॉ. मुरली मनोहर जोशी (वाराणसी): आप इंटेन्सिटी कम कर दीजिए बाकी सब सही है।...(व्यवधान)

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: How will this emission intensity be cut? That is the question. We are planning a series of policy measures. On some of which we will come back to Parliament. I want to assure the hon. Members of the House that we will come back to Parliament on:

- We are going to legislate mandatory fuel efficiency standards for our vehicles by December, 2011.

We will come to Parliament. We will mandate mandatory fuel efficiency standards for all vehicles. This will reduce and manage the greenhouse gas emissions from our transportation section.

- We will come back to Parliament with a model energy conservation building code and we will recommend to the States and to the Municipal Administrations mandatory green building codes.
- We are going to come to Parliament with amendments to the Energy Conservation Act to introduce what we call the energy efficiency certificate which will enable energy intensity decline in our industry.

We will come to Parliament. Parliament will discuss these amendments.

- I am going to lay this Report on Forests on the Table of the House hopefully next week. We are going to come to Parliament regularly to report on the state of our forest cover.

Today, in response to the question raised by many Members, our forests are absorbing 10 per cent of our annual greenhouse gas emissions. कार्बन सिंक की बात हो रही है, हर साल दस परसेंट ग्रीन हाउस गैस एमिशन, कार्बन सिंक फॉरेस्ट पॉवर देता है इसलिए दस परसेंट को कायम रखना चाहिए। I will come back to Parliament on that.

- We are going to ensure that increasingly more and more of our coal based power plants of the type that are coming up in my friend, Shri Mahtab's State which is causing him great concern, will come from clean coal technology.

This does not require law. It requires us to take decisions on super critical technology, ultra super critical technology, coal gasification – Dr. Joshi knows as when he was the Minister for Science and Technology many of these initiatives had started. We will ensure that 50 per cent of all new capacity that is going to come will be based on clean coal technology. That will substantially reduce the CO₂ emissions from our power stations.

So, we have an action plan in transportation, industry, buildings, forestry and in various sectors of our economy which will ensure 20 to 25 per cent cut in emissions intensity between 2005 and 2020.

At Copenhagen if we have a successful agreement, if we have an equitable agreement, if we are satisfied with this agreement, we are prepared to do even more.

(k4/1915/bks-rc)

यह हमारे लिए बेसलाइन है। यह हम अपने आप करेंगे, किसी की मदद से नहीं करेंगे। हम अपने आप एमिशन इंटेंसिटी 20 से 25 परसेन्ट तक घटायेंगे। यदि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समुदाय की हमें मदद मिलेगी, अगर कोपनहेगन समझौता सफल समझौता होगा, इक्युटेबल समझौता होगा, हमारी आशंकाएं दूर हो जायेंगी तो हम दुनिया को कहने के लिए तैयार हैं कि हम इससे ज्यादा भी कर सकते हैं।

अब मैं संक्षेप में समराइज करता हूँ।

I separate domestic responsibility from international obligation. I want to be aggressive on domestic obligation and I want to be pro-active on international obligation because in international obligation there is only one thing that counts. Ultimately, when I go to Copenhagen, it is not G-77 or China or America or Brazil or South Africa, it is India's interest that counts. What is in India's interest? That is what ultimately is the only deciding factor. What is in India's interest, that is what we have to do. I believe that our negotiating position is strengthened considerably if we go to Copenhagen from a position of leadership, taking these pro-active measures and taking the responsibility as part of the 11th Five Year Plan, 12th Five Year Plan and thereafter between 2005 to 2020 our emission intensity would reduce by 20 per cent to 25 per cent on our own, in a legally non-binding agreement and to be reflected in any international agreement.

Sir, I want to thank the hon. Members for listening to me very patiently. I know that many of your doubts may still be there but I do want to assure the hon. Members that when I used the word 'flexibility', it does not mean the sell out. Flexibility only means the ability to move to rapidly evolving international situations. We are not living in isolation. We are living in an international community. We have to see what is happening in the world. We are a large country. Let us not be defensive about ourselves. Let not any Minister who is going abroad be told: 'Do not sell the country'. It is an insult to my personal honour and dignity to be told: 'Do not go and sell the country's honour'. No Government, no Minister, no Prime Minister and no Minister for Environment will do that. We are going there to get the best agreement for India and the best agreement for India internationally is what we do domestically. What we do domestically, in my view, is an obligation to our own people that we have to undertake.

Now, I thank you for this opportunity.

(ends)