

if we are to buy wheat at the higher price from other countries, why should the Government which is committed to *swadeshi* and self-reliance, not buy it from the indigenous market? Why should the Government give a higher price for wheat to other countries? Why is the Government not giving a higher price for wheat to our own farmers? Why is the Government not giving incentives to grow more wheat in the coming winter, *rabi* season?

There is a great hue and cry against the anti-farmer policies of the present Government, will the Food Minister and the Agriculture Minister look into the matter and scrap the order to import wheat?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI SOMPAL): Sir, one thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please.

SHRI SOMPAL: It is a simple matter of record. I will speak one sentence.

The alleged anti-farmer policies of this Government have nothing to do with this import. This was a decision taken by the previous Government. That is all. Thank you.

SHRIMATI URMILABEN CHIMANBHAI PATEL: Sir, at that time the price of wheat was more than Rs. 20/- per kg., but now wheat is available at a lower price.

SHRI SOMPAL: She has been supporting the previous Government.

SHRIMATI URMILABEN CHIMANBHAI PATEL: The situation is totally different.

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति महोदय, मैं जिस समस्या की ओर इस माननीय सदन का ध्यान और आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ वह बहुत ही गंभीर है। हमारे देश में सफाई कर्मचारी जिनकी संख्या लाखों में ... (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know you- AS a speak. We have to finish it by two O'clock. We must give at least half an hour to (he hon. Minister to make hit statement and for hon. Members to seek clarifications. I request you to finish it in two minutes.

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : फिर कल के लिए कर दें, अगर ऐसा है।

श्री सभापति : हाँ, कल के लिए हो गया।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : सर, कल के लिए कर दें।

श्री सभापति : ठीक है, छोड़ दीजिए। यह कल के लिए हो गया।

Resolution by United Nations Security Council on nuclear testa conducted by India and Pakistan

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, will you be able to finish within two minutes? Apart from you, there are two more Members who would like to speak on this subject, Shri Ramachandran Pillai and Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: (Tamil Nadu) I will add only one sentence.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: (West Bengal) Mr. Chairman, Sir, the matter on which I am seeking the attention of the House and the Government is only on two or three points. I would like the Government to keep the House informed about these things. We are aware of the resolution passed by the Security Council asking both India and Pakistan to halt their nuclear programmes. As reported in *The Times of India* of 8th June, 1998, it appears that there was some sort of unprecedented practice and procedure followed in the Security Council of the United Nations. If I remember correctly, never in the last 50 years of the United Nations' history a party concerned, a country concerned was not allowed to speak on its own behalf. Apart from Permanent Members, Non-Permanent Membe** also constitute the Security

Council. But whenever the country concerned is criticised or has to say something on a matter on which the Security Council is deliberating, that country is given a chance to speak, whether it is a Member or a non-Member. But according to the newspaper report we find that our permanent representative in the Security Council was not allowed to speak whereas the permanent representative of Pakistan was allowed to speak. It is against the Charter of the United Nations. I do not know whether the news is correct or not, but I have my own doubt. That is why I would like to seek clarification from the Government in regard to that.

The second aspect is, it is not a question of what we are going to do, but some sort of absurd proposition is arising out of the resolution which has been passed and how the Government of India is going to respond to it. I think the Government in its response must carry the whole country with them. Therefore, I would like to suggest that the authorised representative of the Government should talk to the leaders of the various political parties and try to evolve a national response to the resolution which has been adopted because it may lead to the next stage, economic sanctions. I would not like to put any conditionalities to the Government's observation, but I would expect that some authoritative representative of the Government should come to the House either today or tomorrow and make a statement explaining the position in detail, what the situation is, where we stand, how he has responded to the sort of peculiar situation which has been created where India's case was not represented when the Security Council deliberated on this issue. As per the newspaper report, our permanent representative was not allowed to speak at the meeting of the Security Council. Thank you.

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI (Kerala): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the wrong and bankrupt policies of the

present Government have actually internationalised the Kashmir issue. These policies are putting the security of our country into danger. Of course, we have been taking a consistent stand that

the Kashmir issue between India and Pakistan is a bilateral issue and we will try to find a solution to this problem through discussions. We have also consistently resisted the intervention of any other country in this dispute. But by doing all these things now this issue has become an international issue. They have internationalised the Kashmir issue because of their wrong policy. Because of the earlier consistent policy, we were able to come to an agreement with Pakistan in 1972 which is known as the Simla Agreement. Pakistan also had agreed to the terms and conditions of that Agreement. This is a bilateral issue. We tried to settle this issue through bilateral negotiations. Now, the P-5 countries have come into the picture. The Security Council has passed a resolution directing the Secretary General to come to the Security Council and report whether this decision is being implemented or not. They have asked India to stop making nuclear weapons. They have also directed India and Pakistan, as per the Press reports, to come together and try to settle the Kashmir issue. So, the P-5 nations' decision and the Security Council's decision show that because of the policy of the Government of India, you have facilitated internationalising the Kashmir issue. Not only this, now, our country is getting isolated in the international community. Of course, we have friends, and through our friends, we are trying to find out a solution to the problem. We know that some of these P-5 countries in the Security Council have always been trying to create a problem and trying to instigate and induce these countries to fight against each other because America's interest is there, because Great Britain's interest is there. That is why we have been resisting the intervention of these countries. Now, because of your wrong policy, you have put the security

of our country in danger, facilitating isolation of our country in the international community. I also say that these countries, the P-5 countries and the Security Council, have no right to impose any sanctions, have no right to issue any direction. Why are they doing so? This is just to keep their monopoly and to safeguard their own interests. So, with all the force at our command, we oppose the action of these countries to intervene in these matters. Sir, this is a very serious matter and many reports have come. I do not know about the correctness or otherwise of the reports. Let the Government come forward with a statement and we will get an opportunity to discuss this most important issue. The Government should also take steps to initiate a discussion and try to evolve a consensus on this particular issue. Thank you.

SHRIMATI

JAYANTHI

NATARAJAN: Sir, I would like to associate myself with what has been said by Mr. Pranab Mukherjee and Mr. Ramachandran Pillai. I would just like to add that all of us, cutting across party lines, object to the Resolution that has been passed by the Security Council is a display of standing immorality of the permanent Members of the Security Council, who have been responsible over the last fifty years for conducting over 2,000 tests who are turning around to countries like India and PaWstan to tell us how to run our nuclear weapons programme or whether to conduct blasts

in our country or not. Therefore, Sir, I would like to join all my colleagues in condemning the Resolution of the P-5 countries, as being totally discriminatory, totally opposed to all norms of international law and totally opposed to all norms of international and diplomatic conduct. Sir, I would also like to join all my colleagues in saying that there has been no talk regrettably in the Security Council, and in the Resolution, of any attempt to reduce their own arsenal. There has been no reference at all to the

arsenal which the P-5 have kept *int* themselves, and for a country which I *«iU not, name; that has been the only country to actually use nuclear weapons, to turn around and tell India how to run its affairs, in something which is nothing short of uncivilised behaviour. Therefore, I would like to say that we call upon the Prime Minister, while condemning the Resolution which has been passed by the security Council, adding my views to those of Mr. Ramchandran Pillai, that it is unfortunate that the policies of this Government have to led to the internationalisation of the Kashmir issue. I would also like to point out to the Prime Minister, who is present over here, that certain of his statements conveyed an impression to some of us that as a result of the explosions, as a result of the nuclear tests, there may be some move on India's part to sign the CTBT. This is a move having very, very far ranging consequences. I would like to Prime Minister to please explain to us whether there is any move to sign the CTBT because in my view, the CTBT continues to be a discriminatory treaty, and merely because of these explosions, merely because of these nuclear tests, I don't think India should be pushed into a position to sign the CTBT, particularly in view of the entry into forced provisions. I would like the Prime Minister to please clarify it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): Sir, the thing is, to the Prime Minister is only reacting to the hon. Members' request, and this will not be treated as a statement; otherwise, there will be clarifications etc.

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI: Let us have a discussion.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): We will have a discussion. Just clarifications won't do. One day we will have a through discussion on this question.

Sir, hon. Members are aware of the Resolution adopted on 6th June, 1998, by the United Nations Security Council. I would like to take the House into confidence on our position in this matter.

We regret that the Security Council has acted in a manner in which it has produced a Resolution which is completely unhelpful in respect of the objectives it seems to address. The Resolution contains a number of references to nuclear non-proliferation. As I had mentioned in my earlier statement in the House, we are a responsible and committed member of the international community. The Resolution urges us not to carry any nuclear weapons test explosions. For India, such an urging is redundant because we have already instituted a voluntary moratorium. We have also indicated our willingness to explore ways and means of converting this undertaking into a *de jure* obligation. Further, we have made clear our readiness to engage in multilateral negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty in the Conference in Geneva. We cannot, however, be expected to commit ourselves in advance of these negotiations, to unilaterally restrain production of fissile materials. In keeping with our commitment to non-proliferation, we maintain the strictest controls over exports of nuclear materials and technologies. Our record in this regard has been impeccable and better than that of some countries who are parties to the NPT or members of the Nuclear Suppliers' Group or even Permanent Members of the UN Security Council.

However, the call made in the Resolution that we should stop our nuclear programmes or missile programmes is unacceptable. Decisions in this regard will be taken by the Government on the basis of our own assessments and national security requirements, in a reasonable and responsible manner. This right, which we claim for ourselves is not something new; it is the right of every sovereign country, and right that every Government in this

country has strongly upheld for the last 50 years.

Sir, a glaring lacuna in the Resolution is the total absence of a recognition that the non-proliferation issue is not a regional issue but has to be dealt with in a non-discriminatory global context. We find it unfortunate that the UN Security Council Resolution does not reflect on the judgement of the highest international judicial body, the International Court of Justice, which has questioned the legitimacy of nuclear weapons and called for urgent negotiations for their elimination. In the Paper on "The Evolution of India's Nuclear Policy" laid on the Table of this House, we have reiterated our commitment to nuclear disarmament. Let me categorically state that unlike other nuclear-weapon States who have sought to retain their exclusive hold over their nuclear arsenals, India has no such ambition. Government is committed to initiatives that can open negotiations for a global convention for the elimination of all nuclear weapons. The attempt to project the recent tests by India as a threat to peace and security is totally misguided and grossly out of focus. Such a portrayal of our policy ignores the positive steps announced by Government to which I have already referred both in the global disarmament framework and the regional context. Our tests were necessary because of the failure of a flawed non-proliferation regime and, therefore, we categorically reject the notion that these have adversely affected either regional or global security. Government has indicated willingness to engage in a meaningful dialogue with key interlocutors on the whole range of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation issues. Last week Special Envoy, Shri Brajesh Mishra, visited Paris and London in this regard. He had meetings at the seniormost levels in the two capitals. Dialogues with other countries are also planned. These dialogues have to be seen as part of a process, a process that will lead to a better understanding of India's position.

Hon. members are aware that India has always desired a peaceful, friendly and mutually beneficial relationship with Pakistan based on confidence and respect for each other's concerns. I have already said on the floor of both Houses and I would like to reiterate that a secure and prosperous Pakistan is in India's interest. Our vision of our bilateral relationship is not confined to a resolution of outstanding issues, but is also directed to the future by seeking to build a stable structure of cooperation, which will benefit the people of both countries. As I wrote recently to Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, we must not remain mired in the past, prisoners of old contentions. And I say to him today, let us put the past behind us, let us think of the welfare of our children and grand children. We have remained committed to a path of direct bilateral dialogue with Pakistan. This reflects the nation's conviction and confidence that it is only through direct discussions in a sustained and constructive manner that we can move ahead in our bilateral relationship. I would again like to reiterate our desire for the earliest resumption of the official talks with Pakistan. The subject for discussions including peace and security, (along with confidence building measures) Jammu and Kashmir, economic and commercial cooperation and cross-border terrorism have been identified. Our proposals for the modalities of these talks have been with Pakistan since January this year. We await their response. We have also made it clear once again that there is no place for outside involvement of any nature whatsoever in our dialogue process with Pakistan.

Hon. Members have expressed strong reservations against attempts to internationalise the Kashmir issue. There is simply no question of India ever agreeing to such internationalism. UN Security Council has chosen to mention Kashmir in its Resolution. This is unacceptable and does not change the reality that the State of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian

Union. I would also like to draw the attention of the Hon. Members to the terms in which Kashmir finds mention in the Resolution. The UN Security Council has recognised that bilateral dialogue has to be the basis of India-Pakistan relations and mutually acceptable solutions have to be found for outstanding issues including Kashmir. This is in keeping with our position. Thank you.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, it is a full-fledged statement. Can we have a copy of the statement? Can we also seek clarifications?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Earlier, you had agreed not to seek clarifications. (*Interruptions*).

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): He was reacting to the remarks made by the hon. Members. (*Interruptions*).

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: That is not true. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Sikander Bakht. (*Interruptions*).

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Sir, it was a full-fledged statement. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now Shri Sikander Bakht will make a statement. Copies of the statement may be circulated.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Maruti Udyog Limited

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): Mr. Chairman Sir, I wish to make a statement concerning the dispute which has been going on over the last year between Government of India and Suzuki Motor Corporation Japan (SMC), over the appointment of the Managing Director of the Joint Venture Co. Maruti Udyog Limited (MUL). A request for arbitration was filed before the International Court of Arbitration (ICA) of the International Chamber of Commerce by SMC and the arbitration proceedings are currently going on. As Hon'ble Members are