

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Hon. Members, I think, the hon. Minister of External Affairs has to share something with the House.

### INFORMATION TO THE HOUSE

#### Postponement of Execution of Shri Sarabjit Singh

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, with your permission, I have the privilege and pleasure of sharing a piece of information with the hon. Members. The High Commission of India in Islamabad has been informed a little while ago by the Pakistani Foreign Office that the President of Pakistan has stayed the execution of Sarabjit Singh till 30th April, that is, a postponement by one month. As all the hon. Members had expressed their deep concern to save the life of Sarabjit Singh, I thought I should share this information at the earliest opportunity. Thank you, Sir, for giving me the permission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Thank you, hon. Minister for this information. Now Shri Jaswant Singh.

### DISCUSSION ON STATEMENT MADE BY MINISTER

#### Foreign Policy-Related Developments

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Sir, at the very first instance, I would like to express our collective sense of relief that even though the announced punishment is delayed only by a month, but, still, it is delayed, and, perhaps, that month offers the required time for us to have the matter totally re-examined. No doubt, Sir, the hon. Minister of External Affairs, the Government as also our Mission in Islamabad, are worthy of commendation for this act of humanity.

Sir, I have a few preliminary observations to make. My first observation is this. It is my understanding that when we have a Statement in the House, the hon. Members then seek clarifications and in this case that cannot be because we have started a Short Duration Discussion. Whoever has visited as the Minister undertaken the responsibility of answering the queries of the House. I have, Sir, the highest consideration and regards for hon. Pranabbabu. He is an experienced Member of the Union Cabinet. He has held this portfolio earlier too, and has conducted his present charge with great expertise and sureness. But, I believe, that a number of these visits have been undertaken by the Prime Minister. He is the Leader of this House. Unless he is so preoccupied that he can't spare the time, we would have preferred a response from the hon. Prime Minister. That notwithstanding, Sir, I am going to limit what I have to say only to the Statement of the hon. External Affairs Minister of 3rd March. There is firstly, Sir, a sense of certain disappointment; and, then, in advance, I would like to offer my apologies to the hon. External Affairs Minister. My sense of disappointment is in the relegation of this very important subject. It is only because of the persistent and energetic efforts by my very able colleague, Shrimati Sushma Swaraj, that we have even managed to get this discussion, short duration discussion, today.

Sir, if you just go over the statement of the hon. the Minister of External Affairs of 3rd March, you will find that the field that he has had to cover is very vast and it can really not be compressed into the artificial mould of a short duration discussion. It merits, the subject merits, the situation merits, the circumstances merit a fuller discussion, but that is no longer now possible, as. If this a *fait accompli*, then we have to deal with what is delivered to us. In advance, Sir, I would like to offer my apologies to you and to the hon. the Minister of External Affairs because I shall not have the benefit of being able to be present here when he rises to respond to the points that the hon. Members or I make. This is because of the circumstantial difficulties — my commitment to be somewhere else at about quarter past five or so. So, no doubt, I will not have that benefit. I want to clarify, Sir, to the House as also to the hon. Minister that this intervention or the discussion that I have sought, rather we have sought, is not for any aggressive, is not even for any assertive foreign policy. If I might submit, Sir, to this Government, we are really trying to find from the Government as to where it stands on a variety of challenges that the country faces. We want it to move away from what I term an 'invisible' foreign policy and, at least, have an effective policy that visibly serves our national interests; and India is thus enabled to influence the situation in its immediate neighbourhood as also the larger neighbourhood, to its national benefit. There are some significant aspects and if the hon. Minister had included them that would have benefited us. He has included Gaza and the West Ban, commendably, Sir, but totally Sir, but totally inexplicably, I do not know why, thereafter, he has chosen not to share the Ministry's or the Government's thoughts on Iraq, the present situation there or indeed even on Iran. This is one large fresh point of danger that is in our neighbourhood. Iraq is our neighbourhood, and it will be a mistake to treat it as anything else; so also Iran. And, if I might submit, Sir, upto 1947, we had a common border; India's borders met Iran's borders and we had a post, which we continue to have at that first outpost in Iran, a place called Zahedom. If we forget that Iran was our neighbour, we do so at our own cost.

Sir, I am limiting myself to what the hon. Minister spoke of. He spoke of the visit by the Prime Minister to the People's Republic of China, and also the corresponding visit by the Chinese Premier here. There are four issues, four aspects, of the present situation in our relations with the People's Republic of China, they are all a matter of significant concern to us. They are not in any hierarchical listing of importance, they, to my mind, are equally important. And, if I take Tibet first, it is only because of the immediacy of the pain of Tibet. I must share with the Government, as also with the hon. Minister, that I was somewhat taken aback by the rather patronising tone of the statement that emerged from the People's Republic of China as if patting India on the back. India, Sir, is too significant a country to be patted on the back in this fashion. Recent events in Tibet are a very painful saga. We have, for long, recognised and we accept that Tibet is an Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China. But I find double standards here. If the autonomy of Tibet as an Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China stands in the way of the Government of India from giving voice to its pain, then what about the sovereignty of Nepal? The sovereignty of Nepal did not stand in the way of your policy to take a stand which, without any doubt whatsoever, was detrimental to national interest, and continues to be detrimental. But that is not the only

3.00 P.M.

factor Sir, but precisely because of that approach. Nepal has descended into a vortex of chaos and uncertainty towards which we too are contributors. So, Sir, the People's Republic of China has taken a stand and caused big distress not simply to the people of Tibet proper but to a lot of the people of Tibetan origin in India. I must admit, Sir, and I was quite taken aback by the manner in which the Delhi Police arrested, stopped, a peaceful protest-march that wanted to give voice to its protest. I cannot help voicing, Sir, that this great faith, Buddhism, has its origin in this land. A very great human being, the Dalai Lama, has given voice to his pain and anguish. It took three or four days for the Government of India to finally find its voice to say what it eventually did. The hon. the Minister of External Affairs has finally said what he did. I cite this only because, Sir, we must be very clear in our mind about the totality of the question that Tibet poses to India. Tibet, Sir, is adjacent to the Indian State of Arunachal Pradesh. Before I come to the larger question of Arunachal, let me share with you, Sir, the question of water.

In the statement that the hon. Minister of External Affairs made, there is a rather cryptic line about the hon. Prime Minister also having discussed the question of river waters, or, words to that effect. I had raised the river water question, and as to what had happened thereafter. And, because I haven't got any satisfactory response so far, I do reiterate my concern and I voice it here in the House to the Minister of External Affairs. No doubt, Sir, the hon. Minister knows that the People's Republic of China has recently announced that a 141 kilometres highway linking Bome to Medog city at Nyingchi Prefecture will be constructed next year. This is all in Tibet. An airport has also been opened and is situated at an altitude of roughly 3000 metres. Sir, Maddock is located near the Great Bend of Yarlung Tsangpo, which is the Brahmaputra, where the river takes a sharp U-turn and then debouches into India. Sir, India is interested in these developments since the road and the airstrip adjunct would facilitate construction of a project planned by China at this Great Bend to divert the Brahmaputra water to the North. This had earlier consistently been denied by the People's Republic of China. I had personally raised it with my distinguished and very able counterpart when I worked in the South Block. But having denied it vehemently for many years, China's official news agency, Xinhua, has now confirmed plans for the Tsangpo diversion project. This is a very serious development. Very often the People's Republic of China chooses to make policy statements through either the official newspaper or through another means to which I will refer in a moment. So, this project is scheduled to start next year, in 2009. There is not time for us to seriously take it up. Then, this Burma Cove, which is near the Great Bend would have two components. It would have a power plant with an installed capacity of more than 40,000 megawatts. May I repeat the megawatts? It is 40,000 megawatts. It is utilised. That is where the Brahmaputra not only turns southward and bends, but there is a gorge and at a distance of about 20 kilometres, it descends 2,000 to 3,000 metres. This is a natural source of great energy. If you construct a dam there, you can certainly

have 40,000 megawatts. But that 40,000 megawatts are at the cost of water to India, to Arunachal Pradesh and to the whole of the Brahmaputra basin. The second part of this is to divert water of Tsangpo to North China to which I referred.

Now, Sir, before I come to Arunachal, let me speak of the question of Line of Actual Control. There is a very intriguing word used here in the statement. I found, and I must voice it, the whole paragraph or two or three paragraphs, or however many paras, about the People's Republic of China visit as if they have been drafted, both in great haste and rather casually. I would request the hon. Minister please do kindly go over the paragraphs at the end of this. I am not at all, for a moment, questioning the great ability of the excellent service that the Indian Foreign Service is. But, perhaps, it has been prepared in a fashion or in a manner that really, to my mind, diminishes the importance, both of our great neighbour as of our relationship. Now, the question here is direct. The term used is 'boundary'. I am sure hon. *Pranab Babu* would understand what I am saying. What we are going now with the People's Republic of China is only a definition of the Line of Actual Control. And, if once the Line of Actual Control has been agreed upon where it lies, there will then arise the question of the border between the two countries. When the Government uses this third term 'boundary', you can have a boundary of a field; you do often have boundaries of a house, a cropped area. I would make a request to the hon. Minister because these small issues, small terms are not small when it comes to the People's Republic of China. Why have we chosen this term? The reality is that what we are doing currently with the People's Republic of China is really a definition? We have set up a variety of teams of specialists to go into the definition and delineation. We are sharing maps. Of what? Of the Line of Actual Control. The Line of Actual Control is not synchronous with the border between India and China which is McMahon Line. What is this 'boundary' that the Government of India is now speaking of? Sir, all Governments do it. But, I found in the statement that was issued about the border phrases like "The two sides reiterated their readiness to seek a fair, reasonable and mutually acceptable solution, consultations on equal footing, etc., etc." There is nothing very new in this. It has been the formulation that has been going on for quite some time now and I was really not able to find the 'shared vision' in this and about what. Of course, we have moved forward in the cosmetics of it. But, what about the strategic and co-operative partnership, etc? Please, do that simultaneously. While the cosmetics are very important in a relationship between two countries, the substance is also very important. Preceding the visit—as I have experienced, on a number of occasions, People's Republic tends to do—the atmosphere of the visit by coloured, statements on the status of Arunachal Pradesh, etc. Sir, though we have said that both sides are committed to resolve all issues, it is intriguing when just before the visit is to take place, or, in this instance, following the visit, statements keep flooding in newspapers. I will share with the hon. Minister and the House that it is standard Chinese practice to very often make statements of policy through eminent specialists, academics, University Professors, etc. This is standard Chinese practice, and I have no doubt in my mind that the number of officers who have served in the People's Republic of China are fully aware of it, and I have no doubt, perhaps, they have already brought it to the hon. Minister of External Affairs. But, let me share three cases. Professor Fu Xiaoqiang of the China State Security Ministry made a statement which followed the Prime Minister's statement. He stated that India was not willing to make suitable

adjustments in its boundary positions. Have you chosen this word 'boundary' because he has used it? Then, I would be disappointed if he has used it. Now, he has also remarked that if this continues, it will not be beneficial to the development of the overall situation in the Sino-Indian relations. This is very typical of People's Republic of China. Let me share with you another example. Sun Shihai accused India of setting up its Province along with the Administrative Division in a still internationally-disputed region and declared that India's announced moves like the construction of hydro electric power stations in the India-China disputed region is not going to benefit current Sino-Indian border negotiations. He urged for caution and restraint and added—and this was in reference to the Prime Minister's visit to Arunachal—that Dr. Singh's visit to Arunachal is a sequel to the anti-China policies of the 'hawkish factions' in India. There is no very great speculation needed as to which are the 'hawkish factions' in the current political situation. I am sure that the venerable Professor refers to the Communist Party (Marxist) that they are hawkish in the polity today.

Thereafter, many articles got written in our newspapers advocating that India learn how to kowtow before China. This is surely not the Government of India's policy. Let me give you third example. Professor Zhao Genchang, who actually found our Prime Minister's visit to Arunachal as 'provocative', calls Arunachal to be the Sino-Indian disputed territory. Then he goes on to say the Sino-Indian border is not witnessing any incident; and, during his China visit, Dr. Manmohan Singh did not adopt any measure for compromise with Beijing. This is in direct refutation of what the Government came out with a statement what they have stated today. Further, the Indian internal political situation is not yet being affected by emotional factors like elections. This is perceptive of this able professor. And, then, on the Sino-Indian border issue, the ruling party and other political groups inside India do not differ, but there exists comparatively low level of mutual political trust between the two sides, that is, between India and Pakistan.

Now, I must share with the hon. Minister that quite often, in fact, almost routinely, such views are given voice to by scholars who are employed by the People's Republic of China as really the forerunners of their policy. They are the advance guard of the policy of the People's Republic of China. They hint, then, they state a policy, as has been done here, then, they repeat that policy following that an accusation arises and they begin to accuse and disagree with India, and, having accused thereafter start claiming the territory. This is routine, Sir. And I have cited all this only because I am keen that we do not repeat the mistakes that we have earlier made in this regard. I do not want to go into the historical antecedents of that, Sir; that is now what we have to deal with, because we must have learnt from the mistakes that we have made, and, this being today's reality, I will make just two other aspects of it.

After the Prime Minister's return, despite what they had to say about Arunachal and despite what the hon. Minister of External Affairs quite ably, but categorically said about Arunachal, a statement was issued, and, to my understanding, I do not know, because diplomatically stated, the People's Republic of China complained that India was choosing to repair some military installations in Sikkim, in the Indian territory. If a military installation, post winter, in winter, requires some kind of repair, that is India's choice, and, to complain about that seems very odd, to say the least.

Sir, I must refer to Pakistan because that is mentioned here. The statement speaks of—not a very innovative idea—what has taken place in Pakistan today is the transformation of the situation beyond recognition. Pakistan recognizes it, the world recognizes it, and, I am sure that the hon. Minister for External Affairs also recognizes it. I do not understand why the

statement limited itself to: we are ready to start a composite dialogue—two ways. There is also a Government. I did make some inquiries to seek a clarification. The theory being that it is best for India not to say anything because otherwise the blame will come upon India. I am not impressed, Sir. There is an existing reality in Pakistan and that reality is worrisome. I don't wish to dwell too long on it.

Sir, the hon. Minister spoke of Gaza and West Bank. What we are witnessing here in Pakistan is too worrisome, because, very often, the theoretical perceptions, particularly in the case of Pakistan, do not necessarily provide practical remedies of policy. I do not wish to pursue it further that Pakistan is still attempting to find an answer with its present travail. We have always said that a stable Pakistan—I said it when I worked in the South Block—a Pakistan that is economically viable, that is socially at peace with itself, and has politically found an answer to its many challenges, is good for Pakistan, is good for India-Pakistan relations, and is good for the region. But I do not think we contribute to such a Pakistan by the kind of near-impossible and near-invisible posture that we currently have.

There is a brief reference to Afghanistan. Sir, it is also mentioned that the situation there is deteriorating.

Sir, the hon. Minister of External Affairs is a man of experience. His long service, both in Parliament and in Government, has given him the needed ballast to understand the totality of the situation.

Sir, the situation in Afghanistan is beyond repair. If we are facing the challenges that we currently face in Pakistan, in Afghanistan or in Iraq, it is a consequence of the total and utter failure of the U.S. policy in this region. Permit me to elaborate on it.

The policies pursued by the United States of America in Iraq and attempted in Iran—I don't want to go into how, from the very beginning, despite our efforts, we were slowly edged out in Afghanistan and, of course, in Pakistan there—are all truly detrimental to India's national interest; they are detrimental to the countries concerned; and, in the case of Afghanistan, I find it beyond comprehension as to what NATO is doing there. I have often shared this concern with my friends in Pakistan that just 60 years down the line of independence how could they accept foreign troops on the soil, not simply of Afghanistan, but also of Pakistan.

Soon after the Northern Alliance had taken over Afghanistan, after defeating the Taliban, a conference took place in Berlin. That was the first attempt to edge India out and I still had the job to do in the South Block. I insisted upon the officer who was to go there. He said, "Sir, they are preventing us from getting reservations." The Conference was in Berlin and I told him, "It does not matter; you go to Berlin; the rooms will be available in the hotels." I was astonished they divided Afghanistan amongst themselves; the United States of America would train the Afghan army and Great Britain with their colonial experience would provide them knowledge of district administration as also policing. But policing would actually be the area which the Germans had. Sir, though I am not on this issue. I must mention it? They entrusted the responsibility of teaching and hardy Afghan friends law to the Italians. I found it astonishing that of all the countries in the world, they chose Italy to teach Afghans what law is. I have said this many times. We wanted to send wheat; we wanted to send buses; we had to send them *via* Bandar Abbas and Iran into Herat. Sir, the situation in Afghanistan is directly damaging India's interests and we had to be more assertive, establishing a position for ourselves there. It is a disaster that faces not just the NATO or the United States of

America, but it is a disaster that faces us India, and not simply because the Taliban is again getting so active in southern Afghanistan, it's because of the reality of the deteriorating situation.

Sir, there is not a mention of Bangladesh though the hon. Minister has visited Bangladesh. Sir, I have just two or three points. Sir, the military intelligence has said earlier that they would be in office for two years and, then, they will hold elections. Elections are now announced for December. It's become a militarised country. Whatever we charged Pakistan with earlier, as being the epicentre of terrorism, is now very close to be levelled on the doorsteps of Bangladesh. Sir, I am not able to understand why the Director-General of Forces Intelligence came here recently. He continues to harbour known ULFA terrorists. It's very important, Sir, that we lean on Bangladesh. This is vital for India. It's vital India's national interests and the camps that India's north-east tribal outfits are found in Bangladesh must be dismantled and the known ULFAs and other—I do not want to name them—must be handed over to India.

Sir, I have already exceeded the time that was allotted to me. I could well cover Gaza and the West Bank. I am gratified that the hon. Minister has now expressed that they will be ready to play a role. This is a very feeble statement of policy. This is what had persuaded me to say this. We are not advocating an aggressive policy, not even, under the circumstances, an assertive policy. But, please don't let it be an invisible policy because the world is not able to see as to where India stands on issues.

Sir, I do wish to say something about Kosovo. I have said it here. The example of Kosovo is an extremely damaging and destructive example. A rather mild and watered down statement had been issued by the Government some three or four days after the event. It is not possible, Sir, for me to accept that a country is cut out virtually a province is cut out of a country, recognised by the United Nations, given the rank of a country in the United Nations and is accepted not just by the United States but by this rather cosy club of the Anglo-Saxon cousins. Sir, the world is not going to be ruled only by the Anglo-Saxon cousins. India do have a statement to make in this regard. And I would urge the hon. Minister to recognise the importance, the dimensions of the step that is currently being taken by the United States in defiance of the United Nations and the UN Resolutions on Kosovo. In the last 3-4 minutes, I wish to make a submission about the Civil Nuclear Agreement. I appeal to the hon. Minister and I appeal to the Government that this is not a private affair, Sir. This is not a private affair only between two political parties of the country. This is an issue of national importance. It has dragged on for too long, and having dragged on for so long, the country is now confused, and we are certainly confused. What do you intend doing? If you wish to go ahead and conclude this Civil Nuclear Agreement, please go ahead and do so, despite the protestations, and despite the pretension of protestations which we are constantly witnessing from some of your allies, and every two, three months, we see that this, that or the other thing will happen. Then I do not know what magic wand Pranab Babu waves around, the rather aggrieved Coalition partners, then meekly come out of the meeting and say, "Now, we will meet a month from now, and revive the agitation all over again." Please make up your mind; do make up your mind. Do you want to go this way or do you not want to go this way? If you do not want to go this way, please end the suspense and say, we are not going. If you are going, then say, please go the way, call the bluff. After all, what will happen? They will withdraw support. You will continue in office as a minority Government, I assure you (*Interruptions*) I do not know why they laugh...(*Interruptions*)... They do not want to withdraw! Then say

that you stand for the Civil Nuclear Agreement. Please understand that I am not going into the totality of the Agreement because the debate has gone on for very long. Sir, the aims are contradictory. Sir, I am not going to say what Condoleezza Rice, as the hon. Secretary of State said, "We will support nothing. That is in contradiction to the Henry Hyde Act. It will have to be completely consistent with the obligations of the Hyde Act. That is a clear enough enunciation of policy, and I totally appreciate what you said because, then you said that the Henry Hyde Act is a piece of American legislation. It is a provision between their Executive and the Legislature, and that is why the 123 Agreement is what we have. That is what the Minister said. This is acceptable. But behind these two statements lies a huge chasm of fundamental difference. That is what I submit to you. I am not going to go into the details of this clause or that clause. I think, the House have got sufficiently educated on the matter. But the considerations or the criteria that the United States of America can simply not give up are the 1954 Act, the Non-Proliferation Treaty; because that is a national security requirement of somehow bringing into force the FMCT; that is connected. FMCT is not only for FMCT, but to put a cap on the reprocessing capabilities of countries like India. When reprocessing capability capped, your future is capped. Now, of course, energy and commerce are also a part of that policy. If India buys the energy, then the US commerce will flow into India.

India's principle, as stated by the Government, and, I think, the large understanding as also the commitment of the House, is that the strategic autonomy post-1998 must not be lost. We are not signatories of the NPT, therefore, we are a non-nuclear weapon State. We have not yet agreed to subscribe to the FMCT, and we have not yet agreed to put either a cap or a reprocessing under anyone's scrutiny. (Time Bell) Sir, I will take just two minutes and conclude. The reason, Sir, is energy, which is very good. But Australia's recent statement of not supplying uranium, and uranium being in global shortage, really, underlines the point. That is why, I have said, at the very beginning, that the statement is, really, a statement on a subject with such dimensions that this Short Duration Discussion cannot do justice to it. But this is the only option we have towards the end of this Session of the House. I am very grateful, Sir, to the hon. Minister that he has found time to sit with us, and I do convey my regrets and apologies to him, in advance, that I shall have to leave before I have the benefit of listening to his reply. Thank you, Sir.

श्री राशिद अल्वी (आंध्र प्रदेश): धैंक यू सर, आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया। फरिन मिनिस्टर ने जो स्टेटमेंट राज्य सभा में दी थी, उस पर स्पष्टीकरण हो रहे हैं। हिंदुस्तान की फरिन पॉलिसी दुनिया की निगाहों में इज्जत और ऐहतयम की निगाहों से देखी जाती रही है। इसकी वजह यह है कि हमारी फरिन पॉलिसी इंडिपेंडेंट फरिन पॉलिसी है। नॉन एलाइन मूवमेंट जिन लोगों ने शुरू किया था, उनमें से हिंदुस्तान एक था। दुनिया में जिन लोगों ने फ्रीडम मूवमेंट चलाया, फ्रीडम मूवमेंट में पार्टिसिपेट किया, यह चाहे दुनिया के किसी कोने में चला हो, हिंदुस्तान ने उसका साथ दिया। चाहे वह कंबोडिया, लाओस, वियतनाम, साउथ अफ्रीका, फिलिस्तीन हो, हमने फ्रीडम स्ट्रगल का हर जगह साथ दिया और उनकी आवाज में अपनी आवाज को मिलाया। अलबत्ता इतना जरूर हुआ कि एन्टी-ए की सरकार में यह थोड़ा डाइल्यूट हुआ, इस पॉलिसी के अंदर थोड़ा डाइल्यूशन आया, लेकिन हिंदुस्तान की फरिन पॉलिसी और हमारे अंदर भी एक कंसेप्स रहा है। अलहदा-अलहदा मुख्तलिफ पोलिटिकल पार्टीज के अंदर इख़िलाफ होने के बावजूद ब्रॉड बेस्ट कंसेप्सेस हमारे अंदर रहता है। आज भी लीडर ऑफ अपोजीशन की बातों से मुझे अहसास हुआ कि न्यूक्लियर डील के मामले में वे आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता अपने मुअबिकफ को हल्का करते जा रहे हैं और सरकार को सपोर्ट करने का काम कर रहे हैं। मैं इसका खैरमकदम करता हूँ। फरिन मिनिस्टर ने चाइना के बारे में शुरू में कहा है कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर वहां गए थे। वहां बॉर्डर रीवेस और बॉर्डर डिसप्यूट्स की बातों पर बात हुई। सबसे पहले मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर को मुबारक बाद देता हूँ, शायद पिछले एक लंबे अरसे में पहले प्रधान मंत्री हैं जो अरुणाचल प्रदेश गए और वहां के लोगों से मिलकर बात की। ऐसा पिछले दस-पंद्रह सालों से नहीं हुआ है। इसके लिए वे काबिले मुबारकबाद हैं। उन्होंने इस बात की परवाह नहीं की



कि दुनिया के बहुत सारे मुमालिक इस बारे में क्या सोचते हैं। उन्होंने बाबांगेदोहल कहा कि अरुणाचल प्रदेश हिंदुस्तान का एक इंटिग्रल पार्ट है, एक अटूट हिस्सा है और हिस्सा रहेगा। इसके लिए प्रधान मंत्री काबिले मुबारकबाद हैं। सर, चाइना में जिस तरीके से अरुणाचल प्रदेश के बारे में उनके बहुत सारे लीडर्स ने आवाज बुलंद की, जिस तरीके से अरुणाचल प्रदेश को डिस्प्यूटिड बताया गया, हमारी सरकार ने गवर्नमेंट ऑफ चाइना को वाजिह किया कि अरुणाचल प्रदेश कोई डिस्प्यूटिड इलाका नहीं है, हिंदुस्तान का एक इंटिग्रल हिस्सा है। सर, मैं सरकार से जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि प्रधान मंत्री की और फॉरेन मिनिस्टर की चीन के नेताओं के साथ जो बातचीत हुई है और उसके अन्दर अरुणाचल प्रदेश के बारे में चीन के लीडर्स ने किस तरह behave किया है, वह हम जरूर जानना चाहेंगे कि गवर्नमेंट ऑफ चाइना का अरुणाचल प्रदेश को लेकर क्या मुवाफिक है, ताकि मुस्तकबिल के अन्दर हिन्दुस्तान अपनी तैयारी कर सके, अपनी पॉलिसी को clear कर सके, चूंकि अरुणाचल प्रदेश को लेकर पिछले काफी अरसे से चीन के अन्दर और हमारे अन्दर भारी dispute रहा है। बिला शुबह चीन के साथ हिन्दुस्तान अच्छे रिश्ते चाहता है, लेकिन मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि तारीख के पन्नों को कभी भुलाया नहीं जा सकता है। मुस्तकबिल की प्लानिंग तभी की जाती है, जब तारीख के पन्नों को पढ़ लिया जाए कि किसका क्या रोल रहा। हम चीन के साथ यकीनन दोस्ती चाहते हैं, लेकिन हम अपना माज़ी नहीं भूल सकते। सर, कोई कौम, जो माज़ी की गलतियों से सबक हासिल नहीं करती है, वह कौम अपना मुस्तकबिल शानदार नहीं बना सकती है। हम अपने माज़ी को नहीं भुला सकते। हम तारीख के पन्नों को पलटेंगे और देखेंगे, लेकिन हम बिला शुबह चीन के साथ आगे जाना चाहते हैं, उसके साथ दोस्ती करना चाहते हैं। फॉरेन मिनिस्टर ने कहा है कि हमारा volume of trade 2010 तक 60 बिलियन डॉलर हो जाएगा। आज हमारा चीन के साथ मौजूदा volume of trade 33 बिलियन डॉलर है, जिसमें 60:40 का ratio है। Balance of payment चीन के हक में ज्यादा है, हमारे हक में कम है। मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि दुनिया के अन्दर यह अलाहिदा चीज़ है कि हमारी पॉलिसी independent है, हम सबको बराबर की निगाह से देखते हैं, हम दुनिया के अन्दर disarmament के सबसे बड़े वकील रहे हैं, लेकिन इसके बावजूद हम अपनी existance को खतरे में नहीं डाल सकते हैं। आज जिस तेज़ी के साथ चीन का ट्रेड बढ़ रहा है, जिस तेज़ी के साथ चीन हमारे यहां भी ट्रेड कर रहा है, उसको हम नज़रअंदाज़ नहीं कर सकते। उसका फायदा चीन को ज्यादा हो रहा है। मुझे तो लगता है कि जिस तरीके से चीन तरक्की कर रहा है, कुछ ही दिनों में वह economically अमेरिका से आगे जा सकता है। आज अमेरिका पूरी दुनिया पर dominate कर रहा है। उसकी यही वजह है कि अमेरिका economically सबसे ज्यादा मजबूत है, सबसे ज्यादा ताकतवर है। इस बात को नज़रअंदाज़ नहीं किया जा सकता कि दुनिया के अन्दर जो मुमालिक economically मजबूत होते हैं, economically ताकतवर होते हैं, वे चाहें या न चाहें, वे दूसरे मुमालिक पर dominate करने लगते हैं। सर, मैं यहां मंत्री जी से कहना चाहूंगा कि एक बड़े थिंकर ने कहा है कि इस दुनिया के अन्दर कमज़ोर आदमी की कोई वक़्त नहीं होती, कमज़ोर मुल्क की भी कोई वक़्त नहीं होती। यह दुनिया बहुत ज़ालिम दुनिया है और यह दुनिया सिर्फ ताक़त की ज़बान समझती है। जिन लोगों के पास ताक़त होती है, उनके सामने यह दुनिया झुक जाती है और जो लोग कमज़ोर होते हैं, उनकी बात नज़रअंदाज़ कर देती है। वक़्त ज्यादा नहीं है, चूंकि यह स्टेटमेंट के ऊपर क्लैरिफिकेशन है, लेकिन मैं तारीख के पन्ने पलट-पलट कर अपनी बात को साबित कर सकता हूँ कि दुनिया के अन्दर जो-जो मुमालिक कमज़ोर थे और जो-जो मुमालिक ताकतवर थे, उन्होंने कमज़ोर मुमालिक के साथ क्या किया। मैं यहां पर सिर्फ एक ही बात कहना चाहूंगा। सद्दाम हुसैन इराक का एक बड़ा डिक्टेटर रहा। कुवैत का बादशाह अपने ज़माने के अन्दर दुनिया के मालदहशरतरीन ईंसानों में से एक ईंसान था। उसके पास बेपनाह दौलत थी, लेकिन इसके बावजूद चूंकि सद्दाम हुसैन ज्यादा ताकतवर था, तीन महीने के लिए कुवैत जैसा मुल्क दुनिया के नक्शे से सद्दाम हुसैन ने मिटा दिया और इराक के अन्दर शामिल कर लिया। अमेरिका इराक से ज्यादा ताकतवर था। सद्दाम हुसैन के साथ जो कुछ हुआ, वह पूरी दुनिया ने देखा। उस दिन सद्दाम हुसैन को फांसी दी गई, जिस दिन तमाम दुनिया के अन्दर बकरीद मनाई जा रही थी। लोग बकरे की गर्दन पर ज़िबह करने का काम कर रहे थे और इराक के अन्दर फांसी का फंदा सद्दाम हुसैन के गले में डाला जा रहा था। जो लोग ज्यादा ताकतवर होते हैं, कमज़ोर लोग उनके सामने दब जाते हैं। यह एक तारीख रही है और इसे हमें अपने सामने रखना होगा। इसलिए मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि जो हमारा ट्रेड चाइना के साथ चल रहा है, उस ट्रेड पर हमें नज़र रखने की जरूरत है। उसका ज्यादा से ज्यादा फायदा हिन्दुस्तान को होना चाहिए।

सर, चाइना की आबादी पूरी दुनिया की 18 फीसदी है और हिन्दुस्तान की आबादी पूरी दुनिया की 16 फीसदी है। मैं इस बात की पूरी बकालत करता हूँ कि अगर हमारा इंडेस्ट्रियल तरीके से लुकआफ्ट किया जा सके, तो चाइना के साथ

ट्रेड बढ़ाने में कोई हर्ज नहीं है। हम दोनों मिल कर 34% हो जाते हैं, यानी दुनिया का करीब-करीब 1/3 हिस्सा हो जाते हैं और अगर 1/3 हिस्सा एक साथ हो जाए तो पूरी दुनिया के ऊपर हम अपने फौसले अमलदरामद कर सकते हैं। मैं सरकार से चाहूंगा कि इकोनॉमिकली हमारा जो ट्रेड चाहना के साथ है, उस पर तवज्जह देने की जरूरत है।

सर, मंत्री जी ने पाकिस्तान के बारे में चर्चा की। आज पाकिस्तान के जो हालात हैं, वह बहुत मुश्किलीफ् हालात हैं। पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी दोस्ती की बात-चीत चलती रही है। अभी वहां के होने वाले प्रधान मंत्री, बेनजोर भुट्टो जी के हस्बैंड का स्टेटमेंट आया है, जो वहां के होने वाले प्रधान मंत्री है, लेकिन उन्होंने भी कहा है कि कश्मीर पर बात-चीत के बिना हिन्दुस्तान के साथ हमारे रिश्ते ठीक नहीं हो सकते हैं। मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि पाकिस्तान के साथ पिछली जो बातें होती रही हैं, करीब-करीब आठ मुद्दों को लेकर बातें होती रही हैं, जिसके अन्दर इग्जु शामिल है, कल्चरल प्रॉब्लम्स शामिल है, नारकोटिक्स शामिल है। मैं चाहूंगा और सरकार से कहूंगा कि अगर कश्मीर के मुद्दे पर इतनी मुश्किल है तो पाकिस्तान के साथ जो दूसरे मुद्दे हैं, पहले हम उन मुद्दों पर कन्सेंस कर सकते हैं। कश्मीर पर हम बाद में बात-चीत कर सकते हैं।

पाकिस्तान के अन्दर जो भी सरकार बनेगी, चूंकि वहां पर डेमोक्रेसी बहाल हो रही है और हमें उसका वेलकम करना चाहिए। मुझे यकीन है कि डेमोक्रेटिकली बनी हुई सरकार हिन्दुस्तान के साथ ज्यादा बेहतर तरीके से बात-चीत कर सकती है, लेकिन यहां मैं सरकार से यह जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि मुझे शुबाह है कि पाकिस्तान का जो डेमोक्रेटिक सिस्टम है, वह न अभी बहुत मुस्तहकम हो पाया है और न ही मुझे होने की उम्मीद है। हम पाकिस्तान के अन्दरूनी मामलात के साथ कोई मداخلत नहीं कर सकते, लेकिन सर, हमारे जो नेबर्स हैं, हमारे जो पड़ोसी मुामलिक हैं, उनके डेवलपमेंट्स को हम नजरअंदाज भी नहीं कर सकते हैं। हम उनकी तरफ से आंखें बंद नहीं कर सकते हैं। पाकिस्तान के अन्दर हमेशा से पाकिस्तान की आर्मी बहुत मजबूत रही है और अभी वहां के चीफ ऑफ द आर्मी स्टाफ, जनरल कयानी का बयान आया है कि आर्मी आज भी मुशर्रफ साहब के साथ है। मुशर्रफ साहब का वहां क्या रोल है, क्या रोल नहीं है, इस पर मैं बहस नहीं करना चाहता हूं, लेकिन शायद यह दुनिया की अकेली मिसाल है कि एक राष्ट्र, जो फौज की बर्दी में है, इसके बावजूद वह एक मुल्क का प्रेजिडेंट भी है। वह यह भी मानता है कि यहां डेमोक्रेसी है और मैं प्रेजिडेंट हूं, साथ ही आर्मी की बर्दी भी पहने हुए है, जो अभी कुछ ही दिन पहले उतारी है वहां पर इससे भी ज्यादा अहम बात यह है कि दुनिया के बहुत सारे ताकतवर मुल्क उन लोगों का साथ दे रहे हैं। मुझे इस बात का मुकम्मल यकीन नहीं है, खुदा करे कि ग़ुलत साबित हो जाऊं कि पाकिस्तान की वह जम्हूरियत, मुस्तहकम जम्हूरियत होगी, इस बात के अन्दर मुझे शुबाह है और मुझे पूरा यकीन है कि सरकार इस बात पर तवज्जह देगी।

यहां पर सरबजीत की फौसी को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए मैं सरकार को मुबारकबाद भी दूंगा। इसके लिए सरकार काबिले मुबारकबाद है। पूरे हाउस, पूरे हिन्दुस्तान को निगाहें आपकी तरफ लगी थीं, लेकिन मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि इसमें मज्जीद बातचीत करने की जरूरत है। वहां पर मैं मंत्री जी से यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि हमारे कितने पॉलिटिकल प्रिज़नर्स या प्रिज़नर्स ऑफ चार हैं, जो पाकिस्तान के अन्दर हैं और पाकिस्तान के कितने प्रिज़नर्स हैं जो हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर हैं। क्या इनका किसी तरीके से कोई एक्सचेंज हो सकता है या नहीं हो सकता है? सरबजीत, जो वहां पर है, अगर उसके बदले हम किसी को दे दें तो क्या वह वापस आ सकता है या नहीं आ सकता है? अगर इन सारी बातों पर सरकार तवज्जह देगी तो ज्यादा बेहतर होगा।

सर, यहां पर मैं सरकार से एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा। जो ट्रेड हम चाहना के साथ कर रहे हैं, पाकिस्तान के साथ करीब-करीब उसका आधा भी नहीं है, शायद आधे से भी कम है। अगर ट्रेड की वही पॉलिसी, जो हमारी चाहना के साथ है, हम पाकिस्तान के साथ करें, तो हमें ज्यादा फायदा होगा। पाकिस्तान का जो ट्रेड है, वह इतना बड़ा है कि हमारे यहां जो स्टॉक मार्केट है, हमारे यहां के दो बड़े कॉर्पोरेट्स पूरा स्टॉक मार्केट खरीद सकते हैं, जो ख़यत उपलब्ध हैं। इसलिए अगर हम ट्रेड की वही पॉलिसी, जो हमारी चाहना के साथ है, पाकिस्तान के साथ कर लें, तो मुझे ऐसा महसूस होता है—मैं कोई इकोनॉमिस्ट नहीं हूं, लेकिन मुझे ऐसा महसूस होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान को इसका बहुत बड़ा फायदा होगा। इसलिए हमें पाकिस्तान के साथ बात करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए ताकि हम उस ट्रेड की आगे बढ़ाएं। जो दूसरे पॉलिटिकल मुद्दे हैं, उन पर बाद में भी बात की जा सकती है। इससे पाकिस्तान का भी फायदा होगा और हिन्दुस्तान का भी फायदा होगा।

अभी हाल ही में तेहरान में एशियन पोलिटिकल पार्टीज की एक कांफरेंस हुई थी। उसमें मैं अपनी पार्टी, कांग्रेस पार्टी की तरफ से पार्टिसिपेट करने के लिए गया था। वहां मुझे मुस्लिम लीग के सीनियर वाइस प्रेसिडेंट मिले। वह मुझसे कहने लगे कि पाकिस्तान के अन्दर डेमोक्रेसी, इस्टैब्लिश्ड डेमोक्रेसी आ सकती है बशर्ते कि आपके और हमारे रिश्ते ठीक हो जाएं। बात उन्होंने बहुत ठीक कही थी। उन्होंने कहा था कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के रिश्ते ठीक हो जाएं, हमारी-आपकी दोस्ती हो जाए, तो हम पाकिस्तान की आर्मी को घटा देंगे, हमें फिर कोई खतरा नहीं रहेगा। अगर हम आर्मी घटा देंगे, तो आर्मी का पाकिस्तान की सियासत के ऊपर जो तसल्लुत है, वह खुद-ब-खुद खत्म हो जाएगा और अगर पाकिस्तान की आर्मी का तसल्लुत पाकिस्तान की पॉलिटिक्स पर कम हो जाएगा, तो पाकिस्तान की डेमोक्रेसी खुद-ब-खुद मजबूत होती चली जाएगी।

(श्री उपसभापति पीठासीन हुए)

सर, हमारे हक में है कि पाकिस्तान एक मुस्तकहम मुल्क हो, इंडिपेंडेंट मुल्क हो, दुनिया के दूसरे मुमालिक के हाथों में न खेले। आज पाकिस्तान ने जितना टेरिज्म हमारे मुल्क के अन्दर किया है, उसमें यह भी एक सच्चाई है कि जो आग पाकिस्तान ने हमें जलाने के लिए जलाई, आज पाकिस्तान खुद ही उस आग के अन्दर जल रहा है। आज पाकिस्तान के अन्दर कितने खौफनाक हालात हैं, दूसरे और तीसरे दिन यह खबर आती है कि आज इतने लोग मारे गए। उसने जो काम हमारे मुल्क को डिस्टर्ब करने के लिए किया था, आज वहीं पाकिस्तान के अन्दर हो रहा है। इन 60 सालों बाद भी अगर मैं मुकाबला करता हूं, तो हिन्दुस्तान एक ऐसा मुल्क है कि तमामतर इखिलाफात के बावजूद, तमाम कास्टिज्म के बावजूद, तमाम कम्युनलिज्म के बावजूद, तमाम रिजनलिज्म के बावजूद उस को कोई दो हिस्सों में नहीं बांट सकता है। हिन्दुस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान का आबाम हमेशा एक रहता है, चाहे वह हिन्दू हो, चाहे मुसलमान हो, चाहे सिख हो। लेकिन पाकिस्तान में 60 साल बीत जाने के बावजूद बलूची अल्लेहदा हैं, पंजाबी अल्लेहदा हैं, हिन्दुस्तान से जो लोग सन् 1947 में बड़े जोश और जज्बे के साथ गए थे, वे वहां आज भी मुहाजरीन कहलाते हैं, वे अल्लेहदा हैं। ... (व्यवधान) ... सर, पाकिस्तान एक नहीं बन पाया। यहां पर मैं अपने दोस्तों से एक बात कहना चाहूंगा, भारतीय जनता पार्टी के लोगों से, कोई शोर मचाने की बात नहीं है, कि पाकिस्तान एक नारे पर बना था, एक मजहब की बुनियाद पर बना था, लेकिन इसके बावजूद, सर, 20-25 सालों के बाद वही मुल्क, जिसकी बुनियाद एक मजहब पर रखी गई थी, वह दो हिस्सों में टुकड़ा हो गया। वह मजहब उस मुल्क को एक साथ नहीं जोड़ पाया। इसलिए मैं अपने साथियों से कहूंगा कि कम्युनल पॉलिटिक्स किसी भी मुल्क के अन्दर कारगर साबित नहीं होती है। अगर पाकिस्तान दो हिस्सों में टूट गया, एक पाकिस्तान बन गया और दूसरा बंगला देश बन गया। आज बंगला देश के हालात भी हमारे सामने हैं। बंगला देश के अंदर भी डेमोक्रेसी बनती है, बिगड़ जाती है, फिर बनती है, बिगड़ जाती है। आज वे दोनों लोग, जो बंगला देश के प्रधान मंत्री बन सकते थे, वे दोनों बंगला देश से निकाले जा रहे हैं। जिस तरीके के हालात उन दोनों मुमालिक के हैं, उनसे यह पता चलता है कि कम्युनल पॉलिटिक्स किसी मुल्क के लिए कभी फायदेमंद नहीं हो सकती है। पॉलिटिक्स वही फायदेमंद होती है, जिसमें सब को जोड़ कर चला जाए। सन् 1947 में अगर इस मुल्क के अन्दर हमारे fore fathers यह ऐलान कर देते कि हिन्दुस्तान एक हिन्दू राष्ट्र होगा, तो शायद उन हालात के अन्दर किसी में हिम्मत नहीं होती कि वह ऊंगली उठा देता। कोई यह नहीं कह सकता था कि हिन्दुस्तान हिन्दू राष्ट्र क्यों बनाया जा रहा है। एक दिन पहले पाकिस्तान बना था और वह एक मुस्लिम राष्ट्र बना था, इस्लामिक राष्ट्र बना था और पाकिस्तान ने तय किया था कि इस्लाम हमारा नेशनल रिलीजन रहेगा। उसके बावजूद हिन्दुस्तान की जो उस वक्त की कांग्रेस लीडरशिप थी—पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू, मौलाना आज़ाद, सरदार पटेल, उन लोगों ने सोच-समझकर फैसला किया कि इन तमाम बातों के बावजूद यह मुल्क एक सेक्युलर मुल्क बना रहेगा। यही वजह है कि आज 60 साल के बाद भी यह मुल्क एक मुस्तकहम मुल्क है, मुस्तकहम जम्हूरियत है। यहां ट्रांसफर ऑफ पावर बहुत smoothly होती है। पिछली सरकार थी, उन्होंने कैसे सरकार चलायी, वह एक अल्लेहदा बात है, लेकिन 24 पार्टीज की सरकार चली। आज हमारी एक coliation सरकार है, लेकिन इस देश के अंदर ट्रांसफर ऑफ पावर इतना smoothly होता है कि वह शायद दूसरे किसी मुमालिक के अंदर हो नहीं सकता है। सर, मुझे नाम याद नहीं आ रहा है। इंग्लैंड के एक प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा कि बड़े लंबे अरसे की इंग्लैंड की डेमोक्रेसी काबिले तारीफ नहीं है, सैंकड़ों सालों की अमेरिका की डेमोक्रेसी काबिले तारीफ नहीं है, लेकिन अगर काबिले तारीफ इस दुनिया में कोई डेमोक्रेसी है, तो वह हिन्दुस्तान की है और बिला शुबह यह सही बात है।

सर, मंत्री जी ने मिडल ईस्ट की बात की, फिलिस्तीन की बात की, मैं यहां यह बात शुरू करने से पहले कहूंगा कि

हम मिडल ईस्ट को हमेशा मिडल ईस्ट कहते हैं क्योंकि यूरोप के लोग उसे मिडल ईस्ट कहते हैं। बेसिकली हमें तो उसे मिडल वेस्ट कहना चाहिए क्योंकि हमारे तो वह वेस्ट पर है, लेकिन यहां फिर मैं कहूंगा कि ताकतवर लोगों की जुबान से निकले अस्फाज कानून बन जाते हैं। आज वे लोग मिडल ईस्ट कहते हैं तो सारी दुनिया उसे मिडल ईस्ट कहती है।

श्री शाहिद सिद्दीकी (उत्तर प्रदेश): वह तो वेस्ट एशिया है।

† (شری شاہد سیدیقی: وہ تو ویسٹ ایشیا ہے)

श्री राशिद अल्वी: वह वेस्ट एशिया है। सर, गाजा और वेस्ट बैंक की आप ने चर्चा की। वहां के हालात बहुत खराब हैं। मैं सरकार से चाहूंगा कि इस पर बहुत तवज्जह देने की जरूरत है। वहां हजारों लोग मारे जा रहे हैं, वहां खाने के लिए रोटी नहीं है, वहां लोग सड़कों पर पड़े हैं। मैं सरकार को याद दिलाना चाहूंगा कि पीएलओ हमेशा से हिंदुस्तान का दोस्त रहा है। यासिर अराफात हमेशा हिंदुस्तान के दोस्त रहे हैं। मैं सरकार से यहां जरूर यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि इजरायली सेटलाइट हम लोगों ने छोड़े हैं, जो इसी इलाके की Spying करेंगे। सर, मैं बहुत अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्यों हमने ऐसा किया? सर, मैं गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से यूनाइटेड नेशंस में गया था। मैं वहां एन्क्वीजिशन सरकार के फौरन बाद में गया था। इजरायल और फिलिस्तीन का जब इश्यू वहां आया तो मैं वोट देना चाहता था। मुझे मेरे अधिकारियों ने कहा कि यह हमारी पालिसी है कि हम फिलिस्तीन के बारे में बोलेंगे, हम उनकी आवाज उठाएंगे, लेकिन हम उनके फोरम में वोट नहीं देंगे। सर, यह कौसी पालिसी है? मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस पालिसी को तब्दील किया गया है या नहीं? फिलिस्तीन के अंदर जो कुछ हो रहा है, उस से हिंदुस्तान के लोगों के दिलों की धड़कन जुड़ी हुई है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से जरूर अपील करूंगा कि इस मामले पर सरकार तवज्जह दे।

सर, म्यांमार के बारे में मैं सिर्फ इतना कहूंगा कि डेमोक्रेसी के लिए जो सरकार की कोशिशें हैं, वे यकीनन काबिले तारीफ हैं। वहां की सरकार से हमारा राब्ता रहना चाहिए। अगर राब्ता ही नहीं रहेगा तो हम इस लड़ाई को नहीं लड़ पाएंगे। मलेशिया के बारे में दो जुमले जरूर कहना चाहूंगा। आप ने अपने स्टेटमेंट के अंदर कहा है, लेकिन वहां पर हिंदू राइट सेक्शन फोर्स जो प्रोसेशन निकाल रहा था, जिस तरह से वहां की सरकार ने उनका harassment किया, उस पर सिर्फ बातचीत करना ही काफी नहीं है। उस बारे में सख्त कदम उठाने की जरूरत है।

सर, आखिरी में मैं कहूंगा कि आपने यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स के बारे में कहा है कि इंटरनेशनल एटॉमिक इनर्जी के साथ हमारी बातचीत चल रही है। यह बात बिल्कुल ठीक है और स्पेसिफिक सेफगाइड्स एग्रीमेंट के नजदीक हम पहुंच चुके हैं और वह हो सकता है। यकीनन इस में कहीं कोई शुबह नहीं है कि यह न्यूक्लियर डील देश के हित में है। मैं हमेशा इस राय का रहा हूँ कि अमेरिका दूसरे मुमालिकों के साथ क्या करता है, इस से हमारा कोई वास्ता नहीं है, लेकिन अमेरिका के साथ हमारी दोस्ती होना बहुत जरूरी है। अमेरिका दुनिया का एक ताकतवर मुल्क है। अगर वह दुनिया के अंदर कहीं ज्यादातियां कर रहा है तो हम यकीनन उसके खिलाफ आवाज बुलंद करेंगे। दुनिया के अन्दर अगर अमरीका किसी मुल्क के साथ ज्यादाती कर रहा है, तो हम उसके लिए जरूर अपनी आवाज बुलंद करेंगे, लेकिन अमरीका के साथ हमारा रिश्ता रहना चाहिए, यह जरूरी है। ... (व्यवधान) ... हम अमरीका के साथ गुलामी करने की बात नहीं कर रहे हैं, लेकिन एक लंबे अर्से के बाद न्यूक्लीयर डील के बाद हमारे ऊपर से सेंसन्स हटेंगे।

श्री उपसभापति: अल्वी साहब, आपकी पार्टी के अभी दो और स्पीकर्स बोलने को हैं और वक्त हो रहा है।

श्री राशिद अल्वी: सर, मैं खतम कर रहा हूँ। ... (व्यवधान) ... मैं यहां एक बात जरूर कहना चाहूंगा, मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि हाइड एक्ट से हमारा कोई वास्ता नहीं है, यह इंटर्नल मामला है, लेकिन कंडोलिज़ा राइस का जो स्टेटमेंट आया, उसने बहुत गलतफहमियां पैदा कर दी थीं। हाइड एक्ट से हमारा कोई वास्ता नहीं है, लेकिन मैं सरकार को मशविरा देना चाहूंगा कि अगर सरकार अमरीकन गवर्नमेंट को, मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री जी मेरी बात को तवज्जोह दें, अगर सरकार अमरीकन गवर्नमेंट को एक चिट्ठी लिखे और यह लिखे कि हाइड एक्ट से हमारा कोई वास्ता नहीं है, हाइड एक्ट आपका इंटर्नल

4.00 P.M.

मामला है, कंडोलिज़ा राइस ने जो बात कही है, इससे हमारे मुल्क के अंदर गलतफहमियाँ पैदा हुई हैं। चूंकि मैंने देखा है, बहुत बार ऐसा होता है कि अमरीकन एम्बेसेडर, अमरीकन फॉरेन मिनिस्टर, सेक्रेटरी ऑफ स्टेट्स इस तरीके के बयान दे जाते हैं, जिससे हमारे यहां गलतफहमियाँ पैदा हो जाती हैं। अगर हम इस तरीके की चिट्ठी गवर्नमेंट ऑफ अमरीका को लिख सकें कि हाइड एक्ट आपका अपना मामला है, हमारा इससे कोई वास्ता नहीं, इस मामले में हमें कुछ लेना-देना नहीं है, हमारा वास्ता आपके साथ वन, टू, थ्री एग्रीमेंट का है और जो भी कुछ हम आगे बढ़ेंगे, आगे न्यूक्लीयर डील के अंदर करेंगे, वह वन, टू, थ्री एग्रीमेंट के मुताबिक करेंगे तो मुझे लगता है कि येचुरी साहब भी ठीक हो जाएंगे, बीजेपी वाले तो पहले ही ठीक हो गए हैं। ... (व्यवधान)...

सर, आखिरी बात कहकर मैं अपनी बात खत्म करूंगा। सर, सिक्वोरिटी कौंसिल की मैम्बरशिप के बारे में मैं जरूर सरकार से जानना चाहूंगा कि इस मामले में कितनी बातचीत आगे बढ़ी है? कुछ दिन पहले अमरीका से किसिंजर साहब हिंदुस्तान आए थे और वे बहुत लोगों से मिले थे। मेरी थी उनसे एक मीटिंग में बातचीत हुई थी। मैंने उनसे पूछा था कि अगर न्यूक्लीयर डील, यह एग्रीमेंट किसी वजह से नहीं हो पाता, तो इसके कांसीक्यू-सेंस क्या होंगे? किसिंजर साहब का सरकार से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है, लेकिन वह वहां के एक बड़े सीनियर लीडर रहे हैं और उनकी बातों को हम नजरअंदाज नहीं कर सकते। तो किसिंजर साहब ने मुझसे कहा था कि सेक्सन्स नहीं हटेंगी, वह तो हम भी समझते हैं कि नहीं हटेंगी, लेकिन जो सिग्निफिकेण्ट बात कही थी, वह यह कही थी कि अगर एग्रीमेंट नहीं होता, तो आप सिक्वोरिटी कौंसिल के मैम्बर नहीं बन सकते। यह बहुत इम्पॉर्टेंट बात है। ... (व्यवधान) ... मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि इस मामले पर तक्जोह देने का काम करें।

श्री राशिद सिद्दिकी: उन्होंने साफ कह दिया है कि नहीं बनाएंगे। आप एग्रीमेंट कर लो, नहीं बनाएंगे। ... (व्यवधान) ...

† [شری شہید صدیقی : انہوں نے صاف کہہ دیا ہے کہ نہیں بنائیں گے۔ آپ ایگریمنٹ کر لو، نہیں بنائیں گے۔ مداخلت]

श्री राशिद अलबी: सिक्वोरिटी कौंसिल का मैम्बर बनाना या न बनाना, किसी एक मुल्क के हाथ में नहीं है, लेकिन जो बात उन्होंने कही, वह मैं सरकार के नॉलेज में लाना चाहता हूँ।

सर, आपने मुझे वक्त दिया, आपका बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया।

श्री उपसभापति: श्री बृजभूषण तिवरी। आपकी पार्टी के दस मिनट हैं। उसी दस मिनट में आप बोलें।

श्री बृजभूषण तिवारी (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदय, नेता विरोधी दल ने ठीक ही कहा कि विदेश मंत्री जी का यह बयान इतना विस्तृत और व्यापक है कि इतने कम समय में इस पर पूरी चर्चा नहीं की जा सकती, क्योंकि इसमें तमाम बिन्दु हैं और उसके बाद भी बहुत सी ऐसी घटनाएँ हैं, जिनका जिक्र इस बयान में नहीं किया गया है।

महोदय, दूसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि यह जो बयान माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी ने दिया है, यह बहुत ही ढीला बयान है। इसमें न तो कोई दृष्टि है, न कोई संकल्प है और न ही कोई दिशा है। जैसे रूटीन में कोई बयान दिया जाता है, यह उसी प्रकार का बयान है और जिन घटनाओं का जिक्र है, इसमें चीन के बारे में बात कही गई है। हमारी सरकार की चीन के बारे में जो नीति है, वह शुरू से ही दोषपूर्ण रही है और एक के बाद एक हम लगातार गलतियाँ करते आ रहे हैं और उसी का नतीजा है कि हम बराबर उसके जाल में फँस जाते हैं। हमने सबसे पहले यह गलती की कि हमने तिब्बत के मामले में उनके संप्रभुता के अधिकार को मान लिया। उस समय भी suzerainty और sovereignty इन दो शब्दों का बड़ा झगड़ा चला और हमने suzerainty स्वीकार कर ली और उसी suzerainty को उन्होंने sovereignty बनाकर तिब्बत को हड़प लिया। अगर उस समय हमने थोड़ी बहुत दृढ़ता और सूझबूझ दिखाई होती तो शायद यह स्थिति नहीं होती और आप देखिए कि दलाई लामा और उसके तमाम बौद्ध भिक्षु शरणार्थी के रूप में हमारे यहां आए, जिन्हें हमने पनाह दी, उन्हें रहने का मौका दिया। उसके बाद हमारा सीमा विवाद हुआ, सीमा विवाद में चीन ने हमला किया और उसने हमारी हजाराँ एकड़ जमीन हथिया ली। हमारे दूसरे सदन लोक सभा ने एक संकल्प लिया था, एक प्रस्ताव पारित किया था, जिसमें यह कहा गया था कि जब तक एक-एक इंच जमीन हम वापिस नहीं ले लेंगे तब तक हम चैन से नहीं बैठेंगे। अब कोई उस प्रस्ताव की, संकल्प की चर्चा ही नहीं करता, सब भूल गए, अब हमें वह संकल्प याद ही नहीं रहा और

लगातार हमारी तरफ से यह कोशिश हो रही है कि हम चीन से रिश्ते सुधारे। हम भी चीन से रिश्ता बनाने के पक्षक हैं। हम तो शुरू से कह रहे थे और हमारे नेता डाॅ. राम मनोहर लोहिया ने एक बार कहा था कि चाइना एशिया का स्लीपिंग द्रैगन है, सोता हुआ शेर है और उन्होंने यह कल्पना की थी, यह आशा व्यक्त की थी कि अगर एशिया में चीन और भारत मिल जाएं, ये दोनों ताकतवर देश अगर एकजुट हो जाएं, तो पश्चिमी देशों का जो दबदबा है, हम इस दबदबे को भी खत्म कर सकते हैं और इतना ही नहीं, एशिया से गरीबी और दुनिया से शोषण को भी खत्म कर सकते हैं। परन्तु, यह दुर्भाग्य था कि चीन को यह बात समझ में नहीं आई और ताकतवर लोगों से लड़ने की बजाए उसने भारत को ही अपना दुश्मन नम्बर एक समझा और एशिया में अमरीका की तरह, जैसे अमरीका दुनिया में दबदबा बनाना चाहता था, उसी तरह से चीन ने सबसे पहले कोशिश की कि एशिया में अपना दबदबा बनाए और वह लगातार हमसे छेड़खानी करता रहा। अरुणाचल के मामले में ही आप देखिए कि वह अरुणाचल को शुरू से ही *disputed area, disputed region* मानता रहा और उस *disputed region* के मानने के कारण हमेशा उन्होंने ऐतराज जताया और अभी जब प्रधान मंत्री जी अरुणाचल के दौर पर गए तो उसने सख्त ऐतराज जताया। पहले इसकी खबर थी कि जो हमारे डेलिगेशन थे, जो कि अरुणाचल के थे, उनको वीजा ही नहीं दिया, क्योंकि उनको वीजा की जरूरत नहीं थी इस बयान में जो विदेश मंत्री जी ने भी कहा है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अरुणाचल में जाकर यह साबित कर दिया कि अरुणाचल हमारा हिस्सा है। प्रधान मंत्री जी को जाकर यह साबित करने की आवश्यकता पड़ी। हमको जिस दृढ़ता के साथ बराबर इस बात को कहना चाहिए था और मैं नहीं जानता हूँ, क्योंकि बहुत गोल-मटोल तरीके से यह बात कही गई है। आपकी मुलाकात चाहे प्रधानमंत्री के स्तर पर हुई हो, चाहे अधिकारियों के स्तर पर हुई हो और चाहे विदेश मंत्री के स्तर पर हुई हो, आपने खुलकर किन-किन मुद्दों पर बात की। आपने बात की तो उस बात का चीन के प्रतिनिधिमंडल ने क्या जवाब दिया, इसकी जानकारी भी तो सदन को मिलनी चाहिए, नहीं मिली। रिवर के बारे में, नदियों के बारे में, जानकारी नहीं मिली। अभी माननीय नेता विपक्ष ने बताया कि उनकी क्या नीति है, उनकी क्या strategy है, किस तरीके से उन लोगों ने वहां के पूरे पर्यावरण को ध्वस्त कर दिया, उसका नाश कर दिया। उन्होंने वहां इतनी ऊँचाई पर रेल बिछा दी, सड़कों का जाल बिछा दिया और आज तिब्बत के अंदर जो विद्रोह की स्थिति है, उस विद्रोह की स्थिति का सबसे बड़ा कारण यह है कि उन्होंने कहा कि *cultural genocide* कम हुआ है, उनकी संस्थाओं पर, उनकी भाषा पर, उनके रीति-रिवाजों पर, उनकी धार्मिक आस्था पर, उनकी संस्थाओं पर ज़बरदस्त हमला हुआ और हमला ही नहीं हुआ, उन इलाकों में चीन के दूसरे प्रदेशों के लोगों को ज़बरदस्ती बसाया गया, उनकी जीवन-शैली में परिवर्तन किया गया। इसके कारण वहां पर जो विद्रोह की आग भड़की इसका नतीजा यह है कि आज वह हिंसक रूप ले रही है। दलाई लामा जी ने भी कभी आज़ादी की बात नहीं की, कभी तिब्बत को चीन से अलग नहीं माना। उन्होंने कहा कि ठीक है, जब एक बार बात हो गई तो तिब्बत चीन का हिस्सा है, लेकिन वे स्वायत्तता की बात कहते हैं, *autonomous region* की बात करते हैं। हमें आज़ादी दो, हमें स्वायत्तता दो, हमारे जो मौलिक, जनतांत्रिक अधिकार हैं, उन अधिकारों का क्षरण नहीं होना चाहिए और हमें आदमी की तरह जीने का अवसर मिलना चाहिए, लेकिन चीन के लोग बात करने को भी तैयार नहीं हैं। उन्होंने कोशिश की, पहल की कि कम से कम दलाई लामा या चीन के राष्ट्रपति या प्रधान मंत्री जी से बात हो जाए। भारत सरकार के बारे में मुझे यह कहना है कि यह इतनी ढीली और इतनी दम्बू सरकार रही कि दूसरे देशों ने तो पहल की, लेकिन भारत की सरकार ने दृढ़ता के साथ चीन के लोगों से यह कभी नहीं कहा कि आप पहल करके, दलाई लामा से बात करके कोई शांतिपूर्ण रास्ता निकालिए।

उपसभापति जी, तिब्बत का मामला हमसे अलग नहीं है, यह हमारी एकता से जुड़ा हुआ है, हमारी संस्कृति से जुड़ा हुआ है और हमारे हिमालय का जो क्षेत्र है, उसको यदि हम शांति ज़ोन बनाना चाहते हैं, तो वह तब तक शांति ज़ोन नहीं बन सकता, जब तक तिब्बत का मामला न सुलझ जाए। फिर तिब्बत के शरणार्थियों की इतनी बड़ी तादाद भारत में पड़ी हुई है। उनके मन में बेचैनी है। अब दलाई लामा तो उम्र पार कर रहे हैं, लेकिन जो नयी पीढ़ी आ रही है, वह इतने दिनों तक इंतज़ार नहीं कर सकती है। मैं दलाई लामा जी के नेतृत्व की तारीफ करना चाहूंगा कि इतने *provocation* के बावजूद भी उन्होंने शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से अपना आंदोलन चलाया। इस सरकार की यह जो नीति है, यह एक तरह से दम्बूपन की नीति है।

फिर इज़राइल की बात आती है। अभी सत्ता पक्ष के वक्ता महोदय ने स्वयं कहा कि इज़राइल के बारे में आपकी कैसी नीति है। आप उनसे बराक मिसाइल खरीदते हैं, इज़राइल की जो वीपन फॉर्म है, आप उसकी *blacklist* नहीं करते हैं और खुद CPM के जनरल सेक्रेटरी ने इस बारे में प्रधान मंत्री जी को पत्र भी लिखा है। फिलीस्तीन के मामले में जितनी दृढ़ता

से और कितनी हिम्मत के साथ आपको खड़ा होना चाहिए, आप खड़े नहीं होते हैं। हमें यह समझना चाहिए कि हमारी जो विदेश नीति है, वह केवल दरबारगिरी करने की नीति कभी नहीं रही है। वह नीति राष्ट्रीय आंदोलन से निकली है। जो राष्ट्रीय आंदोलन का संदर्भ था, जो राष्ट्रीय आंदोलन के मूल्य थे हमने साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ, उपनिवेशवाद के खिलाफ संघर्ष किया, हमने आज़ादी के लिए संघर्ष किया, हम दुनिया में अमन चाहते हैं, शांति चाहते हैं, हम disarmament चाहते हैं, हम निःशस्त्रीकरण चाहते हैं। किसी भी विदेश नीति की दो कसौटियां होती हैं सबसे पहली कसौटी होती है देशहित और दूसरी कसौटी यह होती है कि हमारा दर्शन क्या है, हमारी दृष्टि क्या है, हमारा लक्ष्य क्या है, हमारा सिद्धांत क्या है। अगर हमारे पास सिद्धांत नहीं रहा, अगर हमारे पास दृढ़ता नहीं रही, अगर हमारे पास विचारों की साहसिकता नहीं रही, तो हमारा देशहित भी कभी पूरा नहीं होगा।

श्री उपसभापति: तिवारी जी, अब समाप्त कीजिए।

श्री बृजभूषण तिवारी: उपसभापति जी, मैं दो मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त कर रहा हूँ। हमारी विदेश नीति की सफलता की कसौटी यह है कि अमरीका और चीन, इन दोनों के बारे में हमारा क्या नज़रिया है। अमरीका भी हमें destabilize करना चाहता है, वह अपना दबदबा हमारे ऊपर कायम करना चाहता है और चीन भी हमें destabilize करना चाहता है, इन दोनों के बारे में हमारा नज़रिया स्पष्ट होना चाहिए। हमारी सबसे बड़ी मुसीबत यह है कि पहले जो हमारी विदेश नीति थी, उसे हमारे नेता चलाते थे, जो सचमुच देश के नेता थे। जिनमें confidence था, जिनमें नेतृत्व का गुण था और आज हमारी विदेश नीति का संचालन ये अस्फ़र करते हैं या नौकरशाही करती है। मैं अफसरों की काबिलियत पर प्रश्न-चिन्ह नहीं लगा सकता, मगर अफसरों का जो विज़न है, अफसरों की जो दृष्टि है, वह बहुत ही सीमित होती है। वह राष्ट्र हित में नहीं है, वह देश हित में नहीं है, किसी विचार, किसी दर्शन और किसी आंदोलन से उनका कोई रिश्ता नहीं है। वे लकीर के फकीर होते हैं, वे दम्बू होते हैं, वे डरपोक होते हैं, वे कोई भी रिस्क लेने को तैयार नहीं होते और इसीलिए आज हर जगह, जो हमारा initiative होना चाहिए, जो हमारी पहल होनी चाहिए, वह पहल हम नहीं कर पाते और इसीलिए न तो हम अपने देश का हित कर रहे हैं और जैसा कि हमारे सत्ता पक्ष के सदस्य ने कहा कि ताकत, उनकी बात बहुत सही है। कमज़ोर की बीवी गांव की भीजाई होती है। ताकत भी ज़रूरी है, देश हित भी ज़रूरी है, स्वाभिमान, स्वतंत्रता और स्वायत्तता की रक्षा भी ज़रूरी है। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ, बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY (West Bengal): Sir, at the outset, I am very glad that the Government and the hon. Minister of External Affairs have accepted my suggestion, and what some others have also said, and this discussion is taking place, following the *suo motu* statement made by the Minister. This is a very important discussion because the Foreign Policy of any country, what it is and how it is conducted, actually defines the character of that country. And, to that extent, I think, in what the hon. Minister has said in the concluding paragraph of his statement, there are two objectives that he has outlined. One, to develop close political, social and economic relations with the countries of our region and the major powers of the world; second, to pursue our independent Foreign Policy, as dictated by our national interest. On the basis of these two objectives, there are certain concerns that I would like to place before the august House, and that is, with reference to the pressures that are there on India to change from this course. I would like to concentrate, within the available time that I have, on those issues because I agree with most of the other things that the hon. Minister has said in other paragraphs of his statement. But, are we cognisant of such pressures? And, how are we facing up to them? In that context, the first point that I would like to make is concerning paragraph 12 of the hon. Minister's statement, where he refers to the deep concern that we have over the recent events in Gaza and West Bank in Palestine. Now, the concern has been expressed, the hardship and the misery caused have been bemoaned; and we have said that we will render all assistance. But why have these hardships been caused? Who is responsible for this misery? Who is responsible for these events? Why is there not a single statement that says that the root cause of the problem in Palestine is the occupation of Palestinian land by Israel? Why has that acceptance not come? That is where my first

apprehension comes: Are we succumbing to pressures to shift the direction of our Foreign Policy? As far as Israel is concerned, I am glad that the Congress Spokesman, Mr. Raashid Alvi, has also made these observations. In fact, I was in a lighter vein thinking that these observations would be more credible speaking from here, rather than there, But the point is, I am repeating this, we have said this earlier, why is it that our defence ties with Israel are growing to such an extent when everybody knows that it is Israel, which through its occupation, is preventing the Palestinians from getting their genuine demand of a homeland. Today, India is the largest defence goods purchaser from Israel. In fact, what we buy from Israel is more than what Israel spends on its Armed Forces. Annually what Israel spends on its Armed Forces, we are buying arms of a value more than that. I have got these figures here. I can give them to you, if you are so interested. *(Interruptions)*.

**SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI:** He is denying it. Can you read out the figures?

श्री उपसभापति: शाहिद साहब, आप बैठिए। यहां बैठकर इशारों में जो बात होती है, वह रिकॉर्ड में नहीं जाती।

**SHRI SITARAM YECHURY:** On the top of this, Sir, you have launched the Israeli satellite. We, in India, are saying that it is a commercial launch. Now, I am repeating what I had said earlier on a different occasion, in this House. But what does Israel and Israel's own media and newspapers report it as?

This is the heading which appeared in Israel's most influential media paper, Haaretz: This is the heading under which it reported the news. I quote, "New Israeli spy satellite sends Iran a message." And, what does the report say? "The launch is also an expression of growing cooperation between Israel and India in the security sphere as a whole, and in particular, in the field of missiles, radar and satellites". Now, all of us know, satellites are used for spying on other countries with whom we have friendly relations. Why should India expose itself to such vulnerability? As a result of this satellite, there are apprehensions that many targets have been noted, fixed and people eliminated by Israel because we have provided them this facility. Now, by allowing ourselves to be drawn into this dragnet, are we not compromising on the two objectives that were stated in the hon. Minister's statement itself? Are we not, under pressure, compromising our foreign policy positions, and that too, with Palestine. Remember, our ties date back to pre-Independence. Our ties date back to the days of Mahatma Gandhi who had said that if French can have France, if English can have England, then, the Palestinians must have Palestine. Are we not betraying that cause today? If that is happening, is it under some pressure? If there is any pressure of that nature, we want the Government to withstand that pressure and to defeat that pressure. We will support the Government in defeating that pressure. But they should first acknowledge that this pressure is there and this is something that we will have to face and we will have to resist. In this context, what we would expect of the Government of India is to take the lead; take the lead in mobilising the Third World countries, take the lead in mobilising the developing countries in bringing about peace in West Asia. And for that, the primary pre-condition must be that Israel vacate occupied lands. For that, we urge upon this Government that this correction will have to be brought about. Otherwise, there is a big question mark that comes up on the question of the neutrality of India's foreign policy and its independent character.

The second aspect where this doubt or this apprehension arises is with regard to what is happening with Iran. Now, I will come to the Hyde Act and the Nuclear Deal subsequently. But the important part of the Hyde Act was that India should shift its policy vis-a-vis Iran. In this *suo motu* statement, there is a glaring omission as far as Iran is concerned. What is our attitude towards Iran? The gas pipeline, all of us know, is of advantage to us. We are talking



of Indo-U.S. Nuclear Deal in the backdrop of energy augmentation. The gas pipeline is the cheapest and the most efficient part of our energy augmentation. Then, why is it not happening? Why are delays taking place it? Is it the American pressure not to allow us to go ahead? Secondly, Sir, why is that the State Bank of India, a nationalised bank, not allowing some of the private parties to open LoCs to trade with Iran? Why is it that an Indian corporate entity has been threatened by the United States of America or some corporates there that if they have a joint venture in Iran, their joint venture in the United States will come under a big question mark and will be jeopardised? These are the pressures we are talking of. There is pressure on our nationalised bank, pressure on our corporate world, and pressure on the Government itself to go slow on the gas pipeline. Now, all these, actually tell us that there is a pressure, and that pressure is from the single largest superpower in the world; the United States of America. There is the United States Imperialist pressure to make India change its course in the foreign policy. We do not want this Government to change that course. We will firmly support this Government when it does not want to change the course. But we will be the first to oppose this Government if it succumbs to that pressure. This is something that we want this Government also to realise that this is not in our country's interest. As I said, this is not the real character of India which evolved over 60 years of Independence into having a foreign policy of this nature. Keeping this character in mind Sir, I would like to make a point regarding the reference made about the Indo-U.S. Nuclear Deal. I must seek your permission, Sir. We have discussed this, at least, five times in this House. I do not want to repeat what I have already said a number of times. But, there is a reference in paragraph 15 of the hon. Minister's statement which says that the Hyde Act has a provision that enables the U.S. President to make a waiver, but, it has nothing to do with India. I would be the happiest person if the Hyde Act would have nothing to do with us. But, as has been pointed out earlier, it was the US Secretary of State who was on record to state that nothing in the 123 Agreement can happen which will contravene the Hyde Act. The 123 Agreement, Sir, is anchored in the Hyde Act. If you accept the 123 Agreement as anchored in the Hyde Act, which it is, then the provisions of the Hyde Act will willy-nilly be imposed on us. Already, the pressure is there on the question of Israel and Palestine issue, already these pressures are there on the question of Iran; all are indicative that such pressures are mounting on India and the apprehension is that we are succumbing to those pressures to some degree or the other. We do not and we cannot, and will not permit this Government to succumb of these pressures and that is why we want this Government to assure us that these pressures will be resisted and in no uncertain terms, all the powers in the world will be told that India will pursue its independent Foreign Policy. In that context, Sir, I would also like to say that when these pressures are being mounted by the United States of America on India to shift its direction of Foreign Policy, the other areas in which cooperation is taking place, that is also an area of concern. Yes, we want relations with everybody including the United States of America. We stand for good relations with all countries, but that has to be on an equal basis, on a basis of mutual respect. India cannot afford to be drawn into strategic tie ups—defence tie ups, military tie ups—with the United States of America and expect that there will be no pressures put on our Foreign Policy. The moment these tie-ups are progressed further, the immediate consequence will be the pressure on your Foreign Policy. Sir, we cannot simply understand why there is a joint military, naval exercises between India, USA, Australia, Japan and Singapore. Joint military exercises, Sir, are often between countries which perceive a common enemy. Who is the common enemy between India, USA, Singapore, Australia and in this region? This is only a clear indication that we are going to be part of a regional set up under US leadership in our area. This is something we think is a very, very dangerous development because from this will follow ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAASHID ALVI: China and Pakistan. ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: No, no, Sir, I am drawing the attention of this House to this particular military exercise. The particular military exercise that I am drawing the attention of this House is to draw the linkage between strategic tie-ups in defence and security areas and the pressures that will be mounting on our Foreign Policy. The Foreign Policy pressures cannot be isolated or separated from the pressures that will mount in other areas of cooperation and that cognisance must be there is the Government's thinking. The Government cannot be satisfied, or, be under an illusion; yes, in the area of defence, I will cooperate, but they will not put any pressures on the Foreign Policy areas. No, that will not happen, Sir. Therefore, in this present situation in the world, India has, I think, a very important role to play in the modern times with its Foreign Policy direction, and that is where I think we will have to lead, lead once again, like we did once with the Non-Aligned Movement, we should lead once again the entire contingent of the developing countries in the world into resisting the attempt to impose a unipolarity on this world. India wants and we wish this Government firmly takes up this position that after the end of the Cold War bi-polarity, we want a situation of multi-polarity in the world. It is the USA which is seeking to impose unipolarity instead of allowing this multi-polarity. We have to resist those efforts. In resisting those efforts and wanting this multi-polarity, we will strengthen this Government if it takes those positions, but if it falters, we will pull this Government, not down, but we will pull this Government ...(Interruptions)... That depends on to what extent they will go and that is why on the nuclear deal we are telling them to be very careful. This is not an issue on which we can sacrifice.

श्री राशिद अल्वी: आप छेड़ते जरूर हैं, परन्तु छोड़ देते हैं। ... (व्यवधान)...

([شری شاہد صدیقی : آپ چھیڑتے ضرور ہیں، لیکن چھوڑ دیتے ہیں۔ مداخلت۔])

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: In response to what my learned friend said, I can only tell them छेड़ते जरूर हैं हम, इनको गिराकर अगर हम उनको लाएं, तो अमेरिका खुद बोल रहा है कि आधी शर्तों पर यह मान जाएंगे, समझ गए न आप। ... (व्यवधान) ... यह मैं नहीं कर रहा हूँ, यह अमेरिका के नेता कह रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एसएस अहलुवालिया (झारखंड): इनको अमेरिका से डर नहीं लगता, हमसे डर लगता है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: सर, Strobe Talbott साहब ने यह कहा कि अगर बीजेपी सत्ता में होती, तो यह न्युक्सिलयर डील इससे आधी शर्तों में मान लेती। यह हम नहीं कह रहे हैं, यह हम नहीं कर रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एसएस अहलुवालिया: Kissinger साहब, राशिद अल्वी साहब को कह गये हैं ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: देखिए, उनको Kissinger कह सकता है, आपको Strobe Talbott कह सकता है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एसएस अहलुवालिया: पता नहीं, यह किसने कहा है, ... (व्यवधान) ... ये बातें ही असत्य हैं। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: लेकिन हम तो नहीं कह रहे हैं, हम तो हिन्दुस्तानी ही कह रहे हैं ... (व्यवधान) ... हमारे लिए कोई और नहीं बोलता है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: आप इनको बोलने दीजिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: हमारी तरफ से कोई और नहीं बोलता है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: अब आप आखिरी बात बोल दीजिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Finally, Sir, I will say that as far as the overall direction in

the Foreign Policy is concerned, many positive steps have been taken by the Government. We think that the IBSA is a very, very good initiative; that India, Brazil and South Africa is a very, very good initiative in the grouping of the developing world. But we would want to see the process where this IBSA, India-Brazil-South Africa, will reach and culminate in what is normally called by the acronym BRICS, *i.e.*, Brazil-Russia-India-China-South Africa. It is this unity which we can build. These are the bricks of a modern multi-polar world and it is these bricks of multi-polarity that have to be built and what we are doing with IBSA on one hand and what we are doing with the India-China-Russia, the trilateral thing, on the other hand. Merge these two triangles to create this five-cornered BRICS, on the basis of which the new world order can be made.

Sir, I think the Government of India will have to move in this direction and resist all efforts at USA and US imperialism to change the course of our foreign policy. *...(Interruptions)...* With these words, Sir, I conclude. Thank you, Sir, for having given me this opportunity.

DR. V. MAITREYAN (Tamil Nadu): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, for giving me this opportunity.

Sir, I am the fifth speaker. Four major blocks have already spoken. The NDA has spoken, the UPA has spoken, the UNPA has spoken and the Left Front has also spoken. But it is really unfortunate that none of the four distinguished speakers have even made a passing reference about a troublesome nation and the most troublesome terror outfit and its impact on India down South. *...(Interruptions)...*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shunmugasundaram, why are you creating problem? *...(Interruptions)...* Please, the debate is going on well.

DR. V. MAITREYAN: Sir, we will have the trouble from Mr. Shunmugasundaram for one more day.

Sir, the problem of ethnic Tamils in Sri Lanka has been in existence for the last four to five decades and it has been pre-existing even prior to the Lal Bahadur Shastri-Bhandaranayaka Agreement. It is a recorded history that Tamils have been in Sri Lanka for more than last thousand years and it is also a recorded history that Sri Lanka had been ruled by the Tamil Kings for a number of years. Therefore, it is imperative that the Sri Lankan Government has to ensure that Tamils, living in the land for generations, enjoy equal rights along with other citizens. Sri Lanka should not forget that the rights enjoyed by the Sinhalese and the followers of Buddhism are likewise enjoyed by the Tamils. Hence, I share the sentiments expressed by Pranabda on this issue in para 8.

Sir, the AIADMK is of the considered view that there is no military solution to the conflict and that there should be a peacefully negotiable political settlement within the framework of a united Sri Lanka, acceptable to all communities, including the Tamils. The Sri Lankan Tamils should live with dignity. I urge the Union Government to take all measures to see that the Sri Lankan Government implements the 13th Amendment at the earliest with all sincerity. I also want to reiterate the AIADMK is opposed to terrorism of any sort, including, the LTTE.

Of late, it has become the order of the day that the National Security Adviser makes some controversial statement every now and then, and, a few days later, the PMO denies it. On 16th March, the National Security Adviser went to Kerala and he mentioned that there are presence of LTTE pockets in Tamil Nadu and Kerala.

Yesterday, the PMO has denied it. I am at a loss to understand who is speaking untruth. Is it the NSA or the PMO? The hon. Minister should clarify what the real position is. Is the NSA echoing the correct picture or the PMO echoing the correct picture? The Minister has also mentioned about the frequent killings of the Tamil Nadu fishermen by the Sri Lankan Navy and said that the Government has impressed on the Sri Lankan Navy to act with restraint. At this juncture, I would like to recall the giving away of Katchatheevu in 1974 by the then Union Government headed by the late Prime Minister, late Shrimati Indira Gandhi. This has stripped Tamil Nadu's rights at the international level. Mr. Karunanidhi was the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu at that time and he\* the State by accepting the proposal. The fishermen from Sri Lanka and Tamil Nadu used to take part in a Church festival in Katchatheevu every year but now that right has been snatched away from the Tamil Nadu fishermen.

SHRI TIRUCHI SIVA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, the use of the word\* could have been avoided. You know it better. This was not warranted. He has said ...*(Interruptions)*... This should be removed from the records, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The word\* may be removed...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. V. MAITREYAN: I urge the Union Government to take immediate steps to retrieve Katchatheevu back for India.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The word\* is removed. ...*(Interruptions)*... \* is not the right word; how can you say that?

DR. V. MAITREYAN: It is there in history, Sir. You may remove it from the records here, but it is there in history...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please go ahead.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Puducherry): Sir, I wish to seek some clarification.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have removed the word. What is there to seek clarification?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I want a clarification. I am on a different point, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Where is the issue of clarification? ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. V. MAITREYAN: I am not yielding, Sir. Is he on a Point of Order? I am not yielding, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: He is reading...*(Interruptions)*... He is reading from a written text.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is not reading. He is taking notes. ...*(Interruptions)*... What you are saying is not going on the record.

DR. V. MAITREYAN: I urge the Union Government to take immediate steps to retrieve Katchatheevu back for India. Referring to China, the Minister mentioned about the joint document that reflects the congruence of interests shared between India and China on regional and international issues. China's stand on Arunachal Pradesh being an integral part of India, the construction of the dam in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir and the claim for ten thousand square miles of Indian territory, all these are contrary to the convergence of interests, about which the Minister is boasting. And now China's bulldozing the legitimate protest demonstrations in Tibet has been condemned by one and all. I urge the Minister to clearly explain our stand on Tibet.

The Minister in para 14 mentioned about the negotiations with the IAEA on the India-specific Safeguards Agreement. On 17th March, the Left parties have been briefed about the various aspects of the draft agreement. It is rather unfortunate that when the Parliament is in session, the House is kept in the dark about this, while the ruling UPA and its allies are busy in discussing it outside. This, inspite of the assurance given by the Prime Minister that this august House will be kept informed at every possible step. I request the Minister to throw enough light on this also. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri D. Raja. Please be brief because we have a lot of speakers. And Mr. Narayanasamy, we will be able to close the debate early, if you do not.... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI D. RAJA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, thank you for this opportunity. I would like to confine myself to only a few things. Firstly, the UPA Government is a coalition Government, which has a very limited mandate. This limited mandate is reflected in the Common Minimum Programme. If one goes through that Common Minimum Programme, the portion which deals with Foreign Policy matters is very clear and categorical. The UPA Government, while engaging with the United States of America, would pursue an independent Foreign Policy. And the UPA Government will fight against unilateralism in the conduct of international relations, rather it will promote multilateralism. My point is, whether the UPA Government pursues such an independent foreign policy to flight the unilateralism in the conduct of international relations, to uphold the multilateralism in the conduct of international relations. The US has a grand design for Asia. This has been said by the US officials themselves and the US is trying to drag India into its global strategy. I want to know whether India is coming under pressure from the US to become a strategic partner and a military ally of the US. The developments show that there are concerns. The UPA Government was not effective in condemning US as was expected. I do not want to refer to many issues what happened in relation to Iran or what happened in relation to Palestinian people. Many people have spoken on it. But I would like to point out one or two other issues. My friend spoke on Sri Lanka. In fact, the Government of Sri Lanka and the Government of USA have entered into an agreement which is a kind of logistic support agreement. So far, the Government of India has not said anything on this agreement. That is why I said that the US has got a grand design for Asia. I listened to the LOP also. He spoke for a long time and, finally, only one point emerged. He says that the US policies failed in Asia. Whether he feels sorry for it or he feels very happy about it, I am not able to understand it. But he has mentioned that it is a failure of US policies. I charge the US policies which are responsible for the political turmoil that is being witnessed in Asian part of the world and we will have to understand this and the policies of the US pose great threat to the stability and peace in this region. Here comes the role of India. Once India had a proud place in the history. India was the leader of the Non-aligned Movement. But where is India today? Who looks up to India today? You can claim that India's policy is a policy of non-alignment. But where is that policy today; and why people are not looking up to India? India is succumbing to the US and US definitely wants India on its side. Israel is on their side in West Asia. In South Asia, they want India to be on their side and they want to see India as a country to play the role of Israel. Can we agree to this? The UPA Government will have to think. If the BJP feels sorry about the failures of the US policy, then their position is very clear. Therefore, the US wants to have upper hand in Asian part of the world to which we cannot agree. In this situation, I think the Sri Lankan development will have to be understood. My friend has been speaking about Sri Lanka. In fact, he must speak about the human rights violations that are taking place in Sri Lanka. How the children

have been dying in Sri Lanka? How the widows in Sri Lanka are suffering? He must speak on those humanitarian issues how the people are suffering there. Rather he is speaking on certain other things. Yes, Kachatheevu is a concern. But who did the Kachatheevu Agreement? It was done by the Union Government. It was not in the domain of the State Government. You cannot accuse the State Government for that. It was an Agreement between the Union Government and Government of Sri Lanka. If there is a need to review that Agreement, let us all do it. Let there be a political consensus. Kachatheevu Agreement needs to be reviewed in today's context. If Sri Lanka behave like that, we cannot tolerate such a thing. Yesterday also I asked, why Sri Lanka deployed sea-mines and what is the response of our Government? The Defence Minister is sitting here. The External Affairs Minister, respected Shri Pranab Mukherjee, is sitting here. I would like to know from the Government what is the response of the union Government when a neighbouring country, a friendly country, deploys sea mines. Is it, in any way, in tune with the international norms? How do you explain this? Why should India keep quiet? A war-like situation is turning to be a war against people of Tamil there. I am not arguing for any particular organisation. I am simply speaking for the interest of the suffering Tamil people there. I am very happy that Pranab came out with a statement that military solution is not the answer there. Everybody should strive for a political solution. But, what is the political solution? Yes, people are talking about article 13 of IPKF. In fact, that was originally part of IPKF Agreement between India and Sri Lanka. But, where does it stand now? Now, we will have to strive for a political solution in Sri Lanka. Having said this, I must say that these are the issues which we will have to address now. *(Time-bell)* India has to play a proactive role and India should take up the initiative to fight sinister designs of the U.S. in our region. Here, I argue that the Government of India should develop relations with China and Russia. If the relation and cooperation among China, Russia and India develop, that can, in fact, change the balance of global forces. It can change the alignment of political forces in favour of peace and stability in the world. In that context, we should see the Nuclear Agreement. I am not getting into a debate here. We have had enough discussions on Hyde Act, whether it is the enabling legislation for 123 Agreement or not. They themselves have agreed that this is the enabling legislation for 123 Agreement. Why should we break our heads as though it is something which cannot be understood? Now, it is for us to decide whether that Agreement is in our favour. And, we think it is not in our favour. That is why, we are asking the Government not to proceed further to operationalise it. On the other hand, as far as the position of BJP is concerned, I do not know whether they have any stand on this issue. ...*(Interruptions)*... So, that is their problem. The country should know their position also.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, conclude.

SHRI D. RAJA: What I am trying to say is that it is good that the hon. Minister has come out with a statement, particularly explaining the developments in our neighbouring countries and Government's handling of the situation in Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal. I appreciate the Government for its very realistic approach to these developments. But, in South, when we move towards South India, Indian Ocean, Sri Lanka, the Government of India will have to rework its strategy and its approach, particularly in the context of the escalation of military conflict in Sri Lanka.

Above all, we will have to see the sinister designs of the U.S. in our region. It is most dangerous and we will have to fight the imperialist policies of the U.S. Unless India stands up, inspires and leads the developing countries, it cannot claim to be the leader of non-alignment movement which is the proud policy of India.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, I am grateful to hon. Minister of External Affairs for having brought a very consolidated and a detailed statement on the foreign policy framework of this Government. There, he has touched upon India's policy towards neighbouring countries. Sir, I could find from the speech of hon. Member from the other side that they want India's foreign policy to be dictated by their own party policy. In the last sentence of his statement, the hon. External Affairs Minister has said, "our ability to pursue our independent foreign policy as dictated by our national interest." It has been made very clear by the hon. External Affairs Minister.

Hon. Member, Shri Raashid Alvi, touched upon various issues. I will confine myself to the problems being faced by ethnic Indians in Sri Lanka and Malaysia. I am grateful to the hon. External Affairs Minister that whenever the issue of ethnic Tamils, who have been suppressed in those two countries, came up, he intervened in the matter and was able to find a solution. Sir, I have to make request to the hon. External Affairs Minister. Sir, HINDRAF, people who have been treated as second-class citizens, the Indians in Malaysia also agitated. In the recently held elections, the party led by veteran Tamil leader, Samuel, who had been fighting for the rights of the Tamil Malaysia defeated the ruling group. This sent a message that the Tamils are united there and they wanted to protect their political interests in Malaysia. Now, Sir, the Government bowed down and five people of Tamil origin were made Ministers in the Government of Malaysia. Therefore Sir, due to the right intervention of the hon. External Affairs Minister, the Tamils were protected in the Malaysia. Sir, I would like the support, for those ethnic Indians, by the Government of India, in Malaysia, to continue. This is what I would like to Submit to the hon. External Affairs Minister.

Sir, a lot of things have been mentioned about Sri Lanka. Sir, as far as Sri Lanka is concerned, India's position is very clear that whatever is happening in Sri Lanka is related to their internal affairs, and India cannot interfere in their internal affairs. But, on the contrary, our Indian Government cannot close its eyes when Indians, people of India origin living in Sri Lanka are being killed there. From time to time, our Government, our hon. External Affairs Minister, in fact, right from our Leader Rajivji, we intervened whenever ethnic Tamils were ill treated or massacred there.

There are two issues as far as Sri Lanka is concerned. One is protecting the Tamils who are living in Sri Lanka and the atrocities committed by the militant organisations and killing the other Tamil groups who are living in Sri Lanka. This is a very vital issue because India cannot interfere in the internal affairs of Sri Lanka. But on the other hand, what is happening in Tamil Nadu. Sir, due to the war that is taking place between the Sri Lankan Government and the LTTE, lot of people have started coming to Tamil Nadu and have taken asylum in Tamil Nadu. Now, the Tamil Nadu has to protect the Sri Lankan Tamils who have come there. Sir, I am not going into the politics of it. I would like to submit to the hon. External Affairs Minister that when they have come to our territory and they want protection or asylum here, it is the duty of our Government, not only of the Tamil Nadu Government but also of the Central Government to protect the interest of those people. That is number one.

Secondly, Sir, the fishermen of Tamil Nadu have been harassed by the Sri Lankan Navy. From time to time, this matter has been brought up in this august House. We have also raised it before the hon. External Affairs Minister. He has taken up the issue with the Sri Lankan Government several times. What is happening there? In the name of international maritime boundary, when the Indian people, the fishermen from Tamil Nadu go to the sea and accidentally cross over to the international border, which they do not know, the Sri Lankan Navy intercepts, and due to this, some of the fishermen have been killed recently.

Sir, I would like to submit to the hon. External Affairs Minister and also the defence Minister, who is here, that our Coast guard in the Southern Coast has to be strengthened. When our fishermen accidentally enter into the Sri Lankan waters, Sri Lankan Navy intercepts and kills our fishermen, which leads to a tense situation in the southern coastal areas of Tamil Nadu. For this, neither the State Government is at fault nor the Central Government is at fault. Moreover, they have been taken as prisoners also. Our Fishermen from Tamil Nadu have been taken as prisoners by the Sri Lankan Navy. They have been put in prison. After the intervention of the Government of India, they have been released. The hon. Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu also wrote letter to the hon. Prime Minister. On the intervention of the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, action has been taken by the Government of India, Sir, it has become a ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI D. RAJA: What is the collaboration between the Coast Guards and the Sri Lankan Navy? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, now the focal point, as the hon. Member, Mr. Raja, has said, is Kachatheevu. Under an agreement, it has been given to Sri Lanka by the Government of India. Now, a consensus is emerging among the political parties in Tamil Nadu. Kachatheevu, which has been held by Sri Lanka, has become a focal point. Our fishermen go there because there is a church. Our fishermen go there, they dry their nets there, and they stay there for cooking their food. During this process, our fishermen are being harassed and they are provoked. There is a consensus emerging among the political leaders in Tamil Nadu that the Government of India should intervene at this stage and see that the Kachatheevu is given back to India, so that our Indian fishermen are not harassed by the Sri Lankan Navy. Sir, it is a very, very important aspect.

Whenever tensions arise in Sri Lanka, whenever there is a semblance of war, the Sri Lankan people who are coming to India, as Rajaji said, are laying sea-mines there. Thereafter, the Sri Lankan Navy indiscriminately fire at our people when they go to sea. It has now become a regular phenomenon. I want the hon. External Affairs Minister to take up this matter with the Government of Sri Lanka and protect our Indian fishermen. It is a very important thing. Otherwise, there will be a law and order problem in the southern coast of Tamil Nadu. I want the hon. Foreign Affairs Minister to look into it.

The final point, which I would like to submit for the consideration of the hon. External Affairs Minister, is this. While chairing the 29th Session of the SAARC Council of Ministers, some important decisions have been taken. They were: to operationalise the SAARC Development Fund, the Asian University, and the SAARC Food Bank. All these decisions have been taken for implementation. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs where this university will be set up. I want to know whether it would be set up in India. If it will be in India, I would be grateful to the hon. Minister.

Apart from that, the SAARC organisation, which has been interacting on various international issues of Asian Countries, has to be further strengthened not only at the Ministerial level but also at the level of the Foreign Affairs Ministry Officials, so that whatever the differences that are arising, whether at political or diplomatic level, can be resolved by all the countries together.

SHRI TARLOCHAN SINGH (Haryana): Sir, I am thankful to the External Affairs Minister for getting temporary relief for Sarabjit Singh and we hope that we will get permanent relief.



Sir, in the Statement of the Minister, there is a small paragraph on Pakistan. Sir, our main need is to have best of the relations with Pakistan, because that has been one country where we had many troubles. So I have a few suggestions to make.

Sir, the entry of the people on both sides was facilitated and, on that account, we got better relations with different types of people who came here. When Pakistan was formed, lakhs of people migrated. Punjab was divided and people from this part of Punjab went to that part of Punjab and people from that part of Punjab came to this side of Punjab. That generation is fading. The people, who were born before 1947, have one wish. Everybody wants to come to his ancestral home. Before death one wants to see his birth place. Why can't India and Pakistan agree to this? This is now a dying generation where there are not many people. Allow everyone. They should visit their birth places. Give them a permit for five days so that they can come to India and Indian people can go to Pakistan. Sir, even when Musharraf came to India, he went to his own house in Daryaganj and we know how he was received by the people there. If you do this, you will get so much support from both sides that they and their children will worship you because everybody is interested in seeing his ancestral place.

Secondly, Sir, You have started a bus after a demand for 20 years from Amritsar to Nankana Sahib. But, the problem with this is, nobody can get visa and security permit because you require 15 days. Why can't India and Pakistan open their consulates in Amritsar and Lahore? If you open these two consulates, visas will be very easier and people from both sides will travel easily. Sir, you are always trying to have relations with all countries. I suggested earlier, but, nobody listened. Guru Nanak is the only prophet in India who visited many countries 500 years ago. He visited Sri Lanka. He visited Tibet. He went to Iran, Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Pakistan and other places. You organise *Iftar* parties. We like it. It is good. But, why can't you organize some functions to commemorate the visit of Guru Nanak in the embassies in those countries, by inviting scholars and people? You will create a new goodwill. After all, only then, people will know his teachings. Guru Nanak stayed in Saudi Arabia and Mecca for two months. He is, perhaps, the only non-Muslim who was allowed to go to Mecca. He stayed in Baghdad. There is still a place in his name. He stayed in Iran, Afghanistan, etc. There are temples, Why can't Indian embassies be asked to organise some functions in memory of Guru Nanak? That will spread a good message.

Sir, Our NRIs are always playing a good role. You have done very well. You have provided them dual citizenship and you are aware that when India needed support of the American Congressmen, Maximum NRIs were requested. They all went together to help Indian embassy and, with their help, you got maximum number of Congressmen to vote for India at that time. Now, an Indian, Bobby Jindal, first time ever, has been elected as the Governor of a State; and there are Members of Parliament even in Canada. One Indian was elected as the Prime Minister of a State. Indians are in Singapore, Kuala Lumpur and everywhere. But, the problem is, you have a black list. You don't allow certain type of people to visit India. They cannot even come to attend wedding or funeral of their relatives in Punjab. To visit the Golden Temple is the wish of Every Sikh. Why don't you allow a temporary visa for five days to those who want to come to their ancestral place? This will not harm your security. If somebody wants to do wrong, he can do it sitting there. But, if you allow them to visit their home places and the Golden Temple, this will be of much help and you will create goodwill among them that they will remember you for ever.

Sir, people in Afghanistan were ousted because of Taliban. They went either to India or

5.00 P.M.

the UK or America. Those who went to the UK and America, they were given proper benefits and help by those countries, but those in India are just roaming hither and thither. So far, India has not tried to help the poor Hindus and Sikhs who are here. Their number is only twenty thousand. I have been pleading their case day in, day out that for God's sake, allow them a permanent residence. They cannot go back to Afghanistan. The situation has not improved there. If we can't allow these twenty thousand people, how are you allowing two crore Bangladeshis? These twenty thousand people are always asked to go. Every time, you say, your permit is over. Give them proper citizenship. They should be allowed to stay permanently here, and they should be given temporary visa so that they can go back to Kabul. This will be a good gesture on the part of the Government of India to have them here. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now, Dr. Keshava Rao, the last speaker.

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद (बिहार): सर, हमारी पार्टी को कोई समय नहीं दिया गया। दो मिनट दे दीजिए।

श्री उपसभापति: आप उधर बैठे हैं, मैंने देखा तो वहाँ नहीं थे। आप migrate हो गए, तो मैं क्या करूँ?

DR. K. KESHAVA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, we have the statement before us which is extensive in coverage, though not exhaustive. So, to complain that it does not contain details as to who is responsible, and where and what should have been left since it is a matter of policy formulation, which the Ministry would look into. Although, we in this House, do give expression to our own feelings, it is true as my friend, Mr. Yechury has said that the way we conduct the foreign affairs, determines the character of a nation, and our own body and our policy formulations. That is why, this statement speaks more about the neighbours than the whole foreign policy as such. I remember having heard the erudite Foreign Minister here who said; "love the neighbours" is the philosophy which has been guiding us as far as our regional cooperation is concerned. And that has been the basis of our foreign policy, from the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru or even Mahatma Gandhi's enlightenment. Whatever it is, if that be so, we have good relations. I would give hundred per cent marks. Our attempt is to have very good relations with our neighbours. Now, Mr. Yechury thinks that if I talk about the nuclear deal or if I talk about Gaza or similar things that he has mentioned, I would not be that credible as he is because he has a "label" to him. Unfortunately, I could not acquire that label although I was born in the four walls of the Marxist literature. I always thought that I am a Marxist, but after having heard him and also the West Bengal leaders in the recent past. I thought it better that I should shun that label. Now, the question today is, going to Gaza. Can my friends from the Left tell me a single statement from this country where we have denied our support to Palestine. Take for instance, Iran. Can you refer to a single statement where we have not gone and stood by Iran about which you have made a reference? Can you give me a single example or a single stance where we have not been condemning the US as far as Iraq is concerned? All things being there, they being in place, and you having supported us on such stances, still you have find an art in finding fault with this Government, vis-a-vis the foreign policy. Now, since my friends have talked about this, I do not want to take much time of the House. Since my friends have talked also about the issues which I wanted to touch, I will not touch them too. One issue which my friends really missed, although Mr. Narayanasamy tried to refer to it, is SAARC. Sir, with heavy heart, I would like to say that though 23 years have passed since SAARC came into existence, it has not reached any stage of maturity. Nothing could be said with pride as far as SAARC is concerned. They have always tried to make necessary changes in the traditional economic parameters but in

vain. Although recently we had the summit where we promised entering into a new phase of "implementation", giving up the age of declarations, I do not know what we have done. ASEAN union, still remains far away from us. The SAPTA remains dormant. In SAFTA, still there is no cooperation from the important countries like Pakistan and others. Although we know that SAARC represents today almost 80 per cent of the least developed countries, yet we have not really made much progress as far as SAARC is concerned. This is one area in which this Government need to do more in trying to have this regional formations. This is the one area relating to the foreign policy where both the Commerce Ministry and the Foreign Affairs Ministry must join together and coordinate to see that we lead Asia so that tomorrow it becomes an area where we can fight poverty, then only this development and all talk of peace will become fruitful. Sir, you know SAFTA continues to be sluggish. The eminent persons group has given the recommendations. It has not found yet any nod of implementation. The promise to reduce tariff to zero to 5 per cent by 2013-16 remains on paper only, and I am afraid, by the time you reach 2016, what will happen is that the WTO will further reduce their rates in such a manner that your calculations in SAARC become redundant. Sir, as far as Ceylon is concerned, I first, though, I would, rather, speak on Sri Lanka. Since both Mr. Raja and Mr. Narayanasamy, had some kind of a difference in their perceptions. Say militarisation is no answer. It is not simply an internal policy, an internal matter of Sri Lanka, alone. We agree but, at the same time, we are as much concerned about the Sri Lankan Tamils as they are, because a nation is not made of geographical boundaries, but is made of the people. That is why, in the Consultative Committees also, the Members have been stressing on this point and making a lot of emphasis on it that militarisation is no answer and something more is required to be done, whether it is 13th Amendment of the IPKF Act that you have talked about, or whether it is a review of that, because it has become obsolete and since it is not serving the purpose. Sir, immediately, we have to address the Malaysian issue. Now, the Government there has changed. Malaysia has come to know the way they have dealt with our Indians there. It is not that the same Government which is in place now. But what has happened, today, is that they have realised the validity of the Indian people's grievances. I hope that the Government would, now, at least, intervene because time has become some kind of opportune for us; we can intervene to see that the problems of Indians living in Malaysia are solved in their favour and in our good because you are trying to lead the SAARC.

Sir, coming to Myanmar, although we do not like to interfere in their affairs, yet it is a matter of deep concern for us because they are the nearest neighbour to us. The U.N. Special Envoy has gone there. The regime still continues to be as adamant as ever before, and unless our moral pressure is going to bring some kind of a sense in the rulers of that nation, I think, we would be failing as leaders of the ASEAN Group — I am not trying to say it is "one-upmanship *vis-a-vis* UN, nonetheless, as a big a nation as India is, we need to play that much role in Myanmar.

Sir, in Afghanistan, the situation is very bad. If we look back to all the neighbouring countries, we will notice that although we always love all the neighbours, yet the things are not that good. As far as Pakistan is concerned, things, I think, are opening up. It is an opportune time for us that we not only begin to have comprehensive talks, but also adopt some innovative methods whereby people-to-people contacts are fortified and the rulers there, with a new heart, with a new approach, are able to solve the problems.

Sir, I know tell you what is good in this debate on foreign affairs. Despite all the differences in the perceptions of the Members belonging to all the parties, the Opposition parties too,

we always agree that we need to have a policy that serves our national interests, that serves the humanity best as a whole. That being the sole criterion of a foreign policy, although the statement that you gave needs some more 'elan' to it, at the same time, the policy that you are yet to make in a few other countries like Myanmar, Malaysia, Sri Lanka or Pakistan should be formulated.

The last word; only one sentence, Sir, on our nuclear deal which the House has debated at length, which has taken more than two or three days. So, I would not like to say much. I would like to only remind my friends sitting on the left that since you are much more strong on that issue, you should also know that in a democracy, there is another party which while sharing with you the sentiments, feels equally strong which also totally shares that they should not come under the influence or the dictates of you or any country, whether unipolar or biopolar. Let us forget all that. Gone are the days of unipolar system. The entire unipolar system is shattered, is dismantled. Today, America does not stand as a unipolar economic power. It was quite possible only when Russia was there; you had biopolar political and economic powers. But, today, there is nothing like any unipolar power at all. What is now known is a multipolar system. Till the multipolar system comes to grips with situation or till it emerges strong what we have to do is we should understand each other in the age of new need to which we are being exposed, to which we would be introduced tomorrow with a nuclear deal. That should not be forgotten. If the Left Parties strongly feel about the nuclear deal as they do, the Congress Party also equally feels strong about the nuclear deal because it opens up a new era of development, a new era of power, a new era of technology, but without compromising with others. But the thing is that we need to match the contradictions. You should not unnecessarily get into the confusion of 123 Agreement being anchored into the Hyde Act or the Hyde Act being anchored into the 123 Agreement. They are entirely different. You will understand it if you go through the Constitution of America. If you have still doubts, these are matters to be better left to the Ministries or our Government. They would never try to compromise on the national interests. They would never compromise on anything that you have objection to. So, I am telling you, with your cooperation, with all of us joining together, knowing well each other's perceptions, objections and strong points, let us work together and solve the problem. The nuclear deal is not only a strategic deal but also an economic deal. It is all comprehensive and I look at the nuclear deal or the 123 Agreement as a new era of technology. It is an accord. It is some kind of a deal which is opening up or heralding a new age of technology. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Rajniti Prasad. Your party has three minutes.

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद: उपसभापति जी, आपने मुझे इस महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर बोलने का समय दिया इसके लिए आपका धन्यवाद। मैं इस विषय में विस्तार में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन मैं यहाँ केवल एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि महात्मा गांधी जी ने यह कहा था कि - "one man is important." एक आदमी बहुत important होता है और मनुष्य को एक आदमी के लिए सब कुछ करना चाहिए। पूरा सदन इस बात का गवाह है कि एक आदमी, जिसको फांसी पर लटकाने की तारीख तय हो गई थी, उसके बारे में एक स्वर से हम लोगों ने कहा कि नहीं, ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए, सारे लोगों की यही भावना थी और मैं विदेश मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि 18 तारीख को इन्होंने यह स्टेटमेंट दिया और उनके प्रयास से, हमारे लोगों की भावनाओं के संदर्भ में, विदेश मंत्री जी ने आज हमें यह अच्छा समाचार दिया है कि पाकिस्तान ने हमारी बात को सुन लिया है, इसके लिए मैं विदेश मंत्री जी को बहुत-बहुत बधाई और धन्यवाद देता हूँ और अपनी पार्टी की ओर से भी उनको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने यह प्रयास किया और सरबजीत सिंह की फांसी अभी

30 तारीख के लिए टल गई है। हमको लगता है कि यदि आप थोड़ा और ज्यादा प्रयास करेंगे, तो जिस तरह से कश्मीरा सिंह छूटकर आया है, उसी तरह सरबजीत भी छूटकर आ जाएगा।

उपसभापति जी, मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह कौन सा कानून है कि 35-35 साल तक, 40-40 साल तक किसी आदमी को आप वहाँ रखे हुए हैं, यह कौन सा कानून है? हमारे यहाँ अगर ऐसी कोई घटना घटती है, तो उसका trial करते हैं। मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि कश्मीरा सिंह, वहाँ की जेल से छूटकर भारत में आया, 35 साल तक उसको पाकिस्तान में जेल में बंद रखा गया। मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से यह निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि इसकी इक्यायरी होनी चाहिए कि कैसे 35-35 साल तक, 40-40 साल तक किसी आदमी को आप वहाँ रखे हुए हैं, बहुत लोगों के बारे में तो पता ही नहीं है कि वे कहाँ हैं, वे लापता हैं। इसकी इक्यायरी होनी चाहिए। अगर हमारे यहाँ Rule of Law है, अगर हमने यहाँ कुछ लोगों को रखा है, तो हम उनका trial करते हैं, हम उनको सजा देते हैं और सजा के बाद उनको रखते हैं, लेकिन आप 35-35 साल तक, 40-40 साल तक किसी आदमी को आजीवन रखें, उसका क्या हुआ, किसी को पता ही नहीं है, उसके परिवार को ही पता नहीं है कि वह कहाँ है, इसकी भी जानकारी जरूर होनी चाहिए। यदि आप ऐसा करेंगे, तो हमारी जो दूसरे देशों के साथ Foreign Policy है, हमको लगता है कि उसमें बहुत इज़ाफा होगा। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, मैं आपको पुनः धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि सरबजीत सिंह को आपने जीवन की थोड़ी झाँकी दिखाई है, हमें लगता है कि 30 तारीख के बाद भी वह बच जाएगा। धन्यवाद।

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, the Leader of the Opposition is not here. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): No problem. He told me about it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He had already said about it.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: While making his speech, the hon. Leader of the Opposition told that he has other commitments. That is why he had to go. Prior to that, before he made his observations, he came and told me about it. Sometimes, it happens, we have other engagements. We should not mind it.

श्रीमती सुष्मा स्वराज (मध्य प्रदेश): सर, आज आडवाणी जी की पुस्तक का विमोचन है, उसमें वे अतिथि के तौर पर बोलने वाले हैं, इसीलिए वे गए हैं, लेकिन हम दोनों यहाँ बैठे हैं। हम लोग उस function में केवल इसीलिए नहीं गए कि propriety demands कि अगर वे नहीं हैं, तो कम से कम हम लोग बैठें।

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: We understand that. We appreciate that.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the very outset, I would like to express my gratitude to all the hon. Members who have participated and have made their contributions on the *suo moto* statement which I made on the floor of this House on 3rd March, 2008. On that very day, Sushmaji herself suggested that at some point of time, instead of seeking clarifications, as the statement was a bit comprehensive, it would be better to have a full-fledged discussion on it. Therefore, we are having this discussion, and, I am indeed grateful to the hon. Members for participating in it, and making their contributions.

Sir, a large number of issues have arisen. First of all, I would like to make quite clear that in the very first paragraph of my *suo motu* statement, I mentioned, "during the inter-sessional

period, the Government has made vigorous efforts to promote our objective of an external environment that enables India's accelerated development efforts...." and "I rise to apprise the House of developments related to foreign policy since the conclusion of the Winter Session". Therefore, you will notice that in this Statement I have referred to only those countries where certain developments took place between the Winter Session and the current Session. Therefore, if there is an omission of Iran or there is an omission of Iraq, that has nothing to do with my deliberate action or any pressure from any quarter. It is simply because of the fact that between these two Sessions, in the inter-session period, there has not been any major development. Some developments always take place, in some countries, but I was talking only of major developments I thought that I should like to clarify that point.

Sir, another point which the hon. Leader of Opposition stated is this. Naturally, as he was an experienced Foreign Minister who served this country since 1998. I think, only for one year, he went to the Finance Ministry, but rest of the period of that six years, he served as the Foreign Minister of this country. And, even before assuming that office, he was engaged in discussions with his interlocutor from USA. So, he knows this subject. He has wondered why in paragraph 3, we have used the word 'boundary', not the words, 'Line of Actual Control' which normally India and China earlier used in their documents or in their statements. Perhaps, the Leader of the Opposition will recollect that even up to 2003 this phrase was used. But in June, 2003, when Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee visited China, and the institution of the Special Representatives representing the two Prime Ministers of the two countries was set up, the word 'boundary' was used, to settle the boundary issues between India and China; thereafter, we are using this word. It is neither any omission, nor it is being done casually, nor is it conveying any other sense. That institution, the Special Representatives of the two Prime Ministers has met several times; they have an agreement on political parameters and guiding principles, and now they are engaged in working out a framework in which a just, fair and mutually acceptable settlement of the boundary issue between the two countries is to be arrived at. I thought that I should clarify these two technical issues at the very beginning.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to respond to some of the issues. First of all, let me make it quite clear that there is continuity in our foreign policy. Foreign policy of a country is not in isolation. Foreign policy of a country, as one hon. Member has very correctly pointed out, and it is true, is advancement of our national interest in the context of the contemporary world. Therefore, from time to time, there will have to be adjustments, there will have to be additions and alterations. But, the basic principles, the fundamentals of the foreign policy of a country, are based on its own civilization, history and culture. Therefore, India's foreign policy is also based on its civilization, culture, its history and its commitments. When I enter into these doors, I have noticed; Sir, all of you have noticed that at almost every door, there are some quotations from various scriptures and various other texts. One such quotation is written somewhere: *vasudhaiva kutumbakam*, the whole universe is my family. Here, it is written: *ekam sad-vipraa bahudhaa vadanti*. These are the basic philosophical frames, which also epitomise the basic tenets of our policy, that we want to expand our friendship.

Therefore, when we talk of the five principles, it is not just a slogan. Indian foreign policy is based on five principles which was evolved in 1954 in discussions between India and China. What are those basic five principles? Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity

and sovereignty; mutual non-aggression; mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs; equality and mutual benefit; and, peaceful co-existence. These two great nations, India and China—India became Independent in 1947, China was Independent but there was a change in the system, a new regime came and, thereafter, on the basis of these five principles, our bilateral relations developed over the years. What was basically between India and China, ultimately, became the fundamental principle of conducting the foreign policy to many of the developing countries, almost all developing countries which joined the Non-Aligned Movement. They accepted these as their basic principles of the foreign policy. And we are continuing to have that. Therefore, there had not been any basic changes there. During this period, whoever has come to the Government, they have accepted these principles, guided their policies in the context of these principles. Of course, there will have to be certain adjustments, certain reallocation of the priorities in the context of the changing world. Two important international institutions were established immediately after the Second World War, one was IBRD, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, that is, World Bank, and another was International Monetary Fund. But there was a third leg, which was missing, that was GATT, which later on came in 1994 as the WTO. Now a large number of countries have joined them, these organisations. Those are the institutional arrangements. When we began our Non-alignment Movement, there was no existence of WTO, there was no such a huge trade agreement where a large number of countries would participate, or where a large number of economic activities would be brought within its parameters. Therefore, when these changes take place, naturally, they will get reflected in the foreign policies of the country. In the days of the Cold War when there was Super Power rivalry, the type of foreign policy, which we used to have, to some extent, it will lose its relevance in the context when the Cold War has come to an end. And I would not say it has become unipolar world, because in my own observations in one of the public addresses in Carnegie Foundation in the USA, sometime in 2005, I said that 'I do not subscribe to this view.' This is a multipolar world. Somebody militarily may be very powerful, but somebody may be equally very powerful in economic muscle. Therefore, there is a multi-polar world. There are various poles and, moreover, certain countries, certain economies are emerging. Why? In our foreign policy, even in my own statement, I have emphasised on building up our relationship with China and this aspect has to be kept in view. One hon. Member, representing Samajwadi Party, also mentioned quoting Dr. Lohia very correctly, that is the ground reality. At one point of time, not far-off period, contribution of India and China taken together was nearly 60 per cent of the world output. After the industrial revolution in Europe, after colonisation and some sort of deprivation in China, our positions were down and today again that possibility is there. When you talk of the Asian Century, this century being the Asian Century, we talk of emerging power of India and China. But how could we achieve it—through rivalry? Through confrontation? through tension? Or through cooperation and co-existence? Therefore, if a statesman while visiting India points out, "I would like to convey to the international community that there is enough space for India and China to grow together and we are determined that India and China grow together", surely we should welcome that statement and we should try to work on it. That does not mean that there will be no problem or problem areas, there will be no divergence of opinion, there will be no differences of approach. There will be and it will be our endeavour to sort out those differences, to convert the divergences of views into convergence of views. To my mind, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, most respectfully I would like to submit, that is the job of those who are conducting the Foreign Policy of this country, to convert the divergences into convergence. Yes, we have differences of opinion in respect of Arunachal Pradesh and the Prime Minister's visit. The Leader of the Opposition

has quoted very extensively from some expert's opinion. I am not disputing that. Yes, they have their own perceptions. They have their own views. We have our own perceptions. When they — not formally, but informally — placed a demarche to our Embassy about the visit of our Prime Minister to Arunachal Pradesh, immediately I responded by saying that Arunachal Pradesh is an integral part of our country, we are having representatives of the people of the area in our Parliament and it is quite natural that if there had not been development, particularly, infrastructural facilities were not built up on this side of the border of an important international border, if Prime Minister visits and assures the people of Arunachal Pradesh that the Government of India is fully aware of their developmental requirement and the package is being declared, it is quite natural and quite consistent with the policies. That is the policy we have stated. Therefore, I do not feel that there is any inherent contradiction in these approaches. It has been stated, hon. Leader of the Opposition also mentioned about Sikkim. I am aware of the problem of Sikkim. But unlike the McMahon line, the boundary between Sikkim and China was settled in Anglo-Sikkim Convention of 1890. Physically, it has not been delineated but both sides have agreed and accepted their position. There have been some occasions where some bunkers have been destroyed and some activities have taken place, but it has been agreed that neither side will take any unilateral action to change this *status quo* and through dialogue we would like to settle the issue which will be sorted out, I do hope, in course of time. Sir, in respect of the recent developments in Tibet, hon. Members are fully aware of the history. If I remember correctly, His Holiness Dalai Lama entered into India sometime in 1959. On 23rd March, 1959, the then Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru made a statement on the happenings in Tibet and when his Holiness Dalai Lama entered India, naturally, India extended shelter to him and to his followers. Again Panditji made a statement. The first statement was made on 23rd March and another statement was made perhaps on 29th March, 1959 after Dalai Lama entered, addressed the press at Tezpur and he was given shelter. The conditions are well known. He is considered as a religious and spiritual leader. He is allowed to have all religious and spiritual activities to continue. His followers are provided with shelter and all sorts of facilities which they require. But, at the same time, they are advised not to indulge in any political activities or any sort of activities which can jeopardise our relationship with any friendly country. And, this is fully appreciated by His Holiness Dalai Lama. Very recently, he had made a statement from Dharmashala on 10th March. His Holiness said and I quote, "I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Government and people of India, in particular, for their continuing and unparalleled support for Tibetan refugees and the cause of Tibet." He expressed these sentiments on an occasion which was organised to honour him.

Sir, it has also been stated that there is some sort of patronization by China. It is not patronization. It is appreciation. If Chinese authorities feel that India's conduct in this matter is reassuring of continuing friendly relationship, good neighbourly relationship and if they appreciate in words, one need not take it as if it is some sort of patronization. This is what I would like to submit most respectfully.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, certain other points have also been made, particularly by my friend, Mr. Yechury. He has, particularly, taken some exception about the joint-exercises. First of all, I would like to assure him that entering into joint-exercises is neither giving up the sovereign right of any country nor subjecting oneself to some sort of pressure. It is not that. We have been entering into joint-exercises for quite sometime. A question may arise that we did not do it in 50s, 60s and 70s. Yes; we did not do it. We did not have the capability. India's military power was never recognised earlier as it is being recognised today. When the



most advanced countries come and see the competence of our Air Force pilots, whether it is in Kalaikunda Joint-Exercise or in some other place or even in Alaska, they do agree that we have built up the capacity. We have built up the capacity in the Indian Navy. With how many countries are we having it? We are having it with Malaysia, Vietnam, Indonesia, Australia, Laos, Japan and the Republic of Korea. In Army, we are having joint-exercises with Mongolia, USA, Thailand, Seychelles, Maldives, Russia, UK. In Air Force, we are having it with the USA, Russia, Singapore, France. Then, we are having Naval exercises with Singapore, France, Russia, Oman, Sri Lanka, Japan, Thailand and China. Therefore, with a large number of countries we are building up these joint-exercises. It would be, to my mind, strange logic if we say if we enter into joint-exercises with Russia or China, we are not subject to the pressure, but we are subject to pressure if we enter into joint-exercises with the UK or France. It is not so. Questions have been raised. Yes, the fact is that certain Israeli satellites were put into orbit with the help of ISRO. And, when we described it as a 'commercial exercise' we did not mean that the satellite has been put in the orbit for commercial purposes. 'It is a commercial activity'. It has nothing to do with the Government of India. It was not an arrangement between the Government of India and the Government of Israel. It was between two commercial entities—one belonging to Israel and one belonging to India. It was not Government-to-Government. That is the meaning of the expression 'it was commercial'. And, surely when we enter into some commercial transactions, it is a commercial secret. It is a fact that we are entering into defence cooperation with Israel. It is not one day's business. They have built up their capacities in certain areas. But we are having defence cooperation with a large number of countries, both, developing countries and developed countries. Sir, I have been in the Government several times. In different decades, I have seen it. Yes, there was a time when at a particular time you used to have all your military hardware from one particular country. But if that particular country is not in a position at a particular point of time, should we give up our exercise; should we give up our efforts? At one point of time, I was Commerce Minister. Twenty-eight per cent of total international trade was directed towards one bloc. If today that bloc is not available, should I give up my international trade? Can that be a policy of any national interest? We shall have to adjust our policies because new forces emerge, new realities emerge. There is IBSA (India, Brazil, South Africa); trilateral arrangement between India, Russia and China, for which I am going. Three meetings have already taken place. We are going to hold Africa-India Summit in India in the first week of the next month. At one point of time, even during the heydays of Non-Aligned Movement, many other outfits emerged—G-77 emerged; in 80s, G-15 emerged. Today, the G-4 has emerged, where we are working. These various formations and combinations depended on the situation prevailing at that point of time. This is quite natural. We are just responding to that. Yes, a day may not be far off when we will convert BRIC into BRICS, including South Africa. And, that will be a quite important formation. IBSA span three continents, three major developing countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia. India Ocean Rim is there. Those littoral countries of Indian Ocean have formed this. In 1995, we made a very small beginning. Now, it has expanded. So, these types of formations are bound to emerge. And, some of them, in the course of time, may lose their relevance and would be substituted by other formations. I think, a question has been raised that have we diluted our policies in respect of our stand on Palestine. Mahatma Gandhi has been quoted. Mr. Raashid Alvi has also pointed out that he was asked that you can speak in favour of Palestine, but, you cannot vote in favour of Palestine. But, if we look at our track record of voting, it is like this. In the United Nations, on the 3rd of this month, my colleague, Shri Anand Sharma, when he participated in the Ministerial Conference of the Human Rights' Council in Geneva, he voted

with the Arab World, condemned the atrocities; disproportionate atrocities, and retaliations which have taken place in Gaza. We are supporting the Security Council Resolutions. What is the contention of the Security Council Resolutions? It is that Israel will have to vacate the occupied land. When we are supporting the Resolution that solution lies in implementing the Security Council's Resolution, am I diluting my policy by not repeating in every statement that Israel should vacate its occupied land? My total support is with the U.N. Security Council Resolutions, the Arab League initiatives and even the recent initiatives taken by Saudi Arabia to resolve these issues and to have peaceful solution to the problems of Palestine. People have suffered too long. During the last couple of weeks, thrice we have expressed our deep concern. But, surely, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, you will agree with me that even the strongest sentiments can be expressed in most sober words, and in most sober language. We are doing exactly that. We are not diluting our stand. We believe that Palestinians have every right to have their homeland. They have their right to live in peace. As Israelis have their right to have their own homeland, similarly, Palestinians must have their right to have their own. Nobody can deny it. And India stands by that. Therefore, there is no question of dilution on that.

One question has been raised, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, about the conditions of persons of Indian origin. Recently, on Malaysia I made a statement when that happened. After that, we took it up with the Malaysian authorities. Sometimes, some news items come, appear, we take it up. One news item appeared, that there will be discrimination about the recruitment of Indians. But, immediately, it was corrected by the Malaysian authorities that there is no such discrimination. Indians who have settled there, who have accepted their citizenship, they have contributed substantially in building up the economy of that country. They have organised themselves, maintaining their old relationships, maintaining their own identity, having their own faith in their own culture. And that is quite natural. One cannot forget his or her roots, they must remember it.

Some hon. Members have expressed their concerns about the happenings in our Southern most neighbour, Sri Lanka. We are fully in agreement with their views that political solution is the only answer, not the military solution. We are all for taking action against terrorist outfits.

We have no sympathy for LTTE. I have no hesitation in telling this to you. This is a banned organisation in India. Subsequent Governments banned it. But every Tamilian is not a subscriber to the philosophy of LTTE. Most of them are not. Therefore, they have every right to live in their own country, that is, Sri Lanka, within its territorial integrity and Constitutional sovereignty. Their ethnic issues must be addressed within the framework of Sri Lanka's Constitution, maintaining the territorial integrity. That is why, it was agreed that, perhaps, the 13th amendment of their Constitution was the solution. We are asking the Sri Lankan Government, "please fulfil your own commitment." You had appointed the High-Powered Committee of political representatives. They have come out with good reports. Implement those reports and try to assuage the feelings of the ethnic minorities, Tamilians and others. Then, their rights will be fully protected and we stand by you. Your security concern is my security concern, because we are the closest neighbour to you. If Sri Lanka becomes the victim of international big powers, India will not be immune from that adverse impact. Therefore, it is in your own national interest. We would like to give you all assistance which you require, which you want, and, actually, we are doing it, but, at the same time, you address the genuine issues of the people. In respect of Pakistan, my colleague, Shri Tarlochan Singh has given certain suggestions. As for one suggestion, I will readily respond to that. Of

course, I cannot give details right now; I shall have to talk to our Missions. Wherever Guru Nanak Devji visited, whichever country it was, our Mission should commemorate, because his was the voice of peace, universal brotherhood and till today we do believe in the contemporary period that there was a great messiah of humanity, that is, Guru Nanak and his message should be conveyed through an appropriate mechanism and some sort of commemoration functions, in whichever country he visited during his lifetime. It is a very good suggestion, Sir. In respect of liberalisation of visas, in respect of the Prisoners of War, in respect of certain other issues, yes, we have moved. We have moved forward. The composite dialogue began. Before the visit of the then Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji, in January, 2004 to Pakistan in connection with the SAARC, an assurance by the then President, President Musharraf, was given to the then Prime Minister that territory under the country of Pakistan will not be allowed to be used by terrorists and we are keeping our faith on it. Please fulfil your commitment. Please don't allow territory under your control to be used by the terrorists. The composite dialogue process is going on. The next round of talks will be initiated. For obvious reasons, we have to be a little slow because of the unsettled situation there. When the tragic assassination of Benazir Bhutto took place, I myself expressed my desire to go and pay my respects but we could not do so. Even the Congress President, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi, had also expressed her desire to visit that country to express her condolences to the family, but because of the situation the Pakistan Government advised us not to go; so, we adhered to that. We are now waiting. As soon as the new Government is in place, we shall begin our composite dialogue. We are all in favour of liberalising visas. We are all in favour of expanding trade and SAFTA is basically aimed at that. One hon. Member wanted to know where the SAARC University will be established. We are trying to locate the land at Delhi. I have told our people that if you do not get land in Delhi, please go to the neighbouring States like Haryana or wherever you can get, but the university project must be implemented as early as possible because we do not want that SAARC would merely confine itself to declaration. Now, we shall have to go for implementation and we have operationalised the SAARC Development Fund, Food Bank and the SAARC villages. In fact, in later part of this month in India, development work will take place in seven SAARC villages. We are going to formally launch that project. In every SAARC country it will be done, because, now the SAARC has assumed more importance geographically with the inclusion of Afghanistan in it; and through land of Pakistan, one day, I do believe that transit to Afghanistan through Pakistan would be possible. Though it is not possible today, but, after today, there is tomorrow; after tomorrow, there is day-after-tomorrow. I hope a day will come when it will be possible. That means, the SAARC is being linked through Afghanistan to West Asia, to Central Asia, and, through Bangladesh-India up to Myanmar, to ASEAN; Central Asia and West Asia will be linked with SAARC. It has immense potentiality. So, we are going to implement the SAARC Development Fund, the SAARC Food Bank and the SAARC university projects. Sir, I do hope that the next SAARC summit at Sri Lanka, whenever it takes place, will give some new momentum to the SAARC developmental activities.

In short, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to say that I have tried to cover as many points as I wanted to cover. However, Sir, at the end, I would like to clarify one more small point because the impression should not go that we are responsible for causing chaos in Nepal. Most respectfully, I would like to submit that not by intervention, not interference, but with our suggestions, with our advice to the political parties, it has been possible to bring a hardcore, militant, believer in violence, organisation in the mainstream of the democratic politics of Nepal. They are participating today in the Constituent Assembly elections. The elections are going to be held under the supervision of the United Nations. The people are

6.00 P.M.

going to exercise their rights. They are going to constitute the Constituent Assembly, which will frame their Constitution. I do feel that this is the most important right, a democratic right of any people of any country to have their own Constitution and to have their own Government through the process of elections. Yes, there may be some problem here, some problem there; there may be some teething problems; but, we have not contributed in creating chaos in Nepal. We have tried to defuse the chaos and tension which was prevailing there by bringing the political parties together, not by—I am repeating—intervention or interference, but by our counsel and that is the approach which we are having. Our approach is, we neither believe in exporting our ideologies nor we have any territorial ambition. We are only interested in moving together for peace, prosperity and development and making our own contribution in that process. Thank you, Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, for giving me this opportunity. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. V. MAITREYAN: Sir, the hon. Minister has not mentioned a single word about the IAEA Agreement. ...*(Interruptions)*... He has not mentioned a single word about it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, one point, please. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI D. RAJA: Sir, I also want to seek one clarification. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One-by-one please. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, I have not spoken. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know that you have not spoken. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI D. RAJA: Sir, one clarification, please. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Raja, you have spoken, but he has not spoken. Therefore, first I am calling Mr. Ahluwalia. After that, I will call you. Mr. Raja, just a minute please. You have already spoken. Mr. Ahluwalia has not spoken. He wants a clarification. Let him speak. I will call you later.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, from tomorrow, we are going into a recess. In the meanwhile, a lot of development has taken place on the Indo-US Nuclear Deal; our learned friend, Dr. Maitreyan, also raised this issue. Leader of Opposition also raised it. In between, on 16 or 17th, there was a meeting between the UPA and the Left and they have briefed each other. They are sharing views with each other. But, as far as I understand, the hon. Prime Minister had said on the floor of this House that whatever the team involved in discussions with the IAEA or the NSG does, they would apprise the Parliament of the situation. But tomorrow is the last day and today, when the External Affairs Minister is speaking on this, he should speak on this too. This is part of paragraphs 14 and 15 of his statement.

SHRI D. RAJA: Sir, I am happy that Shri Pranab Mukherjee tried to convince the House in his own sober way on several issues. But in relation to Sri Lanka, I would like him to state the position of the Government of India.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has talked about that.

SHRI D. RAJA: No, Sir. Firstly, what is the position of our Government on the deployment of sea mines by the Sri Lankan Government? Secondly, is there any effort or decision taken to extend military cooperation to Sri Lanka at this point of time, such as sharing Intelligence,

military intelligence, giving training, etc. Thirdly, the Katchatheevu Agreement guarantees traditional rights to Indian fishermen. Now, the Government of Sri Lanka violates the agreed positions of the Katchatheevu Agreement. If Shri Pranab Mukherjee clarifies to the House on these three issues, it would help not only Tamil Nadu but the whole country. What is the Government's stand on these three issues? These are concrete issues.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, as far as the issues relating to Sri Lanka are concerned, we are addressing these issues. So far as laying of mines is concerned, there is an international convention. Therefore, that will be taken up as per international norms and practice. In regard to the problems of fishermen, we are currently engaged and perhaps we will be able to arrive at a solution which would be acceptable to both countries and the fishermen will be benefited to a considerable extent. So far as training and other facilities are concerned, Sri Lanka is one of the countries which sends the largest number of trainees to our different Defence institutions, not only today, but for quite some time. In regard to political solution, I have already stated that we are encouraging them, we are advocating them and we want them to have this political solution which they have agreed to by the 13th Amendment of their Constitution by devolution of power so that the large ethnic minority feels assured that their legitimate aspirations are fulfilled within the constitutional framework of Sri Lanka.

Sir, in respect of the Civil Nuclear Deal, I did not deliberately spell it out because I have nothing to spell out now. During the last debate I had said that there were three processes. One process was that there should be India-Specific Safeguards Agreement with the IAEA. That negotiation has been going on but it has not been inked and initialled. After that, it will go to the Board; after the Board approves it, it will go to the Nuclear Suppliers Group; then, the Nuclear Suppliers Group will have to amend its guidelines; after the guidelines are amended in the NSG, all these documents will have to go to the US Congress for its ratification. Thereafter, the question of its operationalisation will arise. So, what is happening in-between? Certain talks are going on. It has not yet been concluded. There has been an advancement. But as and when the IAEA Board approves the India-Specific Safeguards Agreement, I assure the hon. Members of Parliament that we will come back. But before that, what should I report to you? Every time we discuss this issue whenever there has been any major development.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: You can tell them if they want to know the information that you are telling us, then let them join the UPA. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I mentioned it why we did not agree to the Joint Parliamentary Committee. You may like it or you may not like it, but I strictly adhere to and my party strictly adhered to the constitutional position. Never before we have subjected an international agreement as such. Any legislation arising out of international agreement will have to be approved by the Parliament; any legislation to implement the international agreement, if it is a Central legislation, will have to be approved by Parliament, but not the agreement as such. Therefore, we consider that it is not the appropriate forum. But whenever there will be any major development in respect of this agreement, we will come and share the information with you. I think, since July 2005, five times we have discussed the Civilian Nuclear Agreement with the Members of Parliament. In respect of the UPA-Left Coordination Committee, I told quite clearly that this is an internal arrangement because they are supporting us and I am to carry conviction with them. Therefore, I am sharing certain information with them and if you are interested, next time when Parliament will meet, I will be too glad to share that information with you. Since this is just a short Session of three weeks or so, there

will be no major development. But I can assure my good friend, Mr. Ahluwaliaji, and others that whenever out of three stages if any stage is complete, I will come and share that information with the House. As the Prime Minister committed, when the entire process is going to be over, if it is over and if we go to that stage, then in that case, surely, we will come and seek the opinion of the Parliament. That is Prime Minister's commitment here. Standing here, he made this commitment. But let that stage come. Now what the Leader of the Opposition Says, I do not subscribe to that view that either you mend it or you end it because we are in a stage where neither we can end it nor we can mend it. We are in the process of dialogue with our supporters. Thank you.

**DR. V. MAITREYAN:** Sir, Shri D. Raja raised the issue of retrieval of Kachatheevu. The Minister has not answered that.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** It is given. Now, clarifications on the Statement made by the Minister regarding Sarabjit Singh. Only two Members had asked for clarifications, namely, Shrimati Brinda Karat and Shri Tarlochan Singh. Both are not present here. So, clarifications are ended. Now, the message from Lok Sabha.

#### MESSAGE FROM LOK SABHA (Contd.)

**(i) The Maternity Benefit (Amendment) Bill, 2008.**

**(ii) The Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order (Amendment) Bill, 2008.**

**SECRETARY-GENERAL:** Sir, I have to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:—

- (I) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 19th March, 2008, agreed without any amendment to the Maternity Benefit (Amendment) Bill, 2008, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 27th February, 2008."
- (II) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 19th March, 2008, agreed without any amendment to the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order (Amendment) Bill, 2008, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 19th March, 2008."

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The House stands adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11.00 a.m.

The House then, adjourned at nine minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 20th March, 2008.