

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Hon. Members, may I have the sense of the House again? It was decided to take up the reply to the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Now should we continue or would you prefer to defer it?..... (*Interruptions*).... Would you prefer to continue or would you do it tomorrow? The Leader of the House wants to say something.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Sir, it has to be done today. All that I can suggest and request for your consideration as also of the House is in addition to conclusion of the discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the Address of the President, there are two other items which are listed in my name. I have to make a statement regarding treaties that are being concluded with the United Arab Emirates and also an agreement that has been signed with the Energy Secretary From the United States of America. If you permit and if the House agrees, I can make those two statements in this House tomorrow which shall better enable the House to seek clarifications. But, so far as the conclusion of the discussion on the Motion of Thanks to the President is concerned, my appeal to you and to the House is that we conclude that business today itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): May I have your attention, please? Our hon. Prime Minister is indisposed is confined to bed and may not be able to come for two or three days more. In view of this, the Leader of the House will reply to the debate.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS — *Contd.*

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful for this opportunity. We had a long debate and 47 speakers have participated in the discussion on the Motion moved by my distinguished colleague and friend, Shri Arun Shourie, and seconded by hon. Shri Vidhuthalai Virumbi. The leaders of all the parties and distinguished hon. Members have participated in this debate. The trend of the debate has been of great benefit to the Government and no doubt, all the various suggestions that have been made or the points which have been raise, will be fully taken into account. In the course of the months and years ahead, we will benefit by the suggestion given by the hon. Members. यह 20वीं शताब्दी का राष्ट्रपति जी का अंतिम अभिभाषण है और यह अभिभाषण जब दिया गया तो 13वें आम चुनाव सम्पन्न हो चुके थे। भारत की पुण्य भूमि की सौधी सीस और उसकी रज से सने हम अभी लौटे ही थे और उस परिस्थिति में यह अभिभाषण हुआ है। स्वाभाविक है कि इस बहस में हमारे विचारों की अभिव्यक्ति और उसकी शैली में अभी चुनावी सरगामी की ध्वनि आती रहेगी। यहाँ कहना आवश्यक नहीं और यह अपने आपमें एक

प्रकार की अतिशयोक्ति होगी की मूल प्रश्न यह नहीं है कि इन चुनावों में कौन जीता, कौन हार, निःसंदेह और हर स्वरूप से भारत में हमारे प्रजातंत्र की विजय अवश्य हुई है, पुनः हुई है।

उपसमाध्यक्ष जी, न चाहते हुए भी, अनायास अपने आप चित्र सामने धूमते हैं। 13 अक्टूबर को राष्ट्रपति भवन के प्रांगण में जब शपथ-ग्रहण समारोह हो रहा था और भारत के प्रजातंत्र का एक स्वरूप जब सारी दुनिया देख रही थी तो उसकी पूर्व संध्या को हमारे पड़ोसी देश में जो कुछ हुआ, That is contrast between the two events—the assertion of the democratic will of the people of India and the thwarting of the democratic process in our neighbourhood. These are two simultaneous events which, in themselves, are the most telling commentary on the evolution of the situation in our sub-continent. I do wish to point out, Sir, that in this election, the size of the Indian electorate—not all of them participated and cast their vote—is 650 million. 650 million voters is larger than the combined population—not the electorate—the combined population of the United States of America, of Canada, and the whole of West Europe. Therefore, the dimension of the functioning of Indian democracy today—it is my belief—is the most outstanding and shining commentary on the process that all of us have participated in. Whether we will it or not, the new century is already knocking at our door. I believe, the real question that all of us effectively face is, how India will meet this century. We will realise our true destiny to achieve and attain for ourselves, to socially move into this new century in harmony; politically, with consensus, and with true and cooperative federalism; economically, capturing the heights of knowledge-based industries and, internationally, as a messenger of peace.

5.00 P.M.

India has stood for stability and it has a voice in the collective wisdom of the nation.

Sir, the President's Address reflects the foundation of the agenda of the National Democratic Alliance. That Agenda is for a proud and prosperous India, a resurgent India, as India that is on the move. It is an agenda for the new century. That agenda is explicit. There is no hidden agenda either from outside or from inside. That is only the agenda of the National Democratic Alliance. That is the agenda, which has been inspired by the vision of faster growth, with employment and equity. For this, our attempt, is a reorientation of the strategy of development, in which the Government attempts to move from a restricting and controlling agency to a supportive and an encouraging body, which transforms its philosophy of governance supported by a sound policy in which effective regulations function as the sinews of that policy. There has to be a reorientation and re-examination by all legislators whether here or in the State Governments of the role and functions of the legislatures in the total developmental strategy that we will have to pursue and adopt in

the coming decades of the next century. The States of the Union will have to become active participants in the experiment that we have already launched for the next ten years or so.

The civic societies and local bodies too shall have to be part of this entire exciting process of a new India that has to be created in the 21st century, in which the entrepreneurial skill of the private enterprise of India has a very constructive and a very real role to play. The attempt of the Government is to bring about this change with continuity. When we say this, we must acknowledge and recognize that we are not working on a clean slate. We acknowledge the inheritance of the past, the previous Governments have left us as a legacy. We acknowledge, without any reservation, the cumulative benefit of the past that this Government inherits. No Government in a democratic set up, can possibly arrogate to itself to all the pluses and the minuses. We acknowledge again without any hesitation or reservation the bricks and mortars of the foundation that have been laid by the previous Governments and we approach our tasks as a new Government with humility and dedication and without the arrogance of any kind or any dogma. It is for that reason the approach of the Government is towards the widest possible national consensus, or the greatest possible cooperation and coordination. These three "Cs" are for India alone, because, I believe the world would not wait for India to catch up with the rest of the international community. The world will not wait for us, for the resolution of some of the crippling domestic conditions. We need this consensus and cooperation and coordination. We need it for India. We need it between the Centre and the States of the Union. The National Democratic Alliance believes in a true, decentralized, federalism, where the States are not just equal partners.

They indeed contribute to this great endeavour and enterprise upon which India is set. We need co-operation, consensus and co-ordination between political parties and their political constituents too. We need an approach of co-operation, co-ordination and consensus among the social constituents of the country as well. This is a great task, this is a gigantic task and the most inspiring adventure, as I believe, a collective challenge and it is also our collective responsibility. It is in that light and spirit that I refer to some unhappy interruptions that have taken place recently. I do not wish to resurrect any contentions. I do not wish to raise any issues that troubled anyone in this House or in the other House or indeed outside the House. That is why I state, re-state, clearly that the chargesheet in a certain case has been filed with no political vendetta in mind. It has been filed only on the satisfaction of the investigating agency and the investigating officers alone. They have done so as is the past practice. There is no political vendetta in our mind.

श्री सुरेश पचौरी (मध्य प्रदेश): कोई एविडेस नहीं है, एफ०आई०आर० में नाम नहीं है। जिनका एफ०आई०आर० में नाम है—हिन्दुजा का और दूसरे का, वह तो रखा नहीं है। साफ दिखता है कि यह राजनीति से प्रेरित है।

श्री बालकवि बैरागी (मध्य प्रदेश): सारा देश जानता है कि आप राजनीति कर रहे हैं।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I raised this issue and I wish to put the contentions behind. I understand the aggrievement of the elegant. Members when they say that they have a sense of grievance and hurt in this regard. What I say is what I believe in. I do not say with any dissimulation. I say with clarity in belief. That is what I have said. I was certainly a political adversary of late Rajiv Gandhi. I knew him as an individual before he became the Prime Minister. I came to know him when he joined the Parliament as the General Secretary of the Congress Party. In his foul assassination—I have said this earlier here, I have said this earlier in the other House, I have said this in public, without any doubt whatsoever—a person of promise in the prime of his years was taken away from our midst. Anyone who is charged in public life is diminished. We are all collectively diminished. That continues to be so. I have said so in other instances also. Even when he was the Prime Minister, we continued to have differences with him in this House and in the other House. I have seen him in the role as the General Secretary of the Congress Party, as the then Prime Minister of the country; then, as the Leader of the Opposition in Parliament. I have seen him in all those roles. But whatever I have said, I have said it with transparency and sincerity. Yes, I had political differences; otherwise we would have worked together. I had political differences. There is no reason for anyone to assume that I continue to carry inside me any kind of political bile or vendetta or a feeling of ill-will. Not at all. I appeal to you, my friends in the Opposition, the Congress Party—reflect on what I am saying. We have to put the past behind us and there in no way....(Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Please sit down. He has not yielded. (Interruptions).

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala): One of your colleagues is still the patron or the president of the Defence Committee of the LTTE people who have been convicted for murder of Rajiv Gandhi. One of your colleagues, one of the Ministers in the Cabinet, is still helping the LTTE, the same people accused in the Rajiv murder case and he is heading the Defence Committee. How can we trust your words when your own Minister is involved in helping the murderers of Rajiv Gandhi? That is the point you have to answer.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I can only respond to what my good friend Mr. Vayalar Ravi has said. He asked how he can trust my words.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I can name him—Mr. George Fernandes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): May I request you, Mr. Ravi? You have raised certain points. A reply is sought to be given. You may not accept it, you may not appreciate it, you may not believe it. But please allow him to continue without interruption because he is trying to reply to the points raised. Please do not interrupt now.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Hon. Mr. Vayalar Ravi and I have known each other for a very long time. The personal regard in which I hold him is not diminished by the disappointment that I suffer with the words that despite what I am saying in this House, he does not trust me.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I said it about the Government, not you alone. I said it about the Government because of Mr. George Fernandes. I am not saying that to you personally.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That is why I said, let me say it again, as quickly as we can, we are committed to do it and I will work with you in that. And for that purpose, put the past behind us. Why put the past behind us? Because really, the future beckons us and the future beckons us collectively, not us alone, not me individually or singly. The future beckons us collectively and it will not be selective in the movement of time because time is not selective in how it moves. By all means oppose us; by all means point out the errors or the wrongs that the Government commits. But I do urge you to reflect on what the need of the hour is. The need of the hour remains what your leader has said, which is cooperative opposition. For, at stake is not any Government or any individual or any single premiership. I do believe that what is at stake is our endeavour for India as we move towards—almost it sounds as a cliché now—a new Century and a new Millennium. It is in that light alone that I wish to yet again refer to His Holiness the Pope's visit. Let me unambiguously state so that all anxieties in this regard be set at rest wherever they arise from, that His Holiness the Pope is the guest of the Indian People; he is coming to India upon the invitation of this Government; it is the Raj Dharam of this Government, to ensure that, that visit, as I have said, is a glittering success. It is our bounden duty and we are committed to doing that. We will ensure, this Government will ensure, that no controversy or interruption or any incident mars that visit. It has been made categorical and clear that we neither approve nor shall we countenance any action that goes contrary to what the Government has stated. I have said so in an interview and I will repeat it again that I do believe—and I believe this as an individual because quite often I am at a loss to describe what faith I subscribe to; I veer often to agnosticism and at times, subscribe to all the faiths on the earth; but I do believe—that His Holiness the Pope's visit on the occasion of Diwali is appropriate, is befitting, because

Diwali is, after all, प्रकाश का पर्व है, ज्योति का उत्सव है और उत्साह की नई शुरुआत का समय है। ऐसे समय में जब राम राजधानी लौटें और सभी उत्साह में लगे हों तो इससे अच्छी बात कौन सी होगी, अन्य देश के धर्म गुरु पोप हमारे साथ दिवाली मनाने के लिए हमारे साथ हों। And it is in that context, Sir, that very briefly, I would like to rest yet another completely unfounded controversy that has been raised in some quarters today. It refers to my Ministry and it suggests that the hon. Vice-President is still waiting for advice from the Ministry of External Affairs about the invitation by the Catholic Church of India, to be a chief guest at a function to be organized at Vigyan Bhawan on the 7th of November, 1999. At the very outset, let me clearly put on record that His Holiness, the Pope John Paul-II, is paying a State visit to India. But he combines in himself both the offices, the Head of the State and the Head of the Church. As the Head of the Catholic Church, His Holiness, the Pope, will also be attending certain non-State functions which are being organized by the Archbishop of Delhi and the Catholic Bishop's conference in India. These include an interreligious function at Vigyan Bhawan on 7th November, 1999, a function essentially intended for His Holiness to meet the representatives of other religions and which is due to be held after the mass which is being conducted by His Holiness at Jawaharlal Nehru Stadium at 0900 hours on the same day. It is, therefore, clear that there are two distinct aspects of the visit. There are State functions and there are functions which are organized by the Church authorities. The Government of India, as a secular body, is involved in organizing the State function. We have full responsibility and we take full responsibility for ensuring all arrangements and full security for the entire visit and the other arrangements too. The invitation for the Vice-President was for a multi-religious function being organized by the Church authority. A similar invitation for a similar function on an earlier visit by the former Pope was also extended in 1986. In 1986 too, a similar occasion arose when His Holiness, the then Pope, visited India and the recommendations of the then Government in 1986 were exactly the same and identical with the recommendations that we have made this time. It is under these circumstances that the advice tendered by the Ministry of External Affairs, *vis-a-vis*, the hon'ble Vice-President, is entirely in accordance with all past precedents, the latest being 1986, His Holiness, the Pope, has State function. He performs functions as the Head of the State and he has certain pastoral functions. The precedents of earlier years and earlier visits are being followed without any deviation at all. Let that too be therefore set at rest.

Sir, you will appreciate that it will not be possible for me to respond to all the valuable suggestions and points that have been made by all the forty-seven speakers who have participated in this discussion. Therefore, for ease of response, on behalf of the Government, if you permit categorisation, I will categorise into economic, security internal, social and such other issues. In

the economic category, a number of hon. Members, principally the hon. Leader of the Opposition, bring to bear, on his intervention, many years of experience in the field, has spoken particularly, cogently, about the problems that we face if we do not check deficit financing. A number of Members spoke about the finances of the States.

Sir, I will just make another correction, that the visit in 1986 was made by the same Pope, His Holiness Pope John Paul II. Let me correct that as well.

Sir, fiscal deficit, no one would know better than the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, or, indeed, the hon. Pranab Mukherjee, or the hon. Chavanji because each of them, at one time or another, had handled the Finance portfolio. Both the questions of the fiscal deficit of the country and the question of the finances of the States are very serious and very real. This is not an issue that can be an issue of any contention between us, and when the hon. Leader of the Opposition points this out and says that this is an area which we need to attend, I totally agree that this is an area which we need to attend, and we can only do so by ushering, as collectively as possible, and as together as we can, that as we move into the 21st century, let us endeavour, let us attempt to move into an era of fiscal responsibility. An era of fiscal responsibility, Sir, will not be possible for any Government to achieve singly, no matter, because the area of fiscal responsibility is not something which a Government alone can achieve. We need to move as far possibly as we can, as collective leadership of the country to arrive at a broader consensus in this regard and I would welcome, and I am sure, the Government would welcome, and also the Finance Minister would welcome and I too have something to do both with the Ministry of Finance and with the Planning Commission of the country. Though in earnest, when it comes to the expertise that the Leader of the Opposition brings to the subject, nevertheless, I share this entirely, the vital importance of controlling fiscal deficit which we cannot do until we move into an era of fiscal responsibility, which we simply cannot unless collectively the political leadership of the country arrives at some basic consensus in this regard, and for that, whether it is the National Development Council or any other fora, or a smaller or a larger body, or indeed the Parliament itself, let us work at arriving at some basic fundamentals in this regard.

Sir, the finances of the States are really in a perilous condition. This I say, amongst the basics that the Planning Commission performs, the Planning Commission has a more direct role in examining or understanding allocating sums of money to the States of the Union. By and large, with only a few exceptions, the state of the finances in all the States of our country is in an extremely perilous situation. Most of the Plan Expenditure, that is, Plan Funds, that are allocated to the States really go towards meeting their

revenue expenditure; in some cases, for meeting their Pay and Allowances, Wages and Salary bills. This situation cannot continue. And if this situation cannot continue, it is not the responsibility of the Government alone to correct it. Because, when it comes to the finances of the States in the patch-up kind of a situation that we have in this country—where all the parties that are here in these two Houses are somewhere the ruling parties or in the Opposition, and all ruling parties are also parties in the Opposition,—if we do not move into an area of consensus and cooperation, this principal task of addressing these two challenges, the finances of the States and fiscal deficit, will be very difficult to meet, no matter who is in the Government. Infrastructure is vital. It does not require my saying so.

मुझे यह कहने में तनिक भी संकोच नहीं है कि आज भारत और भारत के निवासी अपने देश के विकास के लिए तड़पते हैं। पानी हो, सड़क हो, दवा हो, शफाखाने हों, स्कूल हों। आप सभी इससे परिचित हैं। जब मैं अपने राज्य में जाता हूँ या अपने चुनाव क्षेत्रों में जाता हूँ तो मुझे वास्तव में एक प्रकार से उत्साह मिलता है, जब मैं पढ़ता हूँ कि सबसे बड़ी मांग अगर कोई गांवों में है तो वह स्कूलों को लेकर है, सड़क को लेकर है। जो इस मांग के पीछे की तड़प है, जो इस मांग के पीछे की पुकार है उसको अगर हम पहचानने की कोशिश करें तो इसके पीछे शिक्षा की पुकार है। शिक्षा के साथ-साथ सड़कें हों, सुविधायें हों, गांवों में पीने का पानी उपलब्ध हो, दवाखाने हों, अपने आप में इनको दोहराना एक अतिशयोक्ति है।

Here again, there is an area of consensus. The question, Sir, the challenge is, one of reducing the gap between the promises and the delivery. It is a challenge that we face at the level of the Centre; it is a challenge that we face at the level of the States. And unless, as a collectivity, the Parliament attempts, the Legislative Bodies attempt, to reduce this gap between the promises that we make, and the time that we take, the method that we employ, in the delivery, unless this gap is reduced...

जो भूख की तड़प आज भारत की जनता में विकास के लिए आई है उसका हम उत्तर नहीं दे पाए हैं और यह उत्तर यह समाधान मात्र एक दूसरे के ऊपर छींटाकशी में नहीं है। इसका उत्तर व समाधान मेरे विचार में केवल एक ही है कि कुछ मसलों पर इन सभाओं में हमको एक मत होना पड़ेगा और यही संदेश और मत सरकार का भी है। इसके लिए सामाजिक न्याय की समृद्धि एक रास्ता है। यह अपने आप में कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

Let us not miss the revolution of the digital and let us not miss the great frontiers that have opened to us, of knowledge, of industry, the frontiers of informatics. We are only at the doorstep of this revolution of the digital and its dimension and informatics and the entire transformation that it would bring about in the world. India is, today, so positioned that we can truly reach the commanding heights of it. It is for that reason that this Government did take a very significant and signal initiative. I don't refer to that fact alone here because I don't want to individualise the whole effort. But this Government, this Prime Minister, did commission a Task Force on

informatics, on software development, because we have the potential to be the global leader in software. In the time allotted this Task Force submitted its report and in the time allotted, the various Ministries have, by and large, implemented this new software policy. It is because of that we see that a great impetus has already been given to it in India. In tune with that, the other great initiative—it is an initiative in which India can be the world leader—which the Government has taken is for the pharmaceutical industry. There is an announcement in the President's Address about setting up of a Task Force for encouragement of the pharmaceutical industry. India has demonstrated its leadership in the field of pharmaceutical because it is part of knowledge-based industry. I would appeal to the House to appreciate the initiative that has been taken in this regard. Just as an aside, though not strictly within the purview of the Ministry of External Affairs, for the first time—this point was made by the Leader of the Opposition too—the Ministry of External Affairs took the initiative to organize in India conferences in the year 2000 on what is commonly called the problem Y2K. It should do it, because it gives me, as somebody in charge of the Ministry, a great deal of satisfaction, not individual satisfaction, but as a representative of India. When we, in the MEA offered to host functions in India, whether from the G15 or from the SAARC, to share with them the information that we already have on Y2K and how we can move so as to address the problems of Y2K, the MEA initiative was very warmly welcomed and very well attended. I want to say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition with regard to the query that he has raised as to whether we are sufficiently prepared—and some other queries which others have raised—"please don't pay any heed to what certain US journals and commentators might say in this regard." The Government's commitment is that, by the end of October, that is, in a few days' time, we will make all the preparations that human ingenuity can make for equipping ourselves to meet the problems of Y2K. It is much more than what a lot of other countries can say. What we are offering in the President's Address is, of course, no final answer because no President's Address is the final answer. It cannot be. It is a blueprint. It is the route-chart. We will amend the route chart as we go along because we will learn more as we go down in the path. Therefore, I don't speak from any arrogance of certainty. But I say so because of the confidence that I have gained from the great adventure that we are now embarked upon.

There are two or three other broad issues. One is related to National security. My gallant friend, General Shanker Roy Choudhary—we have worked and served together—a leader of the Opposition, and some other hon'ble Members broadly spoke on the points relating to combat-effectiveness of our national security, armed forces, state of morale of the armed forces, state of preparedness, equipment and the need to address ourselves to

the reorganization of the Ministry of Defence. A number of Members also said a number of things about the operations in Kargil. Queries were also raised about the totality of the nuclear capability. Some of these points do not even require any discussion or debate, as they are self-evident. It is axiomatic that you have armed forces and they must have maximum combat-effectiveness. They may not always be required to be in the fullest state of readiness. No army, navy or air force, can always possibly be in the fullest state of readiness. But the potential must always be there. Is the Government satisfied with it? No, we are not. Are we fully reassured? I am greatly reassured by the morale of the armed forces because—Gen. Choudhary would better understand, perhaps, than many of my hon'ble colleagues—a certain degree of grumbling from within the ranks of the armed forces is actually a good thing. A grumbling reflects certain expression of dissatisfaction. It is not always an expression of negativism; it is also an expression of wanting to improve things. The best commentary on the morale of the armed forces is really the exemplary conduct of the army in the Kargil operations. I say this, Sir, as somebody who has had the privilege of wearing the uniform—and General Roy Choudhary and I, we have served in the Army together—I share with hon'ble Members that the task which was given to the army was a formidable task, it was a daunting task. We were requiring our army not to simply engage in combat, but we were requiring our army to operate in, possibly, the most challenging terrain anywhere in the world. We were asking our army to operate in a terrain which does not have simply great heights, but also extreme temperatures. Nowhere in the world would you find the kind of challenge that is being thrown and faced on a daily basis as by our army, particularly, on the great plateau of Ladakh, the great Himalayan range. It was not simply a combat, but it was a combat, combined with mountaineering. The ratio of the casualties of officers and other ranks speaks for itself. No army in the world has demonstrated the kind of excellence at the junior level, as was demonstrated yet again by our army in Kargil. I also wish to say here, and I say this really with a great sense of pride, as somebody who had the honour to wear the uniform in very real terms, that sense of pride continues to be, because one cannot leave it. General Roy Choudhary knows this very well because if you had gone through what he and I went through in four years of cadetship and then served in the armed forces. You will agree, it never leaves your blood, it remains there for ever. We ask our people, we place on the army the most impossible of demands which only the Indian Army can do; and it did come up to meet each of those demands. I wish to pay a particular tribute to the Indian Air Force. The demands which we placed on the Indian Air Force were not crossing the line of control. I took note of the comments which were then made by the General Choudhary. He had by then not joined our fraternity in this House. His advice was to cross the Line of Control which

was a very difficult decision. These are not decisions that are taken easily. But we will perhaps have another occasion to discuss all these operations in totality. Indeed, we should have and in the coming session we will have it. But I do not want to dwell on that for long except to say that the demand that was placed upon the Indian Air Force was equally onerous. It was equally onerous because of the speed and the very nature of the operation in the air. The Line of Control is not a line, marked on the ground, which you can see even when you are there. If you are flying at a certain height and if you are flying at a certain speed a miscalculation or misreading navigation charts or marks makes you cross the Line of Control in a second. It is enjoined upon the Indian Air Force to fly only either in the east-west or the west-east corridor; thus providing to the adversary a clear knowledge that the Indian Air Force will ply only in this limited corridor. Our troops were already deployed on the ground. So the corridor became narrow. The Indian Air Force naturally cannot use its weapons on our own forces and it cannot go across the Line of Control. So a narrow east-west or west-east corridor restriction was placed upon the Indian Air Force as the requirement. Without demurring even once, with great courage, knowing the enormous challenge that was placed not simply on physical courage but on technical skill every time they came up with success.

Certainly, some observations were made during the elections and now also about the Kargil operations. An hon. Member went to the extent of saying that instead of lauding the conduct of the armed forces, instead of observing the Vijay Diwas, we should have observed a mourning day. I was truly saddened by that observation. The hon. Member is entirely free to hold those views. But when she advocates that instead of celebrating a great military victory against the most impossible conditions, instead of celebrating that victory we should have mourned; I am really saddened by that observation. The Committee is looking into various aspects of the Kargil operations. That Committee will submit its report. Its work has fairly advanced. We do not wish to persuade the Committee to work at a speed which is not of its own choosing. But I can assure the Members that when the Committee submits its report, it will be discussed with the hon. Members and the hon. Members will then have the benefit of as objective a view on those operations as possible. All I say and appeal here is that what is without doubt a very signal victory of the Indian military, let us not, please—because we are persuaded by political contentions and controversies—tend to give a colouring of anything other than the magnificent victory.

On the question of nuclear doctrine, a number of aspects were raised. This will be debated. Let me point out just two or three aspects of it which are really the most significant and outstanding contours of the entire nuclear question. The Indian nuclear programme is a continuity. The Indian nuclear

programme is not something that this Government has suddenly brought into being. It is not sufficiently recognized that India was the first country in Asia, outside the former Soviet Union or Russia—which is partly an Asian country—well before the Peoples Republic of China, to have a nuclear reactor. That was in 1956. It was in late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's days that we were able to put together the first nuclear reactor. The May 1998 nuclear tests were simply a decision, a decision to acquire for India the required degree of strategic space and strategic autonomy, that which had been denied to India by coming into being of the end of the Cold War in 1989 and the coming into existence of a new nuclear paradigm as it was, and when from Vancouver to Vladivostak, all together, more arrangements came into being with various countries, either nuclear countries or those which had a nuclear umbrella to protect them, and the reaction as we see. The nuclear reality within which we are working is not country-specific. It was meant to acquire strategic space. And, various Members have referred to the costs of it. It is because this had been spread out over the years, that the costs of it have been absorbed in the Annual Budgets. Every amount that is spent on the nuclear programme is annually reported to the Parliament. There is nothing surreptitious about it except the fact that what was implicit as a capacity became explicit as a programme in 1998.

Sir, briefly, I would like to make certain observations on international relations. There is only criterion which we can adopt. That criterion is of stated objectives. If the hon. Members would reflect on the transition that has come about, we would note that the country has really moved to two major international challenges. The two major international challenges were: one was, the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1172 which followed in the May, 1998 tests. The United Nations Security Council Resolution which is prescriptive in terms which attempted to dictate India to do this, do that or the other, and that United Nations Security Council Resolution and the sanctions that were imposed unilaterally by the United States of America posed one set of challenges to the conduct of our foreign policy. And the other came in the middle of 1999 in the misadventure that Pakistan entered upon in Kargil. Both these were the major international challenges that this Government faced. And the success or failure of the management of the foreign policy is to be judged by the way the international community has moved from the language—tone, tenor and conduct—of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1172 to today. The attempts to isolate India had failed. The attempt to buckle India and bring it down by imposing sanctions had failed. The attempts to isolate India post-Kargil have failed. It is not for me to say where India's stock position today in the international market is. But I do wish to take this opportunity to pay particular compliments to the professionalism, the competence, the devotion

and dedication to duty and the total integrity with which the officers of the Ministry of External Affairs, all of them, and the missions abroad, rose to the challenge and addressed themselves to the challenge that we are collectively facing in India. These officers of the Ministry of External Affairs really are worthy of receiving our highest acclaim. They are amongst the unsung heroes of the attempts that we have made, moving from the United Nations Security Council 1172 Resolution to the post-Kargil situation.

A reference was made to Japan by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I am mindful of what he has said. It is not on account of neglect that the relations as between the other countries have not seen the same movement as with Japan. But I have no difficulty in informing the hon. Leader of the Opposition that that has been the area of attention by the Ministry for the many past months. I have, indeed, very recently in the last few days received a repeated invitation from Japan to visit Japan again, and as a representative of the Government it is my hope that I shall be able to do so before the year is out.

On WTO, some very relevant questions were raised. Why I am attempting here to explain WTO here is because I do believe that the Ministry of External Affairs has a role to play in contributing to the management of foreign economic policy. I wish to inform the hon. Leader of the Opposition that amongst the areas of highest importance, as far as both the Ministry of Commerce and the Ministry of External Affairs, which have been engaging purposefully and timely in an effective manner, are concerned, are the challenges that the Seattle Round is likely to pose us. We began to address ourselves to this task many months back and it is on account of that that we have built up in the Ministry of Commerce and the Ministry of External Affairs by now very definite positions on various issues. I can assure you, Sir, that the errors of the past or the mistakes that we made in the Uruguay Round shall certainly not be repeated. Indeed, to highlight the importance of the Seattle Round and WTO related issues, the Prime Minister himself within days of being sworn into office chaired a meeting at which were present the Ministers of Commerce, Finance and External Affairs and all the officers concerned and a 'position paper' for India to take was devised, prior to the Millennium Round meeting in Geneva. I have no difficulty in also informing the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the United States of America, perhaps, for the first time, sought a dialogue with India on WTO and Seattle Round-related issues. The European Union sought a similar dialogue and Japan has also shown a similar interest. We have held here in India meeting of the G-15, SAARC, and the interaction with a whole host of countries and associations in this regard is continuing. I have no doubt in my mind that at the earliest opportunity the hon. Prime Minister will sit with the leadership of the opposition to share with the leaders of the opposition the thinking of the Government in this regard well before the Seattle Round, and I have no

doubt in my mind that when that takes place, the Government will benefit by the suggestions that you give.

There were some individual points that were raised. I have taken a great deal of time of the House and I am also testing the patience of the House and of the hon. Members. I think, in the generality in which I have attempted to answer these points. Almost all the points that have been raised in broad terms by all the hon. Members, have been answered and, therefore, if you forgive me for not having referred to each of the points that each Member made, it would perhaps save both patience and time of the Members and the House. If there is any specific aspect that any hon. Member wishes me to answer I can attempt to do so. Otherwise, it remains my task only to conclude and conclude very briefly.

Sir, I can only leave a thought and an appeal, and that thought and that appeal is that it is my belief, Sir, that India's true destiny is of greatness, of a global leadership of ideas. A destiny beckons us today; and the unshackling of the true genius of Indian creativity and enterprise requires of us, and by 'us' I mean the political class of the country, to unlock the door. We are sitting somewhere between the true flowering of the creativity of India and the true emergence of the creative genius of India. If we recognise that, then we will really unlock that door. As I said, Sir, the people of India now want results. They do want continuity. They want movement; with movement, they also want stability. That is why I leave a thought. Let it not be said, as the years roll by, in the future, that somewhere, somehow, we stood in the path of India's progress or in the path of the aspirations of Indian people. I appeal, therefore, Sir, to the collective wisdom of Parliament, let us now, as the 21st century arises, be the true harbinger of an initiative and change, and let us be that great dynamo of collective energy—let Parliament be that great dynamo of collective energy—so that all of India, all of India, without distinction, shall be empowered.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Thank you, hon. Leader of the House. We are running behind miserably in the management of time. There are three hon. Members who wish to seek some clarifications, though we have had an extensive discussion about it. The Leader of the Opposition also wants to seek some clarifications. Would the hon. Leader of the House care to reply to these clarifications? ...*(Interruptions)*... Yes, the Leader of the Opposition.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in my speech and in the speeches of several other Members from our side, we have drawn the attention of the Government to its handling of the Bofors case, and particularly the manner in which Shri Rajiv Gandhi's name was dragged into it. Sir, at this late hour, we don't want

to reopen the whole issue. We had appealed to the Government that taking the totality of the circumstances into account, the contribution that this great son of India made to India's development—the hon. Minister talked about information technology revolution—when the history of that information technology revolution is written, it will be recorded that Shri Rajiv Gandhi made an outstanding contribution. The hon. Minister referred to the evolution of nuclear policies, that it is a continuation of the past policies. Here too, history will record a great debt of gratitude to Shri Rajiv Gandhi. We all now are conscious of the environmental dimensions of our development, and no other person in my living memory contributed more to creating awareness and consciousness of the environmental impact than the late Rajiv Gandhi. He is no more with us, and the least that we can do to honour his memory is not to do anything consciously or unconsciously, which would defame him. And it was with that spirit, that we had, from this side of the House, urged the Government to reconsider this matter. It was pointed out to us that this is a matter purely for the investigating agencies. The hon. Minister started by saying that there is no political motive, no political vendetta. Sir, we know that in 1977, when one of the present Government's Ministers was involved in a particular case, the Central Government took a conscious decision to withdraw the case against him, gave explicit instructions to the concerned agencies. The hon. Minister has talked about creating a climate of consensus and cooperation.

6.00 P.M.

On this matter we want to contribute so that this great country realises its dreams, dreams of the founding fathers of our republic to build an India free from fear, war, want and exploitation. It is in that spirit that we had requested the Government, even at this late hour, to rethink over this matter. I would like to know from the hon. Minister if our thoughts have made any impact on the Government, or, there is no change in the Government's thinking.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): There are four Members.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: This is a matter that has to be answered. The ideas of the Leader of the Opposition represent the collective sentiment of the largest party in the Opposition. I can assure you, Sir, that I do stand by everything I have said. When you say this to me, for you to aver, that it had no impact on me could do scant justice to me. I pay the greatest heed to what you say. We treat it with the utmost regard. I understand what you are saying by citing examples of 1977 and others. Believe me, Sir, we are not motivated by any desire for vendetta. I can assure you that I will very faithfully communicate all that you have said, in its essence, nuances and the

deepness of your sentiments, to the hon. Prime Minister and the rest of the Government, without any hesitation whatsoever.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN(Maharashtra): Sir, I had raised very serious points; because of shortage of time, I merely pointed out a number of issues on which we would like to have clarifications from the Government. The first was about the conduct so far as Election Commission is concerned. For the first time in the history of India, we found that the Election Commission of India and the Government were on a confrontationist attitude. They appeared against the Election Commission in the matter of powers under article 324. They had discretion. They had come across with some nuances which compelled them. They were told, 'Please, for God's sake, do not give any trace of the outcome of the exit polls and other things, it is bound to affect the trend in the other States where the elections are still to take place. In spite of that, the Government, in its wisdom, thought it necessary that they should not support the Election Commission, and they opposed the Election Commission. This is the first instance of this type. What were the compulsions? That is the first point. I would like to understand the attitude of the Government.

The second point was about the special provision under the Constitution where a meeting of the Rajya Sabha can be called. Of course, I had said that I do not want to bring in the name of the President. But a number of our colleagues had gone to him, requested him. There is a specific provision, in order to avoid any kind of discussion in the public. We were unanimous; that if a special session had been called, certainly, we would have been happy. We would have given all the support to the armed forces who, in fact, had done the bravest thing that we have ever come across, of similar nature in the world. But I do not know what were the compulsions. In spite of repeated requests, special session of the Rajya Sabha was not called. Certainly we would like to understand what the compulsions were. This is the second one.

The third is the issue which I had raised on the floor of the House. That is about importing sugar and wheat knowing fully well that both were available in the country. There was no shortage. In spite of that, why did you think that it was necessary that under the OGL, sugar should be imported especially from Pakistan and other countries, who were subsidising it to a terrible extent. I requested Mr. Barnala, who was presiding over that Ministry then. He was fully satisfied that there was a definite, justifiable, case that a minimum of 60% of Excise Duty was to be levied on them so that there was a level-playing field for our farmers. I do not know how this proposal had gone to the Cabinet and why it was not thought necessary to turn it down. Was it because Nawaz Sharief was to be obliged? It is being

alleged that this sugar was imported from the factories belonging to Nawaz Sharief. It is also being alleged that other considerations weighed with the Government. I think it is fair enough to ask the Government about it. If this kind of a situation prevails, the Government should come clear as to what the reasons were which made you thinking of importing sugar when plenty of sugar was already available in the country itself. Moreover, they went against the interests of the cultivator as well as the general public. I do not want to know at what price you purchased it and at what price you sold it. These are matters of detail. But, these are very important issues which I thought it necessary to raise for getting a clarification because we are puzzled as to what were the compulsions because of which they were required to import all these items. Sir, they should have invoked the anti-dumping measures. Why did they not think it necessary to invoke the anti-dumping measures? Is this is the only reason that they wanted to please someone or for other reasons best know to them? They have to come out clear and tell us and the public at large as to why they did not invoke the anti-dumping measures. Sir, these are some of the points on which I would like to have a clarification. If for any reason, the hon. Minister, who is deputising for the Prime Minister, is not in a position to reply to my points now, I will be satisfied if I get a written reply from the respective Ministries so that I feel satisfied that there was nothing hanky-panky about it.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Karnataka): Sir, the hon. Minister has stated that he would convey whatever has been stated by the Leader of the Opposition to the government and particularly to the Prime Minister. We are thankful to him for that. Sir, in addition to that, it also concerns the rights of the Members of Parliament. Sir, it has been stated in the Parliament that when an investigating agency files a chargesheet in a court, the Government can do nothing. Sir, the Parliament is supreme. If some charge is filed against people of character, the Members of Parliament in a court of law by the investigating agency without substantiating the charge.....(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Mr. Poojary, would you kindly be specific? ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Please hear me. It concerns the hon. Members. (*Interruptions*) ...If any police officer files a chargesheet without any evidence in a court against an hon. Member whether he is in the Government or whether he is not in the Government, I would like to know whether the Parliament is helpless. Sir, the Parliament is supreme. We have got here a right to represent through you by saying that there is no evidence and please see that the case against him is withdrawn. Now, the question is very simple. If it is stated...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Mr. Poojary, you have to seek clarifications....(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Sir, the hon. Minister...(*Interruptions*)... Apart from this, another statement came from the other wing of Parliament. That is why I am submitting this point. It is a point concerning all the Members of Parliament. Today, it may be Rajiv Gandhi or Poojary; tomorrow, it may be Mr. Vajpaye or Mr. Jaswant Singh...(*Interruptions*)... He has yielded...(*Interruptions*)... After all, it is the functioning of Parliament...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SATISHCHANDRA SITARAM PRADHAN (Maharashtra): When you were ruling the country, we faced a lot of problems like this...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Let us discuss this without any bias...(*Interruptions*)... My submission is this...(*Interruptions*)... The hon. Leader of the House made a point that there is no vendetta and no bias...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Please, one minute...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Poojary, are you making a statement?...(*Interruptions*)... Will you precisely state what clarification you are seeking, which is different from the Leader of the Opposition, from the Minister? ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: The Government should keep in mind this aspect...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SATISHCHANDRA SITARAM PRADHAN: Are you warning the Government? ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: You are not understanding the point...(*Interruptions*)... You try to understand...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SATISHCHANDRA SITARAM PRADHAN: Manmohan Singhji, you guide him properly...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Tomorrow it may happen with you...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SATISHCHANDRA SITARAM PRADHAN: You go and get proper training from Shri Pranab Mukherjee...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Mr. Pradhan, please be seated...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Mr. Pradhan, I was here before you came here...(*Interruptions*)... This you keep in mind...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Now, please sit down...*(Interruptions)*...Mr. Pranab Mukherjee.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, while replying to the debate, the hon. Leader of the House pointed out that the Government will take the issue seriously and engage in a serious dialogue in the Seattle Round where the millennium-round of talks are going to take place. He has also assured the House that the opposition will also be taken into consideration. In this connection, most respectfully, I would like to inform him that eight months ago, the Ministry of Commerce—the Prime Minister was Mr. Vajpayee—invited the designated representatives of the Congress Party to discuss these issues; the Congress Party designated a person to discuss these issues with the Minister of Commerce. But nothing had happened in these eight months. Therefore, what I would like to submit most respectfully is, please don't repeat this.

My second clarification is in regard to the nuclear policy, which he had referred to. He tried to create an impression of continuity of the policy. What was implicit before 1998 became explicit after the second explosion in Pokhran. My respectful submission in this. The policies that we articulated in a phrase, "India will keep its nuclear options open", You closed that option and replaced that phrase, in your National Agenda for Governance, in March, 1998, by a phrase "India will induct nuclear weapons." Are these two expressions the same? Therefore, perhaps, it would be too simplistic to come to the conclusion that what was implicit was made explicit by the explosion. And, I am afraid, from this side of the House, we cannot accept that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Mr. Sanatan Bisi, you wanted to seek two clarifications. Mr. Chavan had already sought one. You don't repeat the first point.

SHRI SANATAN BISI (Orissa): The only thing I want from the Government is an assurance. Sir, there was a lot of discussion in this House, so far as the Lahore Declaration is concerned. But my point is, a copy of this Declaration has not been laid on the Table of the House. I want an assurance from the Government on this.

My second point is with regard to laying on the Table of the House, a copy of the draft nuclear doctrine. I want an assurance from the Government on this also.

My third point is, the Rajya Sabha was not convened; whatever may be the reason. The Government should ensure that in future, they will not ignore the Rajya Sabha. These are the assurances I want from the Government. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Mr. Bisi, we seek clarifications, not assurances. You may re-phrase...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SANATAN BISI: No, Sir, all these things are part of the motion...*(Interruptions)*...Am I clear, Sir?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR) Okay, you have made you point clear. Now, Shri Kapil Sibal.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar): Sir, I had, in the course of my response, made certain points on the draft nuclear doctrine. I had given certain facts and figures with respect to the cost analysis. The hon. Leader of the House has chosen not to respond to them, I guess, because of shortage of time. Sir, as this is an issue which is vital to the interest of the country, I would like to know from him whether he would give an assurance that in the times to come, very soon—hopefully in the next session—the draft nuclear doctrine will be discussed at length in this House before any decision is taken on it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I will try to respond briefly, but as satisfactorily as I can. I have already responded to the clarifications sought by the Leader of the Opposition.

Shri S.B. Chavan made three points. The first point was about the exit polls. It was not an attitude of any confrontation, with the office of the Election Commission. The Government stood by the constitutional doctrine, that is, the freedom of expression. That is the view which we held, and which we continue to hold. The Supreme Court upheld that viewpoint. When it comes to what the Supreme Court has said, the fact is that the Supreme Court did not wish to interfere in what the Election Commission wanted to do. You will well appreciate, Sir, it is not possible and not so easy for the Government to interfere into what the media say, whether that is pleasant or unpleasant to us.

So far as convening of the Rajya Sabha's special session is concerned, a number of meetings were organized by the Prime Minister, in which all the political parties were represented. *(interruptions)*

SHRI SANATAN BISI: But, that was not the proper forum. *(interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): He is answering the clarifications. If you do not agree with that, we will see to it. Let him continue.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, the hon. Prime Minister convened a number of meetings with the leaders and representatives of various parties. *(interruptions)*

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: But that cannot be a substitute for...(interruptions)...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Please, let me answer. The meetings were convened to discuss specifically this aspect as to whether the special session should be called or not. Only two precedents existed in regard to convening of a special session, but they did not relate to conduct of any business, to the discussion of any issue. They did not relate to continuity of the work. I shall not go into that. There was no unanimity amongst the political leadership as to whether...(interruptions)...I can only say what I can say. (interruptions)

Then, Shri Janardhana Poojary largely reiterated the point that had been made attractively and congenitly by the Leader of the Opposition. You have asserted the position that Parliament is a law-making body. I agree with you. If Parliament in its collective wisdom chooses to amend the law, that this is how the law ought to be implemented in future, we agree. We are all servants of Parliament. But at present, that is not one of the parliamentary functions.

Then, hon. Shri Pranab Mukherjee raised some points about the WTO. I recognize that, perhaps, an assurance, which was given eight months ago, could not be then fulfilled. We are a Government that is only a few days old. I assure you, it will be and it has been our endeavour not to repeat the omissions and errors of the past. On WTO, I assure you that if there is a clear position, it will benefit everyone, including the Government, if you sit collectively and work on it. So, on the nuclear tests of 1998 you said that you were not convinced. That, of course, is entirely your prerogative. I can only attempt to convince you because after the post-May 1998 tests; in the statement that was issued, indeed, on the 13th of March, Government had clearly stated that the underground nuclear explosions had to be undertaken, and I remember the phrase very clearly up till now — 'had to be undertaken', to validate and update technology. I am not talking of break in continuity. These two words "validate and update technology" are words or phrases that were insisted upon by the scientific community of our country, and the tests were undertaken only to validate and to update technology because, thereafter at certain international treaties which were then imminent and clearly taking place, the doors to further nuclear underground testing would have been even more firmly shut. The transition that took place between implicit and explicit is the most important transition, and that is of explicit weaponisation which would lead to the attainment of minimum credible deterrence.

A point was raised about Lahore Declaration. In this very House, there was a full-fledged discussion on the Lahore Declaration in which I recollect, a number of Membership participated, and I had the honour. even then of

explaining every aspect, not simply of the Lahore Declaration, but there was a triad of documents that emerged from Lahore Declaration. The reason why the Lahore Declaration was not placed on the Table of the house was because it was Declaration; it was not an Agreement. Sir, the text of the document was carried extensively by all the papers everywhere. On honourable Shri Kapil Sibal's point — he had referred about nuclear doctrine and the cost analysis, let me repeat again, Sir, that the nuclear doctrine is a document of the National Security Advisory board. It is a discussion paper. It is not an adopted doctrine of the Government of India. The National Security Advisory board has submitted a Paper for discussion which is not to be treated as a National Security Council Paper. After the National Security Council takes its position, then it will go to the Cabinet for discussion, and in this process, the Parliament will get every opportunity to discuss what is already under discussion, and I have no difficulty in informing the honourable Members that certainly in the forthcoming Session, when the Demands for Grants of various Ministries get taken up or any other manner should the Members desire to discuss this doctrine, by all means the Government is ready to discuss this. It is only a discussion paper in the form of a proposed doctrine. Shri Kapil Sibal said that in the President's Address it has been mentioned that the nuclear doctrine has been prepared. But I want to clarify that it is a nuclear doctrine, which is still in its draft form because it is a Paper of the National Security Council Advisory Board. That is why it is for discussion. It is the only example any where in the world of a country discussing as important an issue as nuclear doctrine and on cost analysis. I am ready to discuss it at length with you, but it is a highly technical subject and the figures and the examples on which Shri Kapil Sibal had based his cost analysis are Western figures. Let me share with you the reality. I have said it earlier also. We are not re-inventing the Cold War here, and in the approach to the entire nuclear question, India is not falling into the trap, either of re-inventing the cold war or working on the tired cliches, which are the legacy of the cold war here. Therefore, when we use phrases like submarine of a U.S. provenance will cost that much, and therefore, an S.L.B.M. will cost that much, some of these will not apply.

In the world today, there are four separate nuclear realities. I do not want to go into the detail, because it is a highly complex subject. The four separate nuclear realities are: the Western reality. This is the post-NATO-post Warsaw pact, which is really a trans-Atlantic or cross-Atlantic reality. Then there is a Gulf reality. We can't pay scant attention to it. There is a third reality, which is a South Asian reality. And the fourth reality is the East-Asian reality. Each of these nuclear realities is operating in a fashion which has very little relevance to the parameters or the cliches or the calculations of

the Cold War. I can say this much only, briefly, because the time does not permit me. If you combine that with what we have said of 'no first use, non-use against non-nuclear weapons, of nuclear safety and passive defence postures,—on which we will have time to explain at much greater length later on,—you will recognize that the kind of cost calculations on which you are working will simply not apply, because, firstly, the cost of the Indian nuclear programme is spread over the years. It is only entirely indigenous programme in the world. Even the People's republic of China's nuclear programme was not an indigenous one. Even the nuclear programme of the United States of America was not an indigenous one. It benefited from the exodus of the scientific community of the post-World War-II Germany. The Indian nuclear programme is entirely an indigenous one. It has spread over the years. With the kind of expertise and technical ability that India has built, costs have been spread over the years. therefore, in cost calculations you do put those into account. But I assure the hon. Member, Shri Sibal, that when we come to a more detailed discussion on this, this would require a lot of time. I cannot do justice to this complex issue with the constraint of the time that I have. I have attempted on this as best as I could.

Now, I come to the question of sugar. Rather than burdening you with the papers, let me go on with the facts of the matter. You suggested that this was done to please or placate or benefit one or the other, whether in this country or elsewhere. Such is not the case. Sir, coming, as you do, from Maharashtra, which is a great example of development of sugar industry, I need hardly point out to you that sugar production fluctuates from year to year. It depends on various factors. In order to meet the domestic demand during years of low production sugar used to be imported on Government account through public sector undertakings. Since this was not considered to be an efficient and transparent method of balancing the domestic demand and supply, a decision was taken on 9th March, 1994, to put sugar on the free list of imports. At that time there was a different Government and a different Prime Minister. Mr. Chavan, you also held some responsible position in the then Cabinet.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: The instance that I had quoted relates to the period when Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee was the Prime Minister and Mr. Barnala was in his Cabinet. On his behalf you should reply. That is exactly the point on which I would like to have your clarification.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, any Government is free to change its policy, if it so desires, on a day-to-day basis. That is the prerogative of the Government. If you do so, India would devalue itself in the international market. As Government, we cannot be changing policies on a day-to-day basis. Therefore, this Government really inherited the policy of free import

of sugar. Even though imports during 1998-99 were taking place only in response to market situations, imports in 1998-99 could certainly not be considered excessive. Mr. Vajpayee's Government took corrective action by increasing the customs duty. In 1994, it was your Government's decision. It was then zero per cent duty. On 28th April, 1998, we had increased the duty from 0 to 5 per cent. Then, on 14th January, 1999, from 5 per cent to 20 per cent. Then, again on the 28th February, from 20 per cent to 27 per cent. Therefore, to suggest that there was no duty on the import of sugar would be an incorrect conclusion. Even the Government was alive to the situation and it responded appropriately by granting tariff protection to the indigenous industry and to the farmers, sugarcane growers, who were actually denied of it from the 9th March, 1994 to 27th April, 1998. At the same time, we have been able to make available adequate quantity of sugar in the open market. It is because of that the retail prices of sugar have, by and large, been under check, in control, for the domestic consumers.

Now, as regards the imports from Pakistan, may I, Sir, with due respect point out that as these imports were under the OGL, any person could import sugar from any producing country? Now, Pakistan quite rightly and admittedly, has given export subsidies, particularly, in the case of sugar at a significant level to their exporters which makes their prices relatively more competitive. That is why when they came to India, these levies were imposed...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): I fail to understand as to what clarification you are seeking, and I will not except the Minister to reply to it.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: May I expect from the Minister a written reply so that I can get authentic information? Certainly, I would like to be satisfied. That is the only point.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I can understand, Sir, if the hon. Member is not satisfied about sugar, I will attempt to sweeten the matter further by requesting the concerned Minister to provide him with whatever additional sugar that he wants.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Thank you, Leader of the House. Now that the reply and clarifications have been given, I shall now put the amendments which have been moved to vote. I put amendment Nos. 1 and 2 by Shri Thalavai Sundaram to vote. Mr. Sundaram is not present here. Anyhow, I will put them to vote.

Amendment Nos. 1 and 2 were negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Amendment Nos. 3 to 66 by Shri Ramachandran Pillai.

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI (Kerala): I am not pressing them.

Amendment Nos. 3 to 66, were by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Amendment Nos. 67 to 76 by Shri Margabandu.

SHRI R. MARGABANDU (Tamilnadu): I withdraw my amendments.

Amendment Nos. 67 to 76, were by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Amendment Nos. 77 to 79 by Shri Khagen Das.

SHRI KHAGEN DAS (Tripura): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am not pressing my amendments. But my demand is that the Government should come forward with an assurance that they would sincerely take adequate measures to tackle the insurgency problem in the North-Eastern States, in letter and spirit.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have no difficulty in giving that assurance unequivocally and unambiguously.

Amendment Nos. 77 to 79, were by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Amendment Nos. 80 to 82 by Shri Sanatan Bisi.

SHRI SANATAN BISI: I am not pressing my amendments.

Amendment Nos. 80 to 82, were by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Amendment Nos. 118 to 134. Shri Dipankar Mukherjee.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): I am not pressing them, Sir.

Amendment (Nos. 118 to 134) were, by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Amendment No. 135 by Shri O.S. Manian. He is not present. I shall put the amendment to vote.

The Amendment (NO. 135) was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Amendment Nos. 165 to 183 by Shri Nilotpal Basu.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Sir, I am not pressing them.

Amendment (Nos. 165 to 183) were, by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Amendment Nos. 184 to 193 by Shri Vayalar Ravi.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, I am withdrawing them.

Amendment (Nos. 184 to 193) were, by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Amendment No. 228 by Shri Pranab Mukherjee.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am not pressing it, Sir.

Amendment (No. 228) was, by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Now, the question is:

That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:

"That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on October 25, 1999."

The Motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): The House now stands adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty-seven minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 29th October, 1999.
