

**GOVERNMENT BILL**

**The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Amendment) Bill, 1988.**

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA):** Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985.

**The question was put and the motion was adopted.**

**SHRI YASHWANT SINHA:** Sir, I introduce the Bill.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** It is 1.50 p.m. now. Do you want to adjourn for half an hour or one hour?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** One hour.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Then you have to sit one hour late. We have to complete the debate today.

Now we adjourn till 2.50 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at fifty four minutes past two of the clock.

**The Deputy Chairman in the Chair.**

**DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal):** Madam Deputy Chairman, I am happy that after your election for the fourth time as the Deputy Chairman of this House, I have the privilege of making some observations on the floor of this House when you are occupying the Chair. Madam, with your permission, I want to start the discussion on the functioning of the Ministry of External Affairs. There is no doubt that the developments of the last few months have brought India into the focus of international arena and in the fitness of things, the country must respond to the issues,

with which we are confronted, in a unified manner, if possible. Why I am saying 'if possible' is, from the developments which have taken place over the last few weeks it appears to me—I may be wrong—that there is no adequate reflection on the gravity of the situation in the behaviour and conduct, in the functioning of the Government. We are having a discussion on the External Affairs Ministry when there is no full-fledged Foreign Minister. The Prime Minister is being burdened. It is not unusual. also it has happened. During also it has happened. But today's situation is an extraordinary situation. Perhaps, it requires urgent attention of a full-fledged Cabinet Minister for dealing with the subject. I am not making any reflection on the Minister of State who is looking after this work. She is quite competent. But all of us are aware that in this protocol-oriented world of diplomacy, rank and status count. Thereafter, it is necessary that the Ministry must have a proper head. Of course, in every country, Foreign Policy is basically the Prime Minister's portfolio, but, at the same time, without a full-fledged Foreign Minister to aid and advise the Prime Minister, it becomes very difficult for him to transact that business. This point, I thought, I should strike at in the very beginning.

In the last Session, some of these issues were raised by me and also by my colleagues. When the Prime Minister came out with the National Agenda for governance, in that National Agenda for governance, the Prime Minister indicated that he would like to emphasise on a new mode of governance where majority, arithmetic and number are not essentially important; there should be involvement, there should be consensus on major issues; we welcome it. But what did we find, Madam, on the ground? In the same document where he talked of introducing a new culture of governance, governance through consensus, we found

that his Government made a major departure in the area of 'nuclear policy'. It is a major departure. Earlier, there was a consensual position. The consensual position was—that was from 1974 onwards—"India will keep its nuclear options open." That is the phrase we have used umpteen times, including the Prime Minister who represented India. And I still remember the speech made by him as a member of the Indian delegation in the first comity of the United Nations in 1995. You closed those options. And it is not that you didn't consult others. If we look at the document which is titled "National Agenda for Governance", there we will find the signatures of all your coalition partners, including the party which is represented by only one Member, and there you decided to replace the phrase of 'keeping our nuclear options open' by a new phrase 'India will induct nuclear weapons'. Is it not a major change? Is it not a major departure from the consensual position? As the Government of the day, you are entitled to do so.

Did you think it necessary, when you were making a major change in the consensual approach—I am not using the term "taking into confidence"—to consult the principal opposition party which ruled the country for 45 years and which has made its own contribution in evolving the nuclear policies of this country? Why was it not done? At that time nobody expected that you would tell the people that on a particular day you were going to explode the bomb. It was not expected. That is a decision which the Government will have to take and it should exclusively be the prerogative of the Prime Minister. I fully agree with you. When you are changing the position and closing our options by substituting the words "choosing to induct nuclear weapons" for the words "keeping nuclear options open", at that stage, according to me, you should have consulted others and you should have taken into account the concerns of other political parties.

Now there have been major changes in the international scenario, so far as our decision of exploding the nuclear bombs or carrying out the nuclear tests on 11th and 13th of May is concerned. For a few days we had the satisfaction that it will, perhaps, act as a deterrent. I am not mentioning the name of that country. But it did not happen so. There was no question of any deterrent. Just within two weeks, precisely on 27th May, they also exploded nuclear bombs or conducted nuclear tests and there was a major change in the perception about India in the international arena. Here, Mr. Prime Minister, I would like to draw your attention, most respectfully, to the difference in the perception about India and Pakistan in the international arena. In 1988 the then President of the United States refused to certify that Pakistan did not possess nuclear devices which may lead to manufacturing nuclear weapons. He was unable to give that certificate. There were major and serious consequences in USA—Pakistan relation-ships. The supply of F-16 aircraft, which were ordered, and certain other military hardware—Pakistan gave money to an American company for that—was forestalled. The delivery was delayed. The delivery was prevented because the US administration threw up its hand and said. "As per the Pressler Amendment, we cannot deliver these military hardware to you as our President is not in a position to certify that Pakistan has not acquired clandestinely nuclear devices which may lead to the weaponisation of your armed forces." Was that the situation about India? Everybody knew that India had the technological competence. Everybody knew, 24 years ago, that the first blast took place in 1974. Everybody knew that the technological competence of this country was far superior to that of Pakistan and there was an element of indigenous capability compared to Pakistan. But the international opinion was in favour of India and they made a distinction between India and Pakistan. As a result, in 1988 in the third special session of the

United Nations the then Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, came out with a concrete action plan for nuclear disarmament. It was taken seriously. As Prime Minister, you have mentioned on the floor of this House and on the floor of the other House that nuclear disarmament was, and continues to be, an important ingredient of our foreign policy. How? In what form? In what form would you like to articulate it that you are seriously concerned about it?

All of us are fully aware of what Shri Rajiv Gandhi told the international community. All of us are fully aware that like two other countries we are at the threshold level. We are not a nuclear weapon State, but we are a nuclear threshold State. Yes, we can graduate ourselves from the threshold level to a nuclear weapon State. But deliberately we are opting not to do so because we do hope that you too will give us, if not today, tomorrow or if not tomorrow, a day after tomorrow, a commitment, a timeframe by which there will be a positive signal that nuclear disarmament will be taken up with all seriousness. That is the rationality. We have the capability, we have the competence and technologically we are in a position to manufacture nuclear weapons. But we refused to do so. Therefore, I will beg of the Prime Minister to educate this House on what line the Government is thinking and how they are going to handle the post-Pokhran scenario. If the Government comes to a conclusion and says — I will be quite happy to accept the version of the Government — “Gentlemen sitting on that side, you go on making your observations; We know the business of governance; We will do whatever we consider necessary”, I have no quarrel with the Government. You have got the mandate, however limited it may be, to rule. But if you want to have our cooperation, if you want to evolve a consensual policy on these issues, then there must be consultations and there must be institutional arrangements for those consultations. Here

I would like to suggest one thing for the consideration of the Prime Minister. Only the Prime Minister has full facts at his command. He knows all matters. Fortunately, we have some former Prime Ministers who are alive. On major national issues the American President consults the former Presidents. I don't remember — if I am wrong, I may be corrected — whether in the last four months the present Prime Minister has consulted the former Prime Ministers who are alive. This is an area from where we can get necessary inputs outside the official agencies. Only former Prime Ministers have the full information as you have. What prevents that? You should have create an ambient atmosphere where we could have spoken in one voice. Madam, I do feel that there is a need for speaking in one voice. When we talk of the impact of economic sanctions, we don't speak from a negative point of view. I have no intention to fix the Government or to fix the Finance Minister or to enjoin the present Government. I want to know whether in any way, we, sitting on this side, can help the Government to come out of the impasse which has been created. We raise these issues with this intention. But there is no seriousness on the part of the Government. There is no talk and no assessment on the part of the Government. The Finance Minister in his Budget speech dismissed the whole thing in one sentence that gradually the international community will try to understand our situation and the issues will be resolved. Yes, the issues may be resolved. Certain issues get resolved in the course of time. But the country has to pay the price for that. What price are we going to pay?

I am not buying the theory that some statistics say that our total impact will be 21 billion to 22 billion dollars. The hard fact remains. Mr. Prime Minister, I am putting this question to you. Is it a fact that Enron has indicated that they would like to renegotiate with the Maharashtra Government because the amount which

they were hoping to get from the American Exim Bank — now the American Exim Bank's offer is going to be covered by sanctions — they are not going to get it? It is not merely the aids or the developmental assistance which we have been getting from the United States or from certain multilateral agencies that are going to be affected. The fact is that the India Aid Consortium meeting has been postponed. The fact is that certain contracts have not been renewed. Can we have satisfaction with the assurance that the ongoing projects are not going to be affected? In the morning we were having a discussion. We know what the rate of disbursement is, what the rate of utilisation of the external assistance is. Therefore, if something is not constantly on the pipeline and if there is a disruption, the impact will be felt not immediately but after some time. Therefore, with respect to projects which were exposed, I would like to plead with the Government, please do identify the projects which have been exposed and for which you have received certain assistance but the disbursement schedule has not been completed. If the disbursement schedule has not been completed, how is it going to be affected? When we criticise these aspects in the Budget debate, it is not with a view to find fault with the Government but to understand, to appreciate what steps the Government is going to take. If we know that our external sources will be available to this extent, then we can think of supplementing it. Otherwise, there will be a dislocation of resources. We are talking of seven to eight per cent growth. From where will this seven to eight per cent growth rate come? It will not come from heaven. If you want to have seven to eight per cent growth rate, then a minimum of 30 to 32 per cent of GDP should be the investment ratio. If we expand the rate of our domestic savings from the level of 24.6 per cent, which was achieved during the Eighth Plan, to 26 per cent of GDP, then also there will be a gap. How are we going to bridge this gap? That is the area where the

relevance of external support comes. If we don't have that support, the simple question before the nation will be — it is not a question of party; the nation will have to face it — how to supplement it. If there will be no adequate investible resources from the sources which we expected to have, how to substitute it? From which sources will you rally? Is there any serious exercise over it? If there is no serious exercise, then we demand from the Government of the day — for God's sake, tell us what your difficulty is, and let us see how we can engage ourselves in a constructive manner to resolve these issues. When the Prime Minister had said on the floor of this very House that he would like to take the opportunity of opening a dialogue with Pakistan, how enthusiastically the Members supported it. It is because we wanted a serious dialogue. We are fully aware of the difficulties. But at the same time, if you speak in any international fora, in bilateral talks, in private conversations, outside the parameter of the SAARC negotiations — SAARC does not allow bilateral matters to be brought within its purview — various issues can be discussed. On political discussions, say, when two Prime Ministers are meeting, they are surely not going to discuss merely the World Cup:

They are surely going to discuss the issues which affect their countries. Enthusiastically, we supported it and we would now like to know what details you are going to have. Surely, your bargaining capacity will be reduced to that extent, but on two issues, Mr. Prime Minister, the country would demand from you. You should say very boldly and firmly, "yes, I do feel, I do believe from threat percept it was absolutely necessary to take this decision at that particular point of time. Why are the people of this country confused? I am using the word 'confused' because what happened was we found that your immediate predecessor while participating in a debate pointed out, according to him,

there was no threat perception. There was no immediate action called for. Dr. Manmohan Singh had made it quite clear while participating in the debate on nuclear explosions that we would like to go by the perception of the Government, but the Government must speak in one voice unambiguously, with conviction that this is my perception and from the perception I have come to this conclusion that these steps were absolutely necessary. But, there should be no confusion in this issue; otherwise, there is a problem.

Again I am coming back to the areas of investment and the climate. It is not merely a question in terms of how many dollars, how many millions or billions; it is a question of overall security environment and if the security environment is uncertain, if the international investors come to the conclusion that this region is not safe for long-term investment, then who is going to come and make investment here? Therefore, some sort of understanding with Pakistan is absolutely necessary. With Pakistan, and at the same time, with China some sort of understanding is absolutely necessary. I am unable to understand, Mr. Prime Minister, what was the need for your Defence Minister to speak in such languages. After all, he is not a Minister for the first time. He was a Minister in 1977; he was a Minister in 1989 and now again he is a Minister, and the contradiction is, if somebody brings these two pieces together — on 28th of May in reply to a Starred Question you were saying as Foreign Minister, the whole thing is conciliated — for lack of time I would not read it, but every word was chosen in the written part of the statement — that we are trying to improve the relationship with China; confidence building measures initiated a couple of years ago will be continuing; trade, economic and cultural relations will be further advanced. Every word, every nuance, every sentence was perfectly all right, but what happened? In the afternoon, quoting from some

published document — I said that it is a secret document — the whole atmosphere was created just to score a debating point. The Defence Minister thought it absolutely necessary to put China in the dock. Who does not know in this House, or particularly in the Government, from where Pakistan got M-11 missiles, from where Pakistan got this technology? Surely, that is not their indigenous technology — starting from Hatf-I, Hatf-II, Hatf-III, to Ghauri, both for a workload of 250 kgs to 500 kgs, having a range from 250 to 750 kilometres, including the single warhead, everything was imported and most of the people know from which source they imported it. But, surely there are certain things which are not to be told for obvious reasons and more so for the Government because when we are in the Government, when somebody is in the Government, certain obligations are there.

You know it very well because it was under your tenure as Foreign Minister in 1978, after 16 years, when you visited China the formal official trade began between these two countries. Today, it has reached more than one billion US dollars. Whatever be the other considerations, the bilateral trade has reached that much with opening of two border trade points, one at Nibutek and the other at Shibtilla. The normal, regular border trade which was traditional between India and Tibet has been resumed. As a part of the confidence building measure, an agreement was signed during the visit of the Chinese President to India. If I understand correctly, Madam, it is the first visit of the Chinese President to India and an agreement was signed as a sequence to the 1993 agreement. A decision was taken to reduce the number of forces along the actual line of control. To my mind, it was a major political development to defuse the tension in the border areas. To defuse the tension in the border area the first stage was to withdraw armed forces two steps

backward and there we did not make any compromise. The preamble of the agreement starts with the observation, "...without prejudice to respective claims of the countries concerned, both on behalf of China and on behalf of India..." We have respected that which is our actual position and what is the actual line as per our assessment. But, without prejudice to that we decided to defuse the tension in the border area by withdrawing forces. Ultimately, there was an improvement after having taken a decision to reduce the forces. What a great achievement have we made! What a gain have we achieved! I know that there is no relaxation of forces.

Therefore, these are some of the issues, Mr. Prime Minister, which you will have to address. I am not talking in terms of some of your Ministers saying that this would be done and that would not be done. But every word uttered here in this area is being interpreted or being looked into from different angles. Surely, you yourself have got a feel of the Heads of Governments and Heads of States of our neighbours. They are concerned. Those who are traditional supporters, whom we have helped in many ways are concerned about the not-so-good and not-so-friendly relationship of India and Pakistan. We have lived with it for the last five decades but a new dimension has come to it now. That dimension is nuclear threat. It is good that you have reassured and I hope that the international community will take it with all seriousness but the political behaviour of some of your party colleagues does not subscribe to that view. How does it go well with the declaration of constructing a temple there and your saying like a statesman, "Yes, I am imposing voluntary moratorium and I will try to have *de jure* formalisation of our status?" This creates confusion. Therefore, at least, in this area of international relationship, the Government must speak in one voice. Security of the country does not merely concern the Defence Minister alone. Nobody is going to believe that the

security of the country could be maintained only by the armed forces.

When we talk of the nuclear disarmament, that is our biggest bet in the security concern. Why did you want it? From day one we were talking of the nuclear disarmament. It was as early as 1964 when Pt. Jawaharlal came out with the theory of Panchsheel, the speech which you quoted in your statement on the floor of this House on 2nd April, 1964 that there should be a stand-still arrangement and there should be no further change. That was the occasion when America exploded hydrogen bomb. If the world community had listened, perhaps the situation would not have arisen like this. But, it was not from a moralistic point of view, Madam Deputy Chairperson, but it was closely concerned with our security concern because we know being the second largest populous country of the world, having one of the largest standing armies in the world, having technological competence of our scientists, engineers and technicians, having attained self-sufficiency in food production, having a strong foundation of manufacturing and service sector, in other areas India can compete with the mightiest of the mighty. Therefore, it was our vested interest to have the nuclear weapons we want. It is true that we did not achieve success. It is true that the NPT was extended indefinitely despite our wish. It is true that in 1988 the international community did not respond to Rajiv Gandhi's action plan as we wanted to have it. Nonetheless it was on the agenda and still it is on the agenda. There is no other thing and in this process we shall have to proceed. How did we have the Chemical Weapons Convention? How could we achieve an international agreement which is totally non-discriminatory? How was a ban on biological weapons negotiated multilaterally?

Therefore, in certain areas we have a achieved some success and in certain areas we have failed to achieve some

success. But, on a international fora there is no scope for being impatient. But, still as I started with my observation it is your perception, the perception of the Government of day which will decide, because the future will judge you whether you took the correct decision or not.

We did never want Kashmir to be internationalised. All along like parrot, everybody in this House including the Maharaja of Kashmir whose forefathers brought about this State ...*(Interruptions)*...

AN HON. MEMBER: Former Maharaja...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am sorry. He is a former Maharaja. He may be future Maharaja also. ...*(Interruptions)*... Dr. Karan Singh's forefathers were instrumental in signing the agreement which made it an integral part of India. But, unfortunately, people worldwide are talking. We do not want others to talk that Kashmir should be discussed and debated at any international forum. But, unfortunately a talk is going on. Today they are saying, "All right, you talk among yourselves." There are many self-appointed arbitrators who are coming and saying that they are prepared to mediate, starting from the big brother to the small brothers in our region. Brothers and sisters are prepared to offer their services. But, we would like to settle as we want. A new opportunity has come when we can say, "All right, you have acquired nuclear weapons, technology, devices, etc. and physically, technologically and militarily, you cannot conquer India. You cannot destroy us, we cannot destroy you; we cannot conquer you."

This is the hard reality and on the basis of this hard reality let us start negotiation. Now, how do you begin negotiations, what would be your terms, etc., these are the areas you are primarily concerned with. We do not expect you to

talk to us saying "in this method, in that method, in this way, on this point, etc." because in that case your capacity to bargain will be limited. We do not want it. We want to give you the total flexibility in negotiation. But, ultimately it has to be kept in view that we have entered a dangerous area. Madam, Deputy Chairperson, if there is any slippage or any mistake, it will not be the mistake of an individual.

An individual may commit a mistake. We may raise accusing fingers towards that individual but history will not pardon us and the consequences will be disastrous. I do not know what those Senators of the United States of America had thought of. Madam, one-third of the Senators vetoed Warsa Agreement in 1919 and tied the hands of the then President, Mr. Wilson, by refusing to ratify the Warsa Treaty and America had no option but to come out. What was the activity when genocide took place in late 30s in Nazi-Germany and fascist Italy? Ultimately, the Second World War broke out. From their national point of view they might have done a correct thing or they might have thought that they did a correct thing. But, today, all of them are accused in the pages of history that they were responsible for having a holocaust where millions of Jews were persecuted in gas chambers and which witnessed unprecedented destruction of mankind.

Therefore, in this critical moment, I do hope, in whatever areas it is possible, the Government should come out and spell out their policy clearly. So far as we are concerned, we made it quite clear. Madam, I will conclude my observations by repeating what the Congress Parliamentary Party Chairperson has said while addressing the members of the Congress Parliamentary Party. She said, "The nuclear issue has been thrust upon us all of a sudden. It demands a careful evaluation and a measured response and more so, measured response from the Government. Let us remember that we did not become nuclear weapon capable

in May, 1998, we became so a quarter-of-a-century ago. Our decision not to translate that capability into a weaponised armed force was deliberate and held for years with high responsibility. It had a political, economic, social and moral dimensions. The option was kept open in the national interest." It is still relevant today. It has larger implications. What has been done cannot be undone. But, if you consider seriously, certain damages have been done in certain sectors and in certain areas, corrective measures are to be taken up. Please do not hesitate to come forward to take corrective measures. Our co-operation will be there with you to take necessary corrective measures. Thank you, Madam Deputy Chairperson.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE (Uttar Pradesh): As one would expect from Shri Pranab Mukherjee, he has given an erudite speech, full of several facts, suffused with concern for our country. I am, Sir, completely with you. I am sure, everybody in this House is with you when you urge consultations and consensus, when you urge full disclosure on a thing like meeting sanctions, so that by taking those specific measures, by taking everybody into confidence on those measures, confidence will be restored in the country so that we can meet those challenges. Sir, I also completely agree with you when you say that each of us should be careful in the statements that we make and that the Government should speak in one voice. I am sure, as you also implied, the Government and all other parties, especially, the leading Opposition Party, should speak in one voice.

On these points, I think, you speak for the entire House. But, when you maintain at this hour that we had kept options open and that the option should have continued to be kept open, which has now been closed, I must say: options are kept open to be closed and exercised at some time. And I will argue that it was the gross neglect, a refusal to see an

avalanche that was descending upon us that led to the repeated postponement of the decision to go in for nuclear weaponisation. I will show it to you by records that are available to the public, the record to which you alluded yourself. It is precisely because that avalanche was swelling, it is precisely because the door was being closed upon us within this year, that we would not have kept that option open, that it had to be exercised now. I will mention just one or two facts and you will see-- I do not want to use a strong word because of your cooperative speech -- how misplaced the phrase is "that the nuclear question has been suddenly thrust upon us".

As you know, Madam, from the late 1970s it has been clear that Pakistan has been going on with a clandestine nuclear programme only for weapons production. Dr. Qadir Khan faces espionage charges today in courts in Europe. Their persons were caught smuggling items useful only for nuclear weapons programme in the United States, in Europe.

They are serving prison sentences today. Kissinger has written that he personally tried to dissuade Pakistan in 1978 to desist from its nuclear weapons programme, and that he failed. It is precisely because this knowledge became available that India went in for the first subterranean nuclear explosion. After that the situation worsened at an alarming rate and unfortunately—because of political circumstances of instability—of changing Governments, of a refusal to face facts, the next logical steps kept getting postponed. It was not a great act of statesmanship. It was just neglect, as I shall show you. The hon. speaker mentioned that three successive US Presidents could not certify that Pakistan was not in possession of nuclear weapons. What is the inference we are to draw from that? Pakistan is their client State. These Presidents, like Bush, who were very eager to help Pakistan, but by their laws they could not give the requisite certification. That was the



clearest possible announcement that, in the assessment of their patron State, Pakistan was well on the way to possessing nuclear weapons.

Then, you say we should not speak about China. I am not saying anything about the Defence Minister's statement. But, should the facts be hidden? It does nobody any good. Should the policy be based on facts which have been hidden? That does nobody any good. Every Directors of the CIA in open testimony to Congressional Committees have certified that China is instrumental in every single nuclear facility being set up for the weapons programme in Pakistan.

For that reason in 1991, in 1992 and in 1994, thrice sanctions were imposed upon China— not just on Pakistan— because they were violating international understandings to which they had committed themselves, saying that, we shall not assist any other country either through missile technology transfer or nuclear technology transfer. Thrice those sanctions were imposed. Each time they got around them, and each time they started doing other things. They will sign an agreement with the United States— "We will not give missile technology". Then their shipments of missile parts are caught. They say, "Oh, we thought only complete missiles were to be stopped. We have stopped that. These are just components."

The Plants at which they are being put together, they are being put together with the help of Chinese personnel and the Chinese kept denying it. There is an amusing incident. There are things like ring magnets. These are devices that are used in Centrifuges for producing enriched uranium—which is used for weapons production. Five Thousand of these were being shipped. That shipment was caught. They were nailed. First the Chinese denied it. They said, this is a plot to tarnish our image and spoil our relationship with Pakistan. Eventually, they could not deny it because the

shipment landed in Karachi. For what purpose did they then say these were meant? I have got the official Chinese statement. It says, Madam, that they are meant for wind-shield wipers for cars! This is the situation. Pakistan, in a determined way was going for nuclear weaponisation, completely with the assistance of China. And then a third thing happened. The question really is, what were the Indian Policy makers, like Shri Gujral, whom you quoted, doing about this? The third thing that happened was that the United States became a party to all this. They imposed those sanctions. They refused, they could not certify Pakistan in spite of their wanting to do so. They imposed sanctions on China, but they let that collaboration continue. One of the most serious things that are being investigated in the case of President Clinton is that he allowed the transfer of high technology items to China on the explicit understanding that they will go over to Pakistan. It is much more serious than the other scandalous charges that he is facing. That is why he will not take a step against China. So, these three things were happening throughout the 1980's and throughout the 1990's. Sir, you see, the very person who had taken the decisive step forward, as you rightly said, in May 1974, the step about this explosion of a peaceful nuclear device was Mrs. Gandhi, that Very person in 1981, took a decision—I have it from the scientists who are continuing from that time in this project — to go in for this exact step which has been taken now. The shaft in which this explosion has been made was dug in 1981. Mr. R. Venkataraman, the then Defence Minister, has certified that that decision was postponed for unknown reasons. He has certified in writing that in 1983, the decision was again taken to have the explosion because this whole evidence was building up. He has said that he personally went down the shaft to see things for himself. He has said this in a writing in a public statement, in a letter to the Prime Minister. Again it was postponed.

You said that M. Rajiv Gandhi took a great initiative in calling for disarmament. Many of us get carried away by idealism. That is how things should have been. But, as you yourself pointed out, that is not how the world took it. It was said just now, that the world took that initiative seriously and that it get placed on the world Agenda. Did Pakistan take it seriously? Did China take it seriously? Who took it seriously?

Only our newspapers took it seriously. We took it seriously.

Madam, let me tell you what Mr. Rajiv Gandhi came to feel—this is a first person account—about that particular initiative.

In the book which is in the press now, which has been edited by our foremost expert in this matter, the Director of the National Institute of Defence Studies and Analyses, Air Commodore Jasjit Singh, Shri K. Subrahmanyam, the person who has been associated with our nuclear policy for more than thirty years, has said precisely about this particular thing in his memoir.

He says: '1988 was a decisive year in Rajiv Gandhi's life. He put forward his Rajiv Gandhi Plan for nuclear disarmament in the Third UN Special Session on Disarmament. It was a comprehensive phased programme of disarmament...'. But nobody took it seriously, he says. Shri Subrahmanyam says further: 'Faced with these harsh realities, Rajiv Gandhi appears to have given the go ahead to the DRDO, under Dr. Arunachalam—mind you, Shri Subrahmanyam was in the inner-circle of Rajiv Gandhi and, therefore, knew his plans—and the BARC under Dr. P.K. Iyengar to proceed with the Indian weapons programme. The Agni was successfully test fired in May, 1989. It could not have been an easy decision for Rajiv Gandhi. Yet he did his duty by the country and did not allow his own personal inclinations to come in the way of safeguarding country's security. I hap-

pened to meet Rajiv Gandhi at the foreign affairs correspondents club at the Kerala House in May 1991 just a couple of weeks before his assassination. Mr. Manoj Joshi, the well known defence analyst raised the nuclear issue and asked Rajiv Gandhi what would be his policy if he returned to power which seemed very likely at that stage. Rajiv Gandhi replied that he was very perturbed by the implied nuclear threats held out during the Gulf crisis and he had taken up the issue with the President. Quite a different picture from what we have been given. By that time the Pakistani nuclear capability was in the open with the US President refusing to certify in October, 1990, that Pakistan had not reached nuclear explosive capability and invoking the Pressler amendment against that country. The first Indian nuclear deterrent came into existence in early 1990 with Dr. Arunachalam heading the DRDO and Dr. P.K. Iyengar as the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Chidambaram was Director, BARC. In the period 1987—1990, India was totally vulnerable to Pakistani nuclear threat..."

This is the real picture. This whole charge of discontinuity is completely unfounded. One of the great features, Madam, is that this whole thing has been developed as a national consensus by various persons repeatedly trying their best for disarmament, but taking one inevitable step after the other.

I would like to make one important point here. In October, 1995—it is a matter of record of great sadness for the country—when the Congress Government was in power, the then Prime Minister, Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, scheduled a secret meeting in Bangalore. There was a discussion at the highest level about this. But information about this secret meeting leaked out. I, myself, had occasion to submit evidence about that leakage to the former Prime Minister Mr. Gujral. The information leaked. Then, Madam, a decision in 1995 to conduct a nuclear explosion was 'dropped'.

I would give you here just one velling testimony about that cancellation. This is from a person called Milton. A. Bearden, who was the former Head of CIA operations in Pakistan. This is published in a paper—If I mention the name, probably, it would carry more weight with some Members i.e. The 'Dawn' of Karachi. He says 'It was not difficult for us the discover what India was upto. When India prepared to test in 1995, United States intelligence dutifully picked up the signs. United States diplomats then bundled the data together—this is the information I gave to Mr. Gujral—and laid it on India's table with a warning of the consequences of carrying out the atomic tests. India blinked and cancelled the tests, but kept in place the testing infrastructure'.

Here is a mountain coming down on us. And we are going on pleading for nuclear disarmament! Even those advocates realised that something had to be done. But so is our porons is our Government that the Americans came to know and as a triumph, they stopped us. I do not know why my friends who are so concerned about the security of the country, did not, and do not want to ask for an enquiry into the leakage of that information. Instead they are saying that now suddenly the nuclear issue has been thrust upon us.

The hon. Member quoted Mr. Gujral. I have known Mr. Gujral for the last twenty-five years. Our families are known to each other for the last fifty years. If Mr. Gujral has said, when he demitted office, that there was no threat and, therefore, no action was called for, either he was asleep, or, he and the persons who preceded him are guilty of gross neglect of the country's defence needs.

The second point that was made was that, suddenly, because of this explosion, we are isolated. There was one view of India and Pakistan before it was said. There is one view of India and Pakistan now. Now, what you have done is, you have challenged an order with which the world was comfortable.

This decision was taken in the nick of time. We are now in 1998. The significance is that in 1999, next year, i.e. within a few months from now, whether we sign the CTBT or not, the CTBT goes to the United Nations and, as the technical phrase goes it makes "entry into force." Then, the options are completely closed. You have Pakistan arming itself. You have China assisting it. There is complicity by the Americans in this. And you keep postponing the tests. The doors are being closed on you. In such a situation, do you mean to say that we should not exercise our option?

Earlier, there was an order which had taken four hundred years of conflict and at least twenty years of negotiations, bargaining and at least put in place. The Controllers were comfortable with that order the P-5 America was the sole policeman. Clinton and others were selling this CTBT to the domestic audiences. Here, China's hegemony had been accepted as fact of life by everybody.

You were talking about disarmament. By the indefinite renewal of the NPT in 1995, the possession of nuclear weapons for an indefinite period by the nuclear powers has been legitimised. Now you have suddenly changed all that. You have challenged it. You have shown up the inequity of the order. You have exposed the hypocrisy of the orders. You have brought world attention to focus on the clandestine role of China and the complicity of the United States. Naturally, they are upset.

I must remind the House. If you see the debates which took place in this House in August, 1974, precisely the same countries were saying exactly the same things about us. All that has been forgotten. More than that, the whole question of isolation and a changing image is, essentially, Indian self flagellation. This is not how the facts are. It is not one party's achievement: it is everybody's achievement. Within four weeks of the

explosions, the Indian Government was seriously engaged, and it is seriously engaged today, with each of the principal interlocutors in this matter, with the P-5, with the G-8, with the Security Council, with the Secretary-General of the UN. And they are saying on record that we have had very productive talks.

The initial reaction of the Americans if you see Mr. Clinton's reaction and Mrs. Albright's reaction, was, in effect, "We had set up and order. This is a disruption of that order." But now is Inderfurth's statement, in Talbot's statement and certainly in the writings of persons like Mr. Kissinger, we find, they are saying, "No. India is a sovereign country. It is mature country. We must recognise their right to assess their defence needs on their own."

Madam, I will take up just two or three points more. We are engaged with everybody.

Secondly, within three weeks of the explosions, the Deputy Prime Minister of Russia comes here and signs an agreement for two nuclear reactors to be located in Tamil Nadu. Does that show isolation? Does that show a changed perception by the world?

Thirdly, my friend the Minister, Mrs. Vasundhara Raje led our delegation to Columbia for the non-aligned meeting. One hundred and thirteen countries were there. All the P-5 countries tried their damndest to get them to condemn India for the explosions, as the initiator of a this new arms race. That is not the resolution which the non-aligned countries passed. They passed a resolution, in fact, condemning the P-5, saying, "You have violated Article 9 of the NTP. You were under obligation under Article 9 of the Treaty to take effective and purposeful steps towards disarmament." That is the resolution that they passed.

I am not saying that things could not have been improved, I just want you to see that this habit of self flagellation, which has been is become a peculiarly Indian disease, is not warranted.

I have made it a practice these days for the last year and a half to read everyday three Pakistani newspapers. Do you want to get certificates for the Indian foreign policy successes? Just read Pakistani newspapers. I will give you one representative item only. This is from "THE FRONTIER POST" of June, 26. They tried their best to get their Senators to pass a resolution, a mildly worded resolution in the US Senate, which would focus on Kashmir. The story's headline is, "US Senate Kashmir Resolution Runs into Snags." It says:

"A resolution moved by Senator, Tom Hawkin, in the US Senate, on Kashmir, has run into snags amidst intense Indian lobbying with the tacit backing of some senior officials in the US State Department. They described what the resolution was, how it would have helped Pakistan and hurt India. The Indian Diplomats and lobbying firm carried out a vigorous campaign to scuttle the move. They gave the reasons that these people advanced. Although the language of the resolution was balanced and fairly even-handed, these lobbyists succeeded. The Pakistani diplomats who worked feverishly to rebut the Indian efforts and neutralise the State Department, felt dismayed by the role played by some of the senior officials to confuse the whole issue and derail the resolution."

They say:

"The Indian lobbyists were to be seen everywhere, and the Pakistani lobbyist who is being paid \$ 60,000 per months, was nowhere to be seen."

यह उनकी हलत है about their assessment of Indian policy और हम यहाँ मातम कर रहे हैं एक अजनबी बीमारी है।

The last point that I will make, Madam, is that I am completely with Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, which he says that there should be a fuller account of and a fuller discussion on the precise impact of sanctions. It would not do good to go on saying, well, everything will be taken care of. But, the facts must also be seen. In

the morning, Mr. Janardhana Poojary, while asking a question, said that the imposition of sanctions shows the complete failure of Indian Foreign Policy. Kindly see. After these explosions, since the sanction were imposed, the World Bank has given commitments of up to one billion dollars. The G-8 countries have not gone along with the sanctions. There is serious rethinking within the United States. As you know, Senators have already filed a resolution, which is to be voted upon on the 15th, that sanctions are counter-productive and should not be pressed. Today, as you have seen, the newspapers carry reports of the commerce Secretary of the United States—one of the five principal Ministers with this headline. He blasts sanctions. After this whole episode, Mr. Clinton had said that he was imposing sanctions, but he says: "Washington has gone sanctions crazy." Do you think this kind of realisation is coming spontaneously;

Now, to compare ourselves with Pakistan. Actually one of the reasons why I would advocate for continuing with the policies that the Prime Minister has initiated is precisely the effect they are having on Pakistan. Pakistan is determined to define itself as 'anti-India'. To think that they can be sweet-talkers out of that position is completely autistic. When you say world perception has changed, do you think the world is not watching? In May, Pakistan had its foreign exchange reserves amounting to 1.5 billion dollars—one and a half month's reserves. Today they are below 800 million dollars. Their Finance Minister has announced day-before-yesterday after very big statements that countries in the Middle East are going to give them this and that that within this month they will have to declare a moratorium on their debts. He said unless that sanctions are lifted within three months, Pakistan would be plunged into chaos and the situation would go out of everybody's hand. Do you think the United States and the world won't look at the way India has handled the matter and the way Pakistan

has done? Their Rupee today trades at Rs. 57 to a dollar. When this is the situation, I would urge the Prime Minister to Please persevere in a strong live so that sanctions continue beyond three months. After that it will be good to have confidence-building measures towards Pakistan. Unless you bring them to realism, none of this sweet talk will off do.

Madam, I do not want to be fractious. I would take only one minute more to read something out to you. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee ended his speech by reading out statement issued by the present Chairperson of his party. I will read it out to you, Madam, what Mrs. Indira Gandhi, had said in Parliament in 1968. You will recall what happened then. We refused to sign the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. At that time also these doubting Thomases, voices were raised in May 1974 also. Mrs. Gandhi speaking in a debate on External Affairs said: Today you are all very enthusiastic about not signing. Our position then was that it was an inequitous arrangement, which was being worked out. Nobody had listened to our arguments since then. It is only now because you will be a nuclear weapon State that they will take your argument seriously. Mrs. Gandhi said: Yes, you are all supporting me at this time. You are all with us, in spite of these criticisms by a few persons in the House. You are with us in not becoming a party to this inequitous regime. But she said, "At the same time, I would like to warn this House and the country that by not signing the treaty, it may bring the nation many difficulties. It may mean the stoppage of aid and the stoppage of help." A Member interrupted her, saying, "Freedom was won with sacrifices." She said, "That was just what I was going to say." "Since we are taking this decision together,"—exactly the position now, you may or may not have been consulted formally, but as I have shown, what was done under Mr. Vajpayee's personal decision was a continuation of the decisions towards which successive Governments have been tending all along

and then taking steps backward—she said, “Since we are taking this decision together, we must all be together in facing its consequences. I personally think that although it may involve sacrifices and hardships it will be the first step towards building the real strength of this country and we shall be able to go ahead on the road to self-sufficiency.” Madam, that exactly is the spirit me should imbibe. I was glad that Mr. Pranab Mukherjee talked of consensus. But this fractious habit of slowing debating points will do the same type of damage that you were apprehending that other statements from this side are doing.

Madam, I thank you for your indulgence. I feel that a great decision has been taken. One of the ways to carry through the programme that Mr. Mukherjee was setting out for us is for all of us, not just for the Government, but for every party and for this House to speak in one voice. Under your leadership, I am confident we will do so. Thank you.

**SHRI NILOTPAL BASU** (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairperson, it is good to hear a maiden speech before I take the floor. It is also good to have you on the Chair after your re-election. After your re-election this is your maiden session.

Madam, the issue is the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. I must concede at the very outset and share my difficulty with the Members of this august House that I have spoken on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs in the past, but I never found it so difficult as I am now finding it. When I took up the Annual Report of the Ministry for the year 1997-98, the formulations made, the descriptions, the objectives with which the Ministry are working and the actual reality which is today obtaining in the country and the world over as a result of the decisions that have been taken by the Government during the period of 100 days, I find a wide gulf which is very difficult to bridge. Madam, I say this because to start with the Annual Report

of the Ministry of External Affairs underlines that one of the major efforts the Ministry had under taken in the past and will continue with it in future is to maintain a policy of independence, a policy of autonomy and they are continuing with the tradition of carrying on their crusade against the inequitous world order. Just now, all of us have heard a very strong advocacy of the fact that by doing what we have done on the 11th and 13th of May, we have for the first time, broken the inequitous nuclear order that was obtaining in the world. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairperson, I must preface my observations with this simple question to the Prime Minister who is also there in this House now: does the Government of the day assess that by doing what we have done we have changed the very fundamental features of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty? Throughout, the Opposition of the entire House—here and there, across the political spectrum—our opposition to the CTBT, or for that matter, the earlier version, the NPT, had been very fundamentally premised on this issue, that we cannot be a party to any treaty which is essentially discriminatory in its nature. And there are claims today here in the House that we have given a rude shock to the nuclear powers and we have broken the monopoly of certain nuclear ‘haves’. If so, how will that kind of a shock be translated in terms of formulations that are very much there in the CTBT? Are we claiming here that by doing what we have done on the 11th and 13th of May, we will be in a position to have effected a change in the CTBT draft itself? Let the Government come out with that kind of a formulation.

Secondly, a question arises out of this concerning the spirit of national consensus. I must also concede, Madam Deputy Chairperson, to you, that as a political party, perhaps, when Mr. Shourie was speaking, we had a certain elaborate political justification of the testing. It may be a compliment to

Mr. Shourie. But it is for a fact that at different points of time, when this issue was raised, it was said, "Well, we have an open mind". Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was mentioning about consultations. Even after the blast, no consultation has taken place. I think the biggest difficulty that has overtaken the country in the last 100 days—I will go into the reasons—is that the External Affairs Policy of this country has received a severe set-back because the major strength of the External Affairs Policy of the Government of India till now has been a broad consensus among all political parties. Now, we can be blamed of not being patriotic enough to respond to this kind of a situation, that we are not being able to follow the Government blind-fold. But the point is, can a country of India's size, diversity and political pluralism.... follow an approach in evolving its external affairs policy which embraces such a fundamental question where there will be no communication, let alone consultation, with the entire Opposition of the country? I would like to know whether that is the method which is to be followed in adopting the external affairs policy perceptions in the coming days. Since the External Affairs Ministry is under the charge of the Prime Minister, I am sure that the Prime Minister, while replying to the debate, will answer this specific question as to what practice the Government will follow in future. We have heard and participated in a number of discussions on several issues in this House. There have been a full-day discussion on the CTBT. What would be the approach to the CTBT? Let alone consultations with different political parties, should we sign it or not? Now, whatever discussions the Prime Minister will be having with Shri Nawaz Sharief, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, at the end of this month, we think is a positive development. The Indian Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of Pakistan will come together across the table and will discuss a host of bilateral issues. We are very sorry to say that we cannot agree

with the thesis that acquiring nuclear arms in itself is a foolproof arrangement for the national security. The question of our taking an activist position for achieving nuclear disarmament is not an ideological position. But this is, as we see, a position which is necessarily prompted by the narrow self-interest of the Indian nation of retaining the national security. Madam Deputy Chairman, I pose this question before the House and particularly, to the Prime Minister: With all that has been said about the clandestine nuclear programme of the Pakistanis or the Chinese, after the tragedy which overtook the whole world in 1945, is any country in this world in a position to really use the nuclear weapons? The question of "No First Use" is of irrelevance. The nuclear weapon is essentially a weapon which can never be used and we have heard the argument that was so articulately placed before all of us by Mr. Shourie about the forty years of the cold war. Ultimately, all the countries today realise that the whole issue is a zero-sum game. Pakistan will do something, China will do something and we will have to respond in the same language, using the same instrumentalities, whether that context is valid, whether it is the best course open to us or whether we will try to evolve a policy whereby we can engage countries and nations, maybe, about which we have our threat perceptions. But the essence of the external affairs policy—making in the whole world today is engagement, is dialogue, and through that, creating a peaceful atmosphere.

Every country is realising today that we have to ensure peace, especially for ensuring economic development. See the kind of atmosphere that is emerging in South Asia. Madam, so far as our foreign policy making is concerned, we do not go anywhere by saying what kind of misdeeds were committed by the Pakistanis or by the Chinese. That is not the issue. The issue is, by saying all this, whether

we can defuse the atmosphere that we have in South Asia today, and which we have to defuse obviously in our greatest national interest. That is the question. Hurling allegations and counter-allegations doesn't help a country like India in its foreign-policy making, and there, Madam Deputy Chairman, I will also concede that human values do not cut much ice with modern nations. That was the point which was being made but I cannot reduce myself to such a human being who sees the whole development in Pakistan with such cynical eyes that if people starve in Pakistan, I am happy; that is why I would like the sanctions to be extended because that ultimately will bring them kneeling down. I think, that approach is not a display of our strength. It is true that certain ideological contexts have changed. We are not in the fifties or sixties, in the immediate aftermath of the process of decolonisation, but, at the same time, today unless foreign-policy making basically is constructive, unless it is done by engaging the nations in the process of dialogue, we cannot have faster economic development. Today, the world is not bipolar. It is here that the context has changed. Today, we have a situation where big countries are trying to drive the whole world towards a unipolar kind of set up whereas in economic terms we have multipolarity. We have new bipoles, big trade blocs emerging in the whole world, and we have to respond to this new situation where on the security plane we have such big powers, there is no countervailing bipole of the socialist world which has put us in an advantageous position during the entire cold war period, and, on the other hand, we have a situation wherein in trade terms we have multipolarity emerging. I think, this requires more creative engagement and application of the political consensus in this country, which is there, which could be there, and which is unanimous about retaining the independence of this country, the autonomy of this country, the autonomy of decision-making in this country. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, this is

not the issue that there is a controversy on whether the sanctions are morally correct or not. On that question, I think, the whole House is united, and none of us will accept the position that the big powers are taking. They are indulging in self-delusion. They are speaking absolutely on an immoral basis when they talk of sanctions. But here lies the difference when Mr. Pranab Mukherjee says, "Well, we are prepared to fight the sanctions, but please let us know what the sanctions will be, what the road-map for fighting the sanctions is, so that we can also contribute our modest bit."

But you take a decision, the Government takes a decision whereby certain developments take place. There is a patriotic appeal to all the parties that they should follow blind-fold the Government. That is the index of patriotism in this country. We are sorry we cannot accept this kind of logic, which cannot be bought.

Madam Deputy Chairperson, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee maintained that so far as keeping the nuclear options alive is concerned, there was consensus, but on the induction question there was no consensus. It is not only a question of national consensus on retaining the nuclear options open, but it is also a question of amending the Atomic Energy Act. I don't know what is going to happen to the whole action that we have taken on 11th and 13th May. So far as I understand, the Government is not proposing to bring any Bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1962. It states, and I quote as it was legislated—

"An Act to provide for the development, control and use of atomic energy for the welfare of the people of India and for other useful purposes and for matters connected therewith".

Now I don't know how the Government is taking the whole issue. After having done what it has done on 11th and 13th May, the Government does not think that it owes an accountability to the Parliament. At least, some legislative changes



have to be brought about in the existing Act. We really fail to understand the seriousness with which the Government is trying to approach itself to the post-Pokhran developments.

Madam, much was said about our bold stand. I would like to say just one thing. There has been the great US baiting. As we know our political position, we are 100% with you on this. But the point is that the letter, which was written to President Clinton on 12th May by the Prime Minister, did not have any reference to the nuclearised Indian Ocean, to the presence of naval submarines in the Diego Gracia base. Nothing. It is good that our threat perception covers Pakistan and China. It is fair enough when you are talking to the domestic audience. But why did we fail or forget to point out to President Clinton that they were also part of our nuclear threat? Whenever the Indian representatives have spoken in any international fora, they have spoken about Diego Gracia and the militarisation and nuclearisation of the Indian Ocean also. We don't know what kind of foreign policy initiative this is. Therefore, we would also like to be informed whether the Government has started thinking that there is no nuclear threat from the nuclearised Indian Ocean and from the naval base that is there in Diego Gracia. (*Time bell*) ... Madam, please give me five more minutes. I crave for your indulgence.

The Government must come out with a decision on what it wants to do about the CTBT. There are confusing reports. The Government is not coming and informing the Parliament. Who is negotiating? What are the issues? We can understand *de jure* ratification. But if there is an agreement, if we are going to sign some agreement, with what gains are we joining the CTBT? What have we gained through the blasts on 11th and 13th May? We have to be informed about them.

Then there is the issue of SAARC initiative. We do not know about it because we were involved in a very small measure. One bus was to operate from

Calcutta to Dhaka. It was supposed to have started some time back. Now the Government of India is saying that all the contentious issues that are there will have to be resolved bilaterally with Bangladesh before that can start. We were seeing, we were witnessing some positive changes in the entire region of South Asia in terms of the initiative taken by the earlier Government in respect of laying this principle that we will not be asking for reciprocity in terms of our relations with our neighbours.

Then comes the question of China. I don't know whether what Shri Shourie has said is the official position of the Government of India. We know all these things. Notwithstanding that, through assiduous efforts taken in the last more than two decades, we have been able to come to a certain position in terms of confidence building measures, in terms of forming of the Joint Working Group, etc. If what Shri Shourie has said is the official position of the Government of India, then do we have to think that there will be no relations with China hereafter because they are creating such scenes? Let the Government clarify this point. I charge the Government of not sharing information with the Opposition and of speaking in many voices. One of the biggest casualties is the Ministry of External Affairs. The Defence Minister or the Home Minister hijack the rights of the Ministry of External Affairs and apply their mind and engage themselves in policy-making on external affairs. These Ministers publicly take a position contrary to the official position of the Government of India. What have they achieved?

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI:** (Kerala): There is only one poor lady.

**SHRI NILOTPAL BASU:** I totally sympathise with her. She is under great strain.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** I hope it is not discrimination.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, don't try to explain this in terms of a gender logic.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It could be. She is a lady.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: There were also very positive developments which were taking place in terms of Asian Regional Forum, in terms of floating of, Indian Ocean Rim Cooperation, etc. I do not know about these things. We are not hearing anything about the external policy of the Government in regard to how to firefight and how to take care of the impact of the Pokhran-II. The Government owes an explanation to all of us because we feel much to the dislike of Shri Shourie. We are in a very difficult position. We have to engage all our energies towards the positive initiatives that we were taking which we thought were so important in terms of India's contribution, in terms of economic developments and in terms of strengthening regionalism because it is very important in today's very unfair and very apathetic global order. There is the WTO which is imposing certain very unfair conditions on countries like India and other developing countries. There are the issues of democratisation of the United Nations structure and the Security Council. We are not in a position to talk of them, let alone pursuing any of these initiatives. However one may shout from the rooftop, the situation is, all our efforts today are engaged in firefighting and all the positive efforts that we were taking in the past in regard to building bridges with our neighbours, with the developing world as a whole and for democratisation of the United Nations structure, have been put on the back burner.

Therefore, we expect that the Government would come out clean on all these issues. Thank you.

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR (Nominated): Madam Deputy Chairperson,

thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this discussion. I have just come from Pakistan. I went there as a journalist for five days. Since Mr. Arun had spoken something which was not true, I thought that I would correct him. He has said that Pakistanis are admiring very much our foreign policy or admiring the way we are dealing with it. Yes. They are admiring us in this way. They are saying, "the BJP has played into our hands. And they say, 'Look,' in conventional warfare, you are so superior to us. Now with the bombs, we are at par." This is one thing which the BJP has done. The second thing which they are saying is, "Kashmir was almost forgotten and put on the back-burner and now you have brought it to the centre stage. It has become an international subject and you have done it." So, please don't try to misunderstand certain sentences said in the *Frontier Post* which does not sell more than 2,000 copies. The point that I am trying to make to Mr. Arun and others is that some of us believe in a different approach, and that approach is that we have to live with Pakistan and we have to have good relations with Pakistan. Fifty years ago we separated. We separated because there was an agreement between the two parties at that time. Now when Mr. Advani says, "We shall bring Pakistan to its knees," what kind of a statement is this? In fact, this statement has infuriated those people more than even the nuclear tests. What I am trying to convey is that some of us had built some kind of lobby there. It is wrong to say, "Look here, they listen not to the sweet talks but only to threats and bombs". We had built a small lobby which the BJP-led Government, I am sorry to say, has destroyed. Now nobody is talking about India Pakistan friendship. I recall that some of us had been going to the border, lighting candles hoping that the message of peace reached there. That is our approach. Now some of you are against Pakistan itself and which stretches against the Muslims as such. We are not a party to that. I am sorry to say that we

have two different approaches. I am also reminded of one thing. I do not know why our High Commissioner from London has been recalled. I hope that it is not because he is Salman Haider... (Interruptions) It may be shocking... (Interruptions)

SHRI K.R. MALKANI (Delhi): You are communalising every issue... (Interruptions)

SHRI KULDEEP NAYYAR: I am not communalising it. You are communalising everything... (Interruptions)

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: There are limits to it. So many other envoys have been withdrawn. What is wrong? (Interruptions)

उपसभापति: मलकानी जी, आपका नाम यहाँ लिस्ट में है। अगर आपको कुछ एतराज लगता है उनकी बात पर, तो आप अपनी बात रखते समय जरूर उसका जवाब दीजिए।

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: What kind of a statement is he making?

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal) : He is making a correct statement... (Interruptions)

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: Mr. Jibon Roy, please keep quiet. I am addressing the Chair.

SHRI KULDEEP NAYYAR: Before going, he met Mr. Vajpayee who was then the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Vajpayee said, "You go. If our Government comes, we will not call you back"... (Interruptions) It is my version. If it is wrong, you please correct me... (Interruptions) He goes to him. Mr. Vajpayee was then in the Opposition and he said,

आप जाइए, अगर हमारी गवर्नमेंट आएगी तो आपको नहीं बुलाएगा कोई। ... (व्यवधान) ... जो उन्होंने बताया, मैं उसकी बात कर रहा हूँ। ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL: On what background was it made? ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: He is very offensive. ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: Anyway, that is a passing reference, I am not going to dwell on it. ... (Interruptions) ... because you have a different agenda. So, I am not surprised. I only mentioned what you are going. Now, when Mr. Arun Shourie said, "Look here, we want the sanctions to go on so that they suffer." I don't know if those people suffer, how do we get an advantage? If they starve, is it really something to gloat over? I am really surprised at the whole approach. Where a man dies, I also die with him because we are all human beings; whether they are Muslims, Hindus, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis or Indians, it does not matter. ... (Interruptions) ... Please stand up and tell me. (Interruptions)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Madam, I am on a point of order ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, I am on a point of order. (Interruptions) ... Kuldip Nayyarji, I have a point of order. ... (Interruptions)...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SMT. VASUNDHRA RAJE): ...at the level of debate. This is the Upper House. One expects a level of debate here. I don't think the issue should be brought to the level at which the hon. Member has brought it now. ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, I am on a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order? ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, actually we are watching it as it is happening from the morning. It happened earlier also. Now, this is a new practice that the Members of the Cabinet and the Council of Ministers — it never happened in the past — when there is a some repartee, some debate, usually Members from both the sides contradict each other — are getting up or mumbling from their seats, disturbing the Members. It is not in accordance with the Rules of Business.

This should stop. The point is, in the debate when Mr. Shourie says something he will also have to be prepared for the response from this side. This is also an aspersion on the House when she said just now, being the Upper House, there should be some standard in the debate. Suddenly, we are being taught how to talk and how to debate in this House. ...*(Interruptions)*... Madam, we seek your protection.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us not start another debate. ...*(Interruptions)*...No, please sit down.

श्री संजय निरूपमः मैडम, अभी कुलदीप नैयर जी ने बोला कि सलमान हैदर को किसलिए वापिस बुलाया जा रहा है, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह पूरे विषय को एक कम्युनल टोन दे रहे हैं। क्या सलमान हैदर को इसलिए हाई कमिश्नर बनाया गया था कि वे सलमान हैदर थे। ...*(व्यवधान)*... क्या सलमान हैदर को इसलिए हाई कमिश्नर बनाया गया था कि वे सलमान हैदर थे? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की एप्रोच सदन में नहीं रखनी चाहिए, यह सरासर गलत एप्रोच है?

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: (Karnataka): I don't know why that name should irritate my friends, particularly Mr. Malkani. All that Mr. Kuldip Nayyar said was he just made a point, a factual point and ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SANJAY NIRUPAM: That is not the factual point.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Mr. Salman Haider was the High Commissioner in London. The High Commissioner who has been recalled is Mr. Salman Haider. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may put the question to the Government. I am not the competent person to ask why Mr. Salman Haider was called back. This is what a Member would like to speak. He is asking the Government. The Government can answer that was not the reason and it will be over, but there is no need to get so agitated about it.

It is his perception. I am sure, other people have a different perception. When they get a chance, they will speak. If nobody allows him to speak a thing which he feels? If it is proved to be wrong, Mr. Nayyar will be very happy. *(Interruptions)* Let the Government clarify that. Now that matter is closed.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Mr. Nayyar, will you yield for a moment? Mr. Nayyar can be corrected only by asking Mr. Salman Haider to go back to London and ask him to resume his duties as the High Commissioner of India. That is the only way he can be corrected and there is no other way.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now let us close this chapter and continue with the foreign policy.

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: I was very much hurt by the remarks of the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs. When I was talking of a certain humanity suffering there, she said that I am really deteriorating the debate and lessening the standard of the debate. I was only talking about the other side of the human being also. It is very strange. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: (Gujarat): Can you give me just a minute? I listened to my friend, Mr. Arun Shourie, with so much respect. But, in the debate on the Budget, when I put a question to the hon. Finance Minister about sanctions, he said that he did not want to discuss it and that there was no problem. I was discussing the whole question of contingency planning for sanctions. But, in a public statement elsewhere he said, "Yes, we will talk about it." But he did not reply to it when I discussed it. I did not want to raise it because I wanted to listen to Shourie's very well-reasoned debate. I think, it is very important that we give Mr. Kuldip Nayyar a chance to speak that he wants to say. We could have interrupted Arun Shourie so many times. The Prime Minister said that we are not weaponising but Arun said that

we are doing weaponisation. These are the things which will come out in a debate. Instead of interrupting Kuldip, what he was trying to say, I would recommend, please at least, listen to Kuldip Nayyar.

**SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR:** Madam, I was telling you that in Pakistan people are saying, "Look at India, it is such a mature country. India is such an old democracy. Why should they explode a bomb and put the whole region into jeopardy?" One could reason out the bomb: "Look, here we were having some threat." Mr. Arun Shourie said something like Mr. Gujral was sleeping or something else. He is a former Prime Minister and after demitting the office he said, "I really do not see any threat." It is true that there is no threat from Pakistan. With China we are building bridges. We are also having good relations. Where is the threat? He has very right when he said it. Now we have alienated China. Thanks to Mr. Vajpayee for his famous letter to Mr. Clinton. I do not know who drafted it. I am told that the External Affairs Ministry did not draft it. I do not know who drafted it. Then the other point is that we have alienated America and we have also made Pakistan an enemy. When you say that we are not isolated, what do you mean by isolation? Other powers, take for example, the Gulf countries. I was there and they are very happy.

They say, "Both Pakistan and India have done it." Why? Because it is third world. It has shown to the first world that we have the technology. On that point I agree with Mr. Shourie. they are not the people who should be monopolising our policy. We both, India and Pakistan, in fact, should come together when Shri Vajpayee and Shri Sharief summit in Colombo. They should set up a joint commission or a joint board or a joint team which should take up this matter with the rest of the world by saying, "What do you mean by having your own monopoly? We are also there. What is our status? Both of us should do so."

This is a good point. Here, I agree with him. Here I agree with you. But, when you try to isolate Pakistan, I would say—maybe, because here some of us have come from that area; some of us have belonged to that area—we still think that these two countries have to live together, have to learn together whatever differences we have and there is no other way out. I was talking to Mr. Nawaz Sharief, the Prime Minister and he was saying, "I want to settle things with India. How do I go about, please tell me?" I am nobody in the Government; so, how I could tell? But, he said Kashmir will have to be discussed. I think there is no harm in discussing Kashmir. While discussing some people can say that we are discussing the other part of Kashmir and some people can say that we are discussing this part of Kashmir. What is the harm in discussing Kashmir? When we go to Colombo Summit, please see to it that we really go with an open mind so that we discuss this kind of matters. But, coming back to this nuclear thing, it is true that the Pakistan Finance Minister says that things will be very unmanageable. It is true. Probably they may not be able to stand up to the sanctions. But, it is also true if that country is disturbed or if that country is near some anarchy, I think we are going to feel the same thing here. Some kind of repercussions will be coming here. So, let us not wish, all right, let them go to the sea and we shall really be very honky-tonky. I remember Mr. Malkani was with me in one of the travels in Pakistan. He went to the extent of even accepting a present from the Prime Minister of "Azad Kashmir". So, what are you trying to oppose? ...*(Interruptions)*... I did not see that because it was all packed. But, I could not feel whisky ...*(Interruptions)*... Something else must be there. Why is he agitating? He comes from that part. I cannot understand his agitation. Madam, this point I am trying to make is...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री संजय निरूपमः मैडम,

उपसभापति: अभी आप क्यों पेशान हो रहे हैं....(व्यवधान)

श्री संजय निरूपम: क्या वह आजाद कश्मीर है या पाकिस्तान अधिकृत कश्मीर है?....(व्यवधान) मैडम, भारत का पॉइंट आफ व्यू यह नहीं है कि वह कश्मीर आजाद है, भारत का दृष्टिकोण यह है, हमारी विदेश नीति का दृष्टिकोण यह है कि वह पाकिस्तान अधिकृत कश्मीर है। इसलिए अगर नैय्यर साहब उसको करवट करें तो बेहतर होगा।

श्री कुलदीप नैय्यर: हां, बोल दिया न विदिन कोट

Madam, when I said 'Azad Kashmir', I meant within quotes Azad Kashmir. So, what is Mr. Malkani's objection when he was so friendly with them at that time, eating banquet there, etc.? Why should he now agitate? ...*(Interruptions)*... He was there with me. I cannot deny that ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: A lot of secrets are being revealed.

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: Madam, coming back to the working of the Ministry of External Affairs and the bomb, I personally think that this was known to everybody that we had a bomb and they had the bomb. Why you have had to take it out of the closet, I have not been able to understand. If you have exploded the bomb, then the things follow—weapons, you will have to have more funds, bigger bombs, etc. We are not in a position to afford all these things. We are a poor country. It is all right to talk about weapons, bombs, etc., but it is also true that 60 to 70 per cent of the people do not have two square meal a day. Where is the money coming from? We are a democracy. We have to go back and ask as to what there is. So, it is not a good thing. Just see how cold was affected America and the then Soviet Union. They were using planes and were taking bombs in those planes because they were afraid. They were, at least, fifteen minutes away. We are only two minutes

away. We should do something about misadventure, accident etc. All these things are important because casualties will be very many whole North-India.

I also take this opportunity to criticise one statement made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Ayub Khan. He said, "Look here, your cities are more populated than ours." That is not the way of counting human beings. After all, thousands and lakhs of people will be killed here or there. That is not the way. But, he continues to say that way because in Pakistan, people called him as Pakistan's Advani.

SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM: Madam, that also amounts to provocation. He is passing a remark.

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: Madam, they very much want that Parliament Members of this side and that side i.e. Pakistan and India really should sit in Lahore for discussion. Madam, *Jung* is a paper which is willing to finance the whole thing. They want to come here. They want the parliamentarians to sit together and discuss among themselves. They want this before the Colombo Conference. I did find, in spite of everything, a ray of hope. That ray of hope, probably, can be, improved upon or can be made into something bigger. If we send wrong statement like Mr. Advani's, Mr. Khurana's and Mr. Fernandes; there will be a problem. I think, Mr. Vajpayee's statements are very much liked. The people say that he is always talk in with some kind of sobriety and with some kind of objectivity. I think, that is a good thing. Before I conclude, I only wanted to appeal to the House and that is, if you think the bomb has given us superiority in the Indo-Pakistan affairs, you are very much mistaken. In fact, it is the other way round. And, let us not talk that since we have a bomb, we are superior. Let us talk that the bomb cannot be used. There is either annihilation or existence. There is nothing in between. Just like, you let the since of bomb out of the bottle and we cannot do anything about it. I hope, I

pray, for the future please create some kind of consensus in this country. Please consult others also. Please consult the Congress Party or some other party and others because it is the country which is involved now. Whatever you have done has harmed the country, it is the mistake of one Government. But that does not matter now, we are all in it. Do not try to complete your own agenda. This is a country's problem. If tomorrow sanctions come, I am sure, the sanctions are going to hurt us. In fact, Mr. Aziz Sartaj, the Finance Minister of Pakistan, made a very interesting point when I met him. He said, "Have you done it deliberately because you have \$ 27 billion of foreign exchange reserves and we have only \$ 1 billion and we cannot go on after three months? I said, "Well, I do not know. I am not really privy to anything." What I am trying to say is, whatever be the future, at least, try to create a good atmosphere and do not say, look here, there was a mountain coming from. Where was the mountain coming from? Where was the storm coming from? We are the ones who have created a storm. I hope it stays only in a tea cup. Thank you.

DR. M.N. DAS (Orissa): Madam, I am thankful and grateful to you for your kind command to speak a few words on this vital, delicate and sensitive issue. However forceful might have been the arguments of my esteemed friend, Shri Arun Shourie, I feel compelled to say that there is a marked change between the two periods—the post-Pokhran II and the pre-Pokhran II. That is the national perception. That is also the international perception. What I propose to say is that every country develops its own spirit of nationalism, and all nationalisms do not form a uniform stereo-type pattern. The spirit of nationalism of one country may differ from the spirit of nationalism of another country. Over the years, over generations, from the time of freedom struggle to fifty years of independence, India developed a spirit of nationalism

based on its cultural ethos. Many types of nationalism may be there, but our leaders, the founding fathers of Indian National Congress, and the leaders of post-independence India opted for the best form of nationalism available in political theory. That is formed as liberal humanitarian nationalism. The spirit is: Let my nation grow and prosper, let other nations also grow and prosper; let all nations live in peace. Let all nations serve the cause of humanity. Once Mahatma Gandhi was asked, "Mr. Gandhi, how do you define your nationalism?" Gandhiji's reply was "I am a nationalist. I am fighting for the freedom of my nation, so that an Independent India, free India may serve the cause of humanity. But, if need be, let my nation perish, if humanity is benefited by that." In other words, no nation need perish for the benefit of humanity. But, every nation has a duty towards humanity as such. That is, the spirit of liberal humanitarian nationalism.

We developed our External Affairs Policy on certain basic fundamentals. What were those fundamentals? India decided to speak in favour of world peace, and champion the cause of universal brotherhood. India raised its voice against all forms of oppressive systems, whether it was colonialism, imperialism or militarism. And when India emerged as an independent nation, fortunately we had a Prime Minister in Jawaharlal Nehru who enhanced the prestige of this country. The world knew India was a poor country, but that poverty was ascribed to British *raj*, which was an exploitation *raj*. Yet, in spite of internal weakness as a poor nation, the entire world comity of nations came to pay respect to India for the policies announced by the Indian leadership. I have gone through very secret confidential records in British archives and American archives. Even Winston Churchill, who hated Gandhi and Nehru from the core of his heart before independence, developed a kind of admiration for Jawaharlal Nehru when

the Indian Prime Minister wanted to throw warm water on the cold war politics. Churchill advised his colleagues to trust the man, Jawaharlal Nehru. He knew that Nehru was the only man who can soften the hard attitude of the two super, U.S. and U.S.S.R. And India automatically became the leader of Afro-Asian nations. India showed the path and held the light to encourage freedom struggle in many oppressed and suppressed lands. India went ahead. But a successful foreign policy rests, not on the basis of idealism alone. Politics also needs some kind of realism. We were betrayed in 1962 by China. Pretending to be friend, the Chinese stabbed us from the back. It is a fact of facts. We cannot deny whatever actually happened. But that was a lesson for India. That lesson made India active in strengthening her potential military power. India did not become a 'military state'. But militarily, India became a strong and stubborn nation. The Government decided to be powerful enough to face challenges from other nations. What happened when Jawaharlal Nehru was no more, Military rules of Pakistan Field Marshal Ayub Khan thought that India had become weaker after the death of Jawaharlal Nehru, So he took recourse to an adventure,— the Rann of Kutch adventure of Field Marshal Ayub Khan. But India's Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri gave a fitting reply that this country could not be simply taken for granted, and drove out the invaders in no time by inflicting on them defeat and disgrace. Such was the position of India. Thereafter, when Indira Gandhi came to power— she became the Prime Minister— She coupled idealism with realism to such an extent that if need be, India would be ready to face the challenges of the entire world. An occasion came in 1971, when India had to show its strength as a nation to the whole world. Think of 1970-71, when Madam Gandhi was running from country to country, from corner to corner meeting all the Heads of State in the West. Finally, she knocked at the door of

Richard Nixon pleading with him to save India from the demographic invasion from East Pakistan.

Ten Million people had come from East Pakistan to take shelter in India. Madam Gandhi requested Nixon to prevail upon the Military dictatorship of Pakistan to stop the genocide. But no western power came to the rescue of India. Richard Nixon disliked Madam Indira Gandhi to such an extent that he literally closed his doors upon her face. But the strength of the nation was there, and the conviction was there. Madam Gandhi summoned the Army Chief, General Manekshaw, and said, "Go ahead." And the Indian Army marched ahead. One hundred and ten members of the United Nations declared India as an 'aggressor country'. Not only that Richard Nixon ordered the most powerful warship of the Seventh Fleet, to proceed to Bay of Bengal with the inter-continental ballistic missiles aiming at Calcutta. but that the Chinese troops were seen across the Himalayan frontier, threatening us as if they would come to the aid of Pakistan. But what happened; At the end of the war East Pakistan was liberated to become Bangladesh. At that time, one of the finest comments came from one of the greatest statesman. He said that if ever a war was fought for a righteous cause, it was the war by India against Pakistan in 1971 to liberate the millions of oppressed people of East Pakistan. That is the strength.

Indira Gandhi proceeded further. When Pokhran-I took place in 1974, it was a lesson to the world. India had acquired nuclear capability. Two results were there which we should not forget. Firstly, there was no hostile reaction against India from the comity of nations. Pokhran-I was conducted in such a way that there was no hostile reaction. Only Richard Nixon might have trembled in fury. To him how could the CIA not know that India had prepared to explode a nuclear device in the Rajasthan desert? But there was no hostile reaction from



other powers. Secondly, China was compelled to soften its attitude towards India. Once you showed you strength once you showed you power, once you showed your capability... (time-bell)... China began opting for a dialogue, for a discussion. China offered to discuss for settling the border issue.

The country was going ahead. Side by side, economic development was taking place. We had the Green Revolution. Thanks to the people of the Punjab, thanks to the people of Haryana, of West Bengal, of Gujarat, India became self-sufficient in food. Economically, India became stronger. Militarily, India became a power. These are facts. We went ahead. We proceeded further.

Now, Pokhran-II has taken place. Madam, here is the wall-clock. We can open it and push back the hour hand or the minute hand or the second hand. But we cannot push back the time as such. Post-Pokhran-II India cannot be taken back to pre-Pokhran-II.

Madam, we have to reorient our foreign policy immediately and at once. I appeal to the Government. Internally, we may stand divided. As a democratic nation, we may stand divided on political lines, on ideological issues, on regional considerations. But when it is a question of challenge from the external world, the whole nation must have to stand united. United we stand; divided, we fall. This is an elementary lesson taught to us, as pupils, in our school days. Therefore, here is a moment of crisis. At this juncture, the whole nation must stand unitedly to face the external challenge, diplomatically, economically and politically; by various ways and means.

Madam, one or two minutes more. We are discussing substantive issues. We are going into the working of the Ministry of External Affairs.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We started the debate late. We have to sit late. I know it is your maiden speech.

DR. M.N. DAS: Only one or two minutes more, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay.

DR. M.N. DAS: I know that the Prime Minister is a vastly learned man. I need not have to tell him what. Kautilya said long ago that the country next to your frontier is our natural enemy, but the country next to the frontier of your enemy country is your natural friend. Well, let us not try to find friends across the frontiers of Pakistan and China above. We have to discover and rediscover which countries are friendly, which countries appreciate our becoming a nuclear power and our breaking the monopoly of a single super power which wanted to dominate the whole humanity by sheer force of atomic strength. We have scored a victory over that monopoly. But we have to re-establish our friendship with other countries, other nations in a diplomatic way. Diplomacy is a science; diplomacy is an art. The science of diplomacy can throw cold water on the boiling furnaces. The temper of those countries which are speaking of sanctions must be brought down. We have to hold the carrot of economic interests before them. Most of the western countries stand on their spirit of nationalism which is sheer and simple economic imperialism. We have to reorient our thinking towards such countries which have economic ties with us.

The second issue which I want to refer to is that we are maintaining a number of Embassies and Missions all over the world. In other words, we are maintaining highly paid officers. During frequent visits to our Embassies abroad, one comes across the fact how many top officers spend time without work, sitting and chatting over a cup of tea one is told, an important meeting is going on. But one can look through the window to know what that meeting is about. Do they ever try to create an image of their country before the public of that country?

In 1962, I was giving a lecture to the students of Moscow University. I was deputed by the Government of India. A respectable Professor put a simple question, "Well, Mr. Das, India was partitioned in the name of religion. Hindustan contained Hindus. Pakistan contained Muslims. Kashmir is a Muslim majority area. Why do you quarrel with Pakistan on Kashmir? Why don't you offer the Muslim majority area of Kashmir to the Muslim State of Pakistan?" I politely asked, "Mr. Professor, do you think that because 40 lakh people of Kashmir are Muslims, Pakistan has a claim to it? What about millions and millions of Muslims living in India?" They did not know about it.

In 1985, in the centenary year of the Indian National Congress, I had an occasion to talk in one of the universities of the USA. The same question of Kashmir came up. When I exposed the American foreign policy, how it was anti-Indian right from the beginning, they said, "We have a grievance against you. We support Pakistan because you have occupied Kashmir by force, and you don't let Kashmir go to them." I said, "Do you know one thing? The Muslim population of India today out numbers the entire population of Pakistan. Our Muslim population is the third largest Muslim population on earth. Pakistan comes fourth in the rank. After Indonesia and Bangladesh, we have the largest Muslim population. On what rationale, on what ground could Pakistan demand Kashmir when we have 12 crore of Muslims in our country?" The Americans did not know this.

What are our Missions doing? How do they present India's case today before the world audience? They must be advised by the Government, guided by the Government to present the conditions, the position or the reality which forced India to go in for Pokhran-2. Unless that is done, we will be isolated in the world, and we will be called an aggressor. But, if we present our case properly and

adequately and if we activate our Missions, many wrong perceptions will stand corrected in the mind of people of foreign countries.

So, Madam, let there be one unanimous foreign policy perception. Let the present Government understand that India does not belong to one party; India belongs to all the people of India. The policy must be a unanimous one and should serve the interest of the nation. That is my humble submission.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Before I ask the next speaker to speak, I have this to put before you. Five hours were allocated for this debate. We started almost at 3 o'clock. The debate, if I allow a very strict time limit, will still go on till 8 o'clock. I would like to know when the Prime Minister is going to reply.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

**SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa):** Madam, we may resume the debate tomorrow. It is my submission.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Hon. Chairman has fixed 12 o'clock tomorrow for the Prime Minister's reply. So, if we do not finish the debate today, how will the Prime Minister reply at 12 noon tomorrow? I would, therefore, request everybody to please abide by the time in respect your colleagues. I ask not only to abide by your time, but be a little generous to your colleagues and speak for a lesser time. Mr. Ramachandraiah, you have 15 minutes. I will be highly obliged if you complete within 12 minutes.

**DR. ALLADI P. RAJKUMAR:** Madam, it is his maiden speech.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Maiden can be in 12 minutes also. If you show some generosity while speaking for the first time, I shall be highly obliged.

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: उपसभापति महोदय, मेरा एक निवेदन है।

उपसभापति: उनका टाइम ले रहे हैं।

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: उनका टाइम हम नहीं ले रहे हैं। विदेश नीति पर चर्चा चल रही है। बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। इधर एक भी कैबिनेट मंत्री नहीं है।

उपसभापति: बैठे हैं.. (व्यवधान)

एक माननीय सदस्य: दो हैं।

उपसभापति: दूसरे कौन-से हैं? आप चितरंजन जी को भी शामिल कर रहे हैं?

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: हमारा दूसरा निवेदन है कि मैडम यह विषय महत्वपूर्ण और गंभीर भी है इसलिए इसको कल तक भी चलाया जाए। आज ही न खत्म किया जाए।

उपसभापति: मैंने आपसे अर्ज किया कि चेयरमैन साहब ने 12 बजे का टाइम प्रधान मंत्री जी की सुविधा देखकर कल के लिए नियुक्त किया है। उसमें तब्दीली करना मुनासिब नहीं है।

The Vice-Chairman (Shri Sanatan Bisi)  
In the Chair

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH (ANDHRA PRADESH): Sir, we have been debating on the necessity of recent explosions and their pros and cons. I may submit that any national foreign policy — political and diplomatic Tool has to protect the economic and territorial interests of its country. So, this has become inscrutable. Now, what has made the Government to indulge in such an activity? Indian culture is based on supremacy of good over bad. We have been supporting the forces of right against evil. Even most of our festivals have been depicting this concept. We have been adopting the foreign policy on consensus basis. Right from the days of independence, we have been following the non-alignment policy. We have never deviated from that. The country should have kept its options open, but now they have broken that ground. The inevitable in the opinion of the Government has happened. Has it been warranted? Other speakers like Mr. Arun Shourie have said that an avalanche or a mountain is going to fall on the nation. Is it true? Is it a

proper assessment or a pigment of an imagination? The Government should have an introspection. Today are we more secure than before the explosion? Was our security threatened earlier? If the Government has done it to refurbish its sagging image, then, we cannot help it. It is totally untimely. It is more than a political decision than a strategic decision. What is its impact on the economy? Can we play havoc with the economy of the country? The Government has tried to undermine its impact. The Finance Minister has gone on record saying that he does not have the implications of the sanctions. He gave an interview to a foreign correspondent also. In spite of the specific sanctions announced by the United States, by the donor countries and other countries, the Government is yet to evaluate the sanctions that would cause damage to our economy. My appeal to the august House is that we cannot live by this misplaced nationalism. If the peoples patriotic fervour and nationalism has to be aroused, it should be on the basis of a sound principle, on the basis of a good cause. Of course, if we do not support the explosions, we have got an apprehension that we will be branded as antinationalist. But what is the reality? It is totally untimely that the Government has indulged in such an aberration. The Government has to think it over. It is not weaponisation which alone will provide security to the nation. Security does not lie in the arms and ammunition alone. It lies in the minds of the people. It lies in the minds of the leaders who are at the helm.

Are we successful in our foreign policy? Are we successful in achieving the Gujral Doctrine? Are we friendly with our neighbours? What has happened in Afghanistan? Where is India's role in Afghanistan? India has been isolated. I think the ruling party itself is being isolated in the country. China is a very powerful neighbour. We have been trying to maintain good relations with China.

There were a lot of gestures and overtures from both sides. With Pakistan, we have been developing very good relations. So, with this aberration that has been indulged in by the Government, the atmosphere has become totally polluted. We should evolve a dynamic foreign policy wherein we should have good relations with China and other neighbouring countries also.

In the unipolar system, the United States is a dominant country globally. So also China is trying to become, if not globally, at least in Asia. If we want to forget it, it will be to our own detriment and to our disadvantage. Today, the United States has not only imposed sanctions against India, but it is trying to influence other donor countries...to impose sanctions on India. These sanctions appear to be very temporary. But they will have their own adverse impact on the economy. One of the hon. Members who spoke has talked about the Enron project. I would bring it to the notice of the Government, after the explosion, the share market has crashed. The Sensex has fallen down. And in Moody's ratings, India's rating has gone down. And we have announced in our Finance Act or the Budgetary proposals that we will procure Rs. 5,000 crores by virtue of disinvestment. And this amount is meant to reduce the fiscal deficit which in turn, the Finance Minister has proclaimed, will reduce inflation. In this scenario, in this international situation, is the Government confident of getting Rs. 5,000 crores out of disinvestment? If Indians are not purchasing, would you be able to influence the international investors to purchase these shares? Why do you try a hoodwink the people? And you have noted in the Budget proposals that we are going to reduce the inflation, the fiscal deficit and the revenue deficit.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I do not want to take much time. The option should have been kept open. The Government has broken the ground. At least let us try to minimise the damage. You evolve a

Foreign Policy. You should be more dynamic. You have got a point of view though there is no unanimity in the House. You try to sell your point of view to the other countries. You try to convince them. What are the efforts the Government of India has taken? How many dignitaries have been sent to foreign countries to sell our point of view? There are ex-Presidents of India who have got excellent relations with leaders of other countries. How many Muslim leaders have sent to the Gulf countries where we have got very good relationship? And, today, have we been benefited by this? We have viewed Pakistan for explosion; we have viewed China for explosion. Ultimately, do you think that we have been benefited? Now Pakistan is trying to champion the cause of fundamentalism. It is trying to encourage fundamentalism in other Islamic countries because it happens to be the nuclear power in the entire Islamic block. These are all stark realities the Government has to take note of.

Ultimately, before I conclude, I advise the Government that it is the duty of the Indian polity to sell only to the nation what its role is. Let there not be any confusion. It has to re-assess its role in the international scenario; it has to re-assess its role in the Asian region. Otherwise, the diplomats who have been engaged in this activity are totally confused. Let there be a clear policy. And it is the duty of the Government to take the entire country into confidence before such developments take place. Thank you.

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश मंत्रालय के कामकाज पर बहुत वर्षों के बाद आज इस सदन में बहस हो रही है। हमेशा हम बजट के दौरान दो-तीन विषयों पर बात करते रहे और फिर बाकी बातें खत्म हो गईं। विदेश मंत्रालय, शिक्षा मंत्रालय और अन्य जो आवश्यक मंत्रालय हैं उन पर कभी बात नहीं हुई, लेकिन वर्तमान संदर्भ में विदेश मंत्रालय पर बातचीत करना आज आवश्यक सम्झा गया।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन में पूर्वतन वक्तव्यों ने अनेकों बातों को कहा है। प्रणब मुखर्जी जी ने बहस की शुरुआत करते हुए जिस ढंग से बातों को रखा, वह एक पोजिटिव दिशा निर्देशन कर रहे थे, लेकिन उसके बाद सत्ता पक्ष की ओर से पत्रकार महोदय व सदस्य अरुण शौरी जी ने जिस ढंग से अपनी बातों को कहा उससे लगा कि दिशा ही बदल गई। हमें मालूम है कि हमारे देश में आधे तो लोग अनपढ़ हैं और इसलिए पढ़े लिखे लोग, खासकर के पत्रकार बंधु जिन बातों को कहते हैं उसका बड़ा असर होता है। अरुण शौरी जी एक सफल पत्रकार रहे हैं और सफल पत्रकारिता के दौरान उन्होंने जिस ढंग से बातों को कहा, लोगों ने उनकी बातों पर विश्वास भी किया। आज उन्होंने एक राजनैतिक दृष्टिकोण से अपनी बातों को यहां रखा है। छैर, उनकी बातों का जवाब हमारे दूसरे सदस्य पत्रकार साथी ने दिया। मैं उस विवाद में नहीं पड़ना चाहती। मैं केवल दो-तीन बातों की ओर अपनी घात को सीमित रखूंगी और वह यह कि हमें मालूम है, विदेश मंत्रालय का काम केवल आज डिप्लोमेसी, सीधा-सादा डिप्लोमेसी तक ही सीमित नहीं है, आज की दुनिया में पोलिटिकल डिप्लोमेसी के साथ साथ एकोनॉमिक डिप्लोमेसी, कल्चरल डिप्लोमेसी ने भी बहुत बड़ा स्थान लिया है और इसके जरिए हम अपने देश के बारे में दुनिया को बताते हैं। हमने 50 साल से जो विदेश नीति अपनाई थी, जो विदेश नीति का हमारा मूल था भाईचारा, एकसाथ रहना, कोपरेशन, पीस, अमिटी, उसी के जरिए हमने दुनिया में अपना स्थान बनाया था।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछले दिनों यूनाइटेड फ्रंट की संस्कार आई श्री अरुण शौरी जी ने कहा कि गुजराल जी को वह बहुत दिनों से जानते हैं, दोनों परिवारों में 50 साल से आपस की जान-पहचान है। अब 50 साल की जान-पहचान से कोई आदमी दूसरे को पहचान ले, यह बात मैं नहीं मानती, कम से कम उनकी बातों से तो मुझे ऐसा ही लगा क्योंकि उन्होंने जिस ढंग से गुजराल जी के बारे में कहा, वह कदाई उचित बात नहीं थी। उन्होंने कहा— शायद गुजराल जी सो रहे थे। सारी दुनिया को मालूम है कि पिछले दिनों जब यूनाइटेड फ्रंट की सरकार बनी तो उस सरकार में जब गुजराल जी विदेश मंत्री थे तब और जब प्रधानमंत्री थे तब, जो नीति उन्होंने चलाई, जो नीति उन्होंने अपनाई अपने देश के लिए, उस नीति को सारी दुनिया ने गुजराल डक्टिन कहा। वह एक सफल नीति थी और उस नीति का मूलभूत आधार यही था कि हमें अपने पड़ोसी के साथ अच्छा संबंध रखना

चाहिए। बहुत सीधे-सादे आधार के ऊपर यह नीति आधारित थी और वह यह कि जैसे अपने शहर में अगर अपने पड़ोसी के साथ, गांव में अपने पड़ोसी के साथ संबंध अच्छा न हो तो हम चैन की नींद नहीं सो सकते, उसी तरह से हमारे पड़ोसी देश के साथ हमारा संबंध अगर अच्छा नहीं होगा तो हम देश को अच्छी तरह से आगे नहीं ले जा सकते। इसी नीति पर हमारी विदेश नीति रही है। इसी आधार पर हमने आगे और दूसरे देशों के साथ अपनी दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया। बीस वर्ष के बाद चीन के राष्ट्रपति भारत आए। देवेगौड़ा जी उस समय प्रधानमंत्री थे। नवम्बर, 1996 के महीने में उनके साथ हमारा एक समझौता हुआ और उस समझौते के तहत यह पाया कि हम एक दूसरे के साथ मैत्री का संबंध और आगे बढ़ाएंगे, व्यापार खुलेगा। उसी दिशा में हम जा रहे थे।

महोदय, बर्मा, जो हमारे पूर्व की तरफ है सरहद में, बर्मा के साथ हमने दोस्ती का रास्ता अपनाया और सरहद में एक सड़क बनी ताकि बर्मा लेकर जो नारकोटिक्स ड्रप्स की स्मगलिंग होती थी भारत होते हुए, जिसको हम कहते हैं गोल्डन त्रीसेण्ट, जो गोल्डन ट्रायंगल के देशों में जाया करता था, यूरोप और दूसरे देशों में जाया करता था, उसमें ठोकथाम हो। हमारे देश में पूर्वांचल प्रांतों में जो टेयरिस्ट मूवमेंट है, उसमें भी कुछ ठोकथाम हो सके, उसके लिए बर्मा के साथ जो हमारे दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ा, उससे हमें बहुत लाभ हुआ। "सर्क" के बारे में लोगों ने बात की है, मैं उसको दोहराना नहीं चाहती, लेकिन एक और अपने पड़ोसी के लिए हथ-लोगों ने मोर्चा बनाया था उसको BIMSTEC "बिमसेल ज"—बंगला देश, इंडिया, म्यांमार थाइलैंड, श्रीलंका इकॉनॉमिक जोन—कहते हैं और उसके जरिए इन देशों को हम नज़दीक लाने की कोशिश कर रहे थे। इंडियन ओशियन के रिंग के देशों को लॉजिए, उनके साथ हमारे बहुत अच्छे संबंध बने, हमने अर्थ संबंध सुदृढ़ किए, अपने व्यापार को बढ़ाया। "आसियान" के साथ हमारे संबंध बहुत मजबूत हुए और यहां तक कि पिछले दिनों हमने चर्चा चलाई थी कि India being the largest democracy in the world, India being the sixth largest economy in the world, हमें यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की सिक्वैरिटी काउंसिल में जगह मिलनी चाहिए और बहुत से देशों ने हमारे साथ यह राय जाहिर की कि हां, हिन्दुस्तान को जगह मिलनी चाहिए। ईस्ट यूरोपियन कंट्रीज, जो रशिया से अलग हुई यूएसएसआर के टूटने के बाद, उनके साथ हमने वैसी संबंध बने और हमारे

संबंध सारी दुनिया के अलग-अलग हिस्सों में, जो हमने पालिसी अपनाई थी, उसके कारण अच्छे हुए। जैसे पूर्वोच्चल के, पूर्वी एशिया के देशों के साथ हमने एक पालिसी चलाई-लुक ईस्ट। लेटिन अमेरिका के साथ हमने एक पालिसी चलाई-लुक टूर्वटस लेटिन अमेरिकन कंट्रीज और उनके साथ इकॉनॉमिक कोऑपरेशन बढ़ाने की कोशिश की क्योंकि आज के दिन डिप्लोमेसी का बेसिक आधार है Economic cooperation, economic development, bilateral relations and multilateral relations between the nations. यह बहुत आवश्यक है आज के दिन क्योंकि आज कोई देश अलगा होकर नहीं रह सकता। मैं आज फिर उस बात को दोहराना चाहती हूँ बहुत जिम्मेदारी के साथ, गुजराल सरकार के एक मंत्री होने के नाते और विदेश मंत्रालय का मंत्री होने के नाते मैं दोहराना चाहती हूँ कि जिस दिन हम लोगों ने सरकार छोड़ी थी, उस दिन तक There was no danger of any encroachment. There was no warlike situation in our bordering countries, China and Pakistan. There was quiet and peace. हम आपस में बात कर रहे थे। पाकिस्तान के साथ जो मसले थे, उनको सुलझाने की हम बात कर रहे थे, आपस में बातचीत शुरू हुई थी, कई राउंड बात हुई थी। लेकिन अचानक पर्दे में घटना घट गई और पोखरान विस्फोट हुआ। India was a country on the threshold. We had the nuclear capabilities. 1974 से लोगों को मालूम था, सारी दुनिया के लोगों को, जो तीन देश हैं जिनको कहते थे थ्रेशोल्ड कंट्रीज—इंडिया, पाकिस्तान एंड इस्राइल—इनके बारे में सारी दुनिया को मालूम था कि ये जिस दिन चाहें न्यूक्लियर विस्फोट कर सकते हैं, लेकिन हमने नहीं किया था। सारी दुनिया को जानकारी थी इसके बारे में। हम चाहते तो कर सकते थे, लेकिन हमने नहीं किया। लेकिन नई सरकार, 18 पार्टियों को सरकार जब आई तो आते ही उन्होंने पहला काम किया विस्फोट करने का। हमें मालूम है जब बीजेपी बनी नहीं थी, जनसंघ तब भी उनका यह इजेंडा रहा है, यह हमें मालूम है और बीजेपी का भी यह इजेंडा रहा है, कि भारत को न्यूक्लियर स्टेट बनना चाहिए। लेकिन किस कीमत पर? आज हम कहां हैं? ..(व्यवधान).. संघ प्रिय गौतम जी, आज आप इस सदन में आए हैं, कल जब आप जाएंगे इस देश की जनता के सामने तब आपको पता चलेगा कि आप कहां हैं और आपके साथ-साथ हमें भी मालूम पड़ेगा। ..(व्यवधान)...

एक माननीय सदस्य: आपकी सरकार ने ... (व्यवधान)...

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा (बिहार): हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने कुछ नहीं किया, हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने बचाया इस देश को। ..(व्यवधान)। सबसे बड़ी दुर्भाग्य की बात जो है वह यह है कि पिछले दिनों, जब से यह सत्कार आई है और जब से पोखरण की घटना घटी है, हमें नहीं मालूम कि कोई विदेश मंत्रालय है भी क्या? वेअर इज दि एक्सटरनल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री? कोई पता ही नहीं चलता है। खुराना जी यहां बैठे हैं, इन्होंने कहा कि तारीख तय कर लो हम पाकिस्तान पर हमला करेंगे। जैसे क्रूरती के मैदान में ताल ठोककर कहा जाता है, चलो भाई कब आते हो? मैंने तो अखबार में पढ़ा।

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री (श्री मदन लाल खुराना): उसके बाद का सेंटेंस नहीं पढ़ा होगा आपने।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: आप कोई बात कह दीजिए, उसके बाद खंडन कीजिए, यह तो कोई बात नहीं हुई।

एक आपने कहा, दूसरे आपके रक्षा मंत्री ने कहा। जैसे अरुण शोरी जी ने कहा कि— an avalanche is coming. A storm is coming from the northern side. Where is the storm? Even today there is no storm.

इस तरह से तूफान आ रहा है, भयंकर एवोल्यूशन आ रहा है, क्या-क्या हो रहा है, उसको रोकने के लिए हमारा न्यूक्लियर एक्सप्लोजन करना जरूरी था, न्यूक्लियर पावर बनना जरूरी था। अब तो हो गए आप न्यूक्लियर, पावर, so what? What is now? I would like to know what the agenda of the Government is.

इसलिए मैं यह जरूर कहना चाहूंगी कि विदेश मंत्रालय को इस ढंग से न घलाया जाए। बहुत ठकलीफ होती है इसे देखकर। विदेश मंत्रालय में प्रधानमंत्री खुद विदेश मंत्री हैं और विदेश मंत्री होने के नाते उनको समय नहीं है। वे प्रधानमंत्री भी हैं। अब उन्हें जयललिता जी को भी संभालना पड़ता है, दूसरे सहयोगियों को भी संभालना पड़ता है। हरेक के पास हाथ जोड़कर नतमस्तक होना पड़ता है। इसकी नाराजगी दूर करो, उसकी नाराजगी दूर करो। उनका सारा समय तो इसी में चला जाता है, सारी ऐजेंसी इसीमें चली जाती है। अखबारों में जब हम उनकी तस्वीर देखते हैं तो हमें तरस आता है, हमेशा बेचारे धके-धके रहते हैं।

महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि एक फुल फेज्ड फारेन मिनिस्टर होना चाहिए और कैबिनेट रैंक का फारेन मिनिस्टर होना चाहिए क्योंकि अगर फारेन मिनिस्टर कैबिनेट रैंक का न हो तो फिर हम जानते हैं कि प्रोटोकाल में किस तरह की बातें होती हैं। जो दूसरे लोग

है, वे उस काम को नहीं कर सकते हैं। आप जसवंत सिंह को भेजिए, I have the highest regard for him. But he cannot be a substitute for the Foreign Minister.

आप प्रधानमंत्री के प्रधान-सचिव को भेजिए, he cannot be a substitute for the Foreign Minister.

महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि एक फुल-फ्लेड फॉरेन-मिनिस्टर होना चाहिए।

The Foreign Ministry should be allowed to function as a Foreign Ministry. और उसके मामले में दूसरे मंत्री लोग दखल न दें। अब विदेश मंत्री कुछ कह दें, उनको कहना ही चाहिए लेकिन रक्षा मंत्री कुछ कह दें, पार्लियामेन्टरी अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर कुछ कह दें, तीसरा व्यक्ति कुछ कह दे तो, this is a free for all.

आज तो जो बात प्रधानमंत्री जी ने कही थी, उसी को कंटाक्ट करके चले गए अरुण शोरी जी।

What is right? What is wrong? In which direction is the Government going? We don't know. (Interruptions)... गौतम जी, आप बैठे-बैठे बोल रहे हैं, आप खड़े होकर बोलिए जो कहना चाहते हैं, it should go on record.

महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि इस ढंग से काम नहीं होता है। हिन्दुस्तान को कहां ले जाना चाहते हैं आप? इस देश को कहां ले जाना चाहते हैं आप? एक तो कर दिया पौखरण विस्फोट। अब अगर हम इतने ताकतवर हैं और हमें इतनी आवश्यकता थी और हमें अपने पड़ोसियों को सबक सिखाना था और उनकी शक्ति को कंटेन करना था तो हम दुनिया के बाजार में पत्र क्यों लिखते फिर? राष्ट्रपति क्लिंटन के पास हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी ने पत्र क्यों भेजा और वह भी एक दूसरे देश को दोषी करार देते हुए क्यों भेजा गया? Is this democracy? Is this diplomacy? What kind of diplomacy is this?

इस ढंग से तो काम नहीं होता है। इसके बारे में उनको एस्कल्पेशन देना चाहिए। एक तो आप काम कर लो और उसके बाद अपनी सफाई देते फिर। क्यों सफाई देंगे अगर हम इतने ताकतवर देश हैं तो? India is a great country. Why should we go on explaining our conduct to everybody? If we are such a great country, we are responsible for whatever is done. There is no reason to explain our conduct to everybody. But we have been doing that.

We have been dishonouring our country's prestige. We should not do that. We are degrading our self-respect. Where is our self-respect?

एक तो यह काम हम लोगों ने किया। अब यह कहा गया वी डेंट केयर, जो किया-किया, हमने न्यूक्लियर बम विस्फोट कर लिया, हम बड़े ताकतवर हो गए। मुझे तो बड़ी हैरानी हुई। मैं समझती थी कि अरुण शोरी जी जिम्मेदार पत्रकार हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि और तीन महीने बताएं, सैकशन रहे ताकि दुनिया को दिखा सकें कि हम बहुत ताकत वाले हैं। ठीक है वह तो कर लेंगे, वह तो ताकत दिखा लेंगे लेकिन इस देश के आधे लोगों की हालत क्या होगी? आज के दिन में जो महंगाई बढ़ गई है आपको पता नहीं है। हर चीज के दाम दुगुने-तीगुने हो गए हैं। जो खरीदकर खाता है, जो गरीब किसान है, जो गरीब मजदूर है, जो भूमिहीन मजदूर है उनकी क्या हालत है आपको पता है? Where are we leading our country to?

एक तो विदेशी कर्ज के बोझ से हम डूबे हुए हैं। मैं अगर आंकड़े देने लगू तो बहुत समय लग जाएगा। हमने आंकड़े बहुत इकट्ठे किए हैं लेकिन अभी आंकड़े देने नहीं जा रही हूँ।

श्रीमती मालती शर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश): विदेशी कर्ज किसने लिया?

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा (उत्तर प्रदेश): आपने लिया, हमने लिया, सभी ने लिया, भारत ने लिया। देश के ऊपर कर्ज है। यह कर्ज का बोझ हमें कहां ले जाएगा और आज इस कर्ज के बोझ के साथ We are the biggest debtor. We are the biggest borrower.

और वर्ल्ड बैंक ने कह दिया कि हम आपको अब कोई पैसा देने वाले नहीं हैं। क्या होगा? दुनिया के कई देशों ने कहा कि हम आपको आर्थिक मदद नहीं करने वाले हैं। व्हाट विल हैपिन? मैं आपको छोटे-छोटे उदाहरण देना चाहती हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सनातन बिसि): मैडम, टाईम हो गया।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: आई विल कांक्लूड आस्ट्रेलिया से हम कोयला मंगाते थे। हम 25 प्रतिशत कोल विदेश से आयात करते थे। आस्ट्रेलिया से हम कोयला मंगाते थे जिनके कोयले में एस० कंटेन कम होता है। आस्ट्रेलिया ने अब कोयला भेजने से मना कर दिया है। They stopped sending their coal. What is the result?

हमारी ख़िती स्टील इंडस्ट्री है उनके ऊपर उसका इम्पैक्ट पड़ गया। हमारे देश में जितने वाशरीब है उनको कहा गया-वक ओवर टाईम। भारत बुकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के पास इतनी उत्पादन क्षमता नहीं है कि पूरे देश की स्टील इंडस्ट्री की ज़रूरत को पूरा कर सके। मैंने केवल एक उदाहरण दिया, अनेकों उदाहरण इस तरह के हैं। The value of money is going down. रुपए की कीमत गिर रही है डालर की कीमत के अनुपात में। परन्तु यशवंत सिन्हा जी कह सकते हैं कि दूसरी जो कंसीज है उसके साथ हमारी कंसी की कीमती ज्यादा है। अब अगर इटेलियन पिसो के साथ तुलना करें या फिलिपींस के पिसो के साथ करें तो फिर तो ठीक ही है हमारे रुपए की वैल्यू बहुत हाई है। लेकिन यह बात ठीक नहीं है। तो मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि इसके बाद हम कहाँ जाएंगे। एक तो जो इकोनोमिक्स सैक्शन हुए हैं उसके कारण देश के ऊपर जो बोझ पड़ेगा उसके बारे में सरकार का क्या उत्तर है और कम्युनिस्ट टैट बेन ट्रीटी के बारे में गवर्नमेंट की क्या पोलिसी है, गवर्नमेंट को साफ कहना चाहिए।

What will be our policy on disarmament?

What will be our policy on NPT? What will be our policy on FMCT?

इसके बारे में गवर्नमेंट को एक्सप्लेन करके बताना चाहिए और यह भी कहना चाहिए Where do they want to lead this country to?

DR. L.M. SINGHVI (RAJASTHAN): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to begin with an expression of heart felt appreciation of the presentation which Shri Arun Shorie made on the basis of cogent facts and figures. Very little of it was party political. I hope that everyone in the House would take note of the sequence of events which he pointed out. The way the nuclear exercise took place in May was not a point of departure nor a new beginning. It was a logical culmination of the nation's policy. It is unfortunate, however, that even on a matter of this nature and magnitude we seem to bring in a great deal of party politics.

It seems to me that Mr. Pranab Mukherjee tried very skilfully to orchestrate and synthesise dissonance with the concluding note of consonance or consensus for bringing the nation together.

Many of the members who have spoken also sounded that note of consonance and that is the note which the Prime Minister had sounded when he gave us the mantram of *sahmati*. That is the mantram by which we all can work together. I don't think that it is right, for instance, to say that there were no consultations after the nuclear events. There were consultations. I recall seeing pictures of the leaders of the Congress Party with the Prime Minister not only dining but also talking together, consulting together. If there is anyone in this country who would be more keen to try and create a consensus, it is the Prime Minister with his pre-eminent parliamentary career of 41 years and with his strong sense of patriotism and his sense of consensus. I don't think that it is fair to level ludicrous and trivialising that the explosion took place because the party wanted to gain a certain mileage. To say so is to bring the nation and this Government into disrepute. It is to be regretted that some persons have gone to the extent of attributing such motives. When some Members said that there was no threat perception, I would ask: what was the threat perception in 1974 when Shrimati Indira Gandhi decided that the exercise in terms of a nuclear explosion should be undertaken? What was the actual threat when in 1967, Shrimati Gandhi took the very wise initiative of sending a delegation to various countries including the United States to ask them as to what would be the guarantees for countries like India in case of the NPT? The Non-Proliferation Treaty was brought about in spite of the fact that there was no nuclear guarantee given to countries like us. In the context of the threshold countries which were democratic and which are now sought to be subdued into submission by sanctions, the nuclear countries have turned a blind eye to their security concerns.

It is important to remember that the Opposition has a very important role to play. It has a participative role. It has a critical and constructive role. And we



have statesmen of the stature of Mr. Manmohan Singh who, I know, would be able to play that role and who would like to play that role. The divisive words that I heard today are heart-rending. It is not for a great nation to speak of a momentous decision in these trivial terms nor was it proper for my friend and predecessor, Mr. Kuldip Nayyar and another Hon'ble member to speak of Mr. Salman Haidar's recall and appointment on the ground of the religion he subscribes to. Was he appointed on that basis? I hope not. I think that it is an insult heaped on my good friend, Mr. Salman Haidar, "who had long innings in the Foreign Service to say either that he was appointed because he was a Muslim or that he has been withdrawn because he is a Muslim. It is a great pity that we tend to forget that political appointees are under an obligation, a conventional obligation, to tender their resignations and as an honourable gentleman, Mr. Salman Haidar, has resigned. And that resignation has been accepted. Why then is there all this fuss? And why is there an attempt to communalise an issue of this nature?

I think that the Opposition does not have to be a pessimist. It has to be a participant. I remember a Member of the Opposition in the British House of Commons always sounding a note of pessimism. He was asked why this was so. He said, "My difficulty is that I am not only in the Opposition but I am also a pessimist by disposition." It is important to remember that we have to work together. That certain individuals occupy the Treasury Benches and others sit on the other side does not mean that it is any the less a participative democratic Government. That sense of positive and constructive participation, I think enhances the credibility of the system and the decisions which are taken.

It is true that the Annual Report of the Ministry of External Affairs is only a glossy souvenir of the year that has gone out, but I think it would have been appropriate, perhaps, to circulate or to

append something about that which has overtaken the report, the events to which references have been made by many of the hon. Members.

It serves no useful purpose to keep flogging dead horses. Time and again, it has been said as to what the Defence Minister said about China. Time and again, this has been referred to, but it has been forgotten that in a national debate we must move on, we must not flog dead horses and we must also try and see the scenario in its totality.

The Annual Report reminded me of an anecdote. It is an invented anecdote, therefore, I shall say that a Prime Minister was once travelling in his car in my home State of Rajasthan and he asked his Private Secretary, "Where are we?" And the Private Secretary quickly replied, "Sir, we are in the car." The Prime Minister said, "That is a perfect parliamentary answer. It is the truth, but it reveals nothing. Official reports are generally like that answer which conceals more than it reveals, but we must go beyond the official reports. The momentous decision to exercise our nuclear option taken by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister did not take the decision out of the blue. It is unfortunate that the legacy of Shrimati Indira Gandhi and the legacy also of Rajiv Gandhi are being forgotten. Those legacies are precious for the nation. Shrimati Indira Gandhi took the decision in 1974 to effect an explosion or implosion. There was no threat at that time. In 1967, Smt. Gandhi sent around the world a delegation to plead for nuclear guarantees for countries like India. We have known that in the nineties the country was within 10 or 15 days of such an explosion taking place. We don't have to apologise for the explosion that took place, except perhaps to the CIA for not having shared the information with them in advance, and if they are unhappy about it, we cannot help it. This is something which is, as I said, a culmination of a long held view and consistent policy. The option, there is no doubt,

was kept open in the interest of the nation by previous Governments. It has been exercised in the interest of the nation-by this Government. Therefore, we must move on with a sense of solidarity. It seems there is too much hair-splitting on matters of such great importance. Let us understand that firstly it will not help to try and find faults when there are none or to pick holes when there are none. And it will not help merely to be a debating forum without the ability to participate, without the readiness to mobilise and that is why I should applaud the concluding remarks of Mr. Pranab Mukherjee and many other Members offering co-operation, offering participation, offering to assist the Government in every way they can to mobilise because we need national solidarity, we need this togetherness of the nation, not mere debating divisiveness of the nation... (Interruptions)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: At least we should know...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): Why are you getting up? Please sit down. ... (Interruptions)... Please address the Chair.

DR. L.M. SINGHAVI: The Parliament is meant to create, to marshal the consent of the people to create a consensus of the people and that is what we ought to do. We may have to criticise, we have to question, we have to find out information but, at the end of the day, let us adopt a more constructive, a more positive attitude. I do not wish to reflect on anyone but I am sure we must do a great deal more.

I would like to suggest that at the next General Assembly Session of the United Nations, India should take an initiative to propose a resolution with the support of the world community for a treaty of No First Use. This can be very vital. Mr. Kuldip Nayyar need not think that the BJP Government is less humanitarian than any other Government was. So far as national security is concerned, we must

all stand together with national security we should also have a concern for the world as a whole. If we propose a 'no first use' treaty and if we succeed in bringing it about with the support of other nations of the world, then the fact that we were able to exercise our nuclear option would prove to be a great catalyst. As a nuclear weapon State we would be offering to all others that there would be 'no first use'. Let China join it, let Pakistan join it, let Nuclear Power countries join it and once that happens, it would lead us to a situation where we may move towards a nuclear-free world.

Shri Rajiv Gandhi took a very important initiative. That initiative did not come to fruition at that time. That is an initiative which we can not afford to forget. He wanted to try and create a nuclear-free world. That is the high moral ground which belongs to India and has belonged to India because of its consistent commitment to nuclear disarmament. But it cannot be that India should be a passive spectator whereas others stock pride and sell technologies to others. India has to protect itself. Year after year, decade after decade, we pleaded with the world for nuclear disarmament. That was a cry of the heart, but that cry of the heart was a cry in the wilderness. It is, the powers of the world which have to blame themselves for not having listened to us, for not having shared our security concerns, for not having taken note of the fact that technology was being illegally and surreptitiously transferred, often within the knowledge of the great powers. Nothing, nothing at all was done at that time.

Therefore, in this debate, if we are still talking about nuclear disarmament, it is because we know the utter futility of nuclear arms. Our plea is consistent with what we have done and it may well be that it will pave the way for nuclear disarmament in times to come.

I do not think that we need to be reminded of the fact that our country has always stood for peace. The hon.

Member, Kamlaji, spoke of India's commitment to peace but did it mean that when Mrs. Gandhi decided to explode a nuclear bomb or device she was not committed to peace? It was her commitment to peace. Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was committed to peace, Mr. Narasimha Rao was committed to peace and Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee is equally committed to peace. Let us not say that any one of us is more committed to peace than others. We have also to understand that the countries which have paid lip service to our democracy and our rule of law have, however, acted on a hegemonistic power calculus. That hegemonistic power calculus has to be fought now and always. If we do not, we would be surrendering the sovereign rights of the people. We would be surrendering the moral vision of India and that is what this particular nuclear explosion means. I think it is important to turn to some other parts of the annual report because we are not discussing the nuclear explosion only. The Prime Minister, Shri Vajpayee, is one of the first in Parliament who took up the issue of people of Indian origin for many years. From 1957 onwards he has spoken on this issue. I call them not NRIs, the Non-resident Indians, but I call them as National Reserve of India. Their attachment to India is genuine. I am glad that some measures have been taken by the Government recently in the Budget to give them a sense of belonging to Mother India. But, a great more deal needs to be done. I hope that we will take action to make sure that the Indian diaspora throughout the world will be brought close to Mother India. I know Dr. Manmohan Singh shared this view when he was the Finance Minister and he tried to take some measures—but a decision could not be taken. I think it is important for us to promote the idea of the Indian diaspora lending strength to our nation and vice versa. They will consider it a privilege if they are given an opportunity to help in the establishment of a stronger India.

I would like to make two more points and those are with regard to cultural diplomacy and economic diplomacy. Mrs. Sinha is right in making the point that now is the time for economic diplomacy. Now is the time when we can create strength for ourselves. Now is the time also for cultural diplomacy. I would like to pay my tribute to ICCR for what it has done with whatever little funds it has. The Nehru Centre in London was one of the dreams I have been able to fulfil when I was the High Commissioner. Under the stewardship of a seasoned Director like Dr. Gopal Gandhi followed by Prof. Indranath Choudhury, that Centre has rendered a yeoman service to the cause of India.

Sir, Diplomats are not to be regarded as Sir John Wooten described them as 'People who are sent abroad to lie on behalf of their country'. The idea of India as a civilisation has to be projected by our diplomacy, the idea of India as a country which has this long heritage has to be projected, the idea of modern India has to be placed before the people of the other countries. Unless we are able to do this, unless Foreign Service measures itself to the highest standards of skill, pro-active commitment to India and the passion to interpret India as a civilisation, as a vibrant modern democracy, we will not be able to make much progress. I am of the view that diplomacy has become a fine art today. That fine art based on scientific analysis, on evaluation, on reviews and it is this which we must try to build up. Equally, we should try to build up the strength of our external publicity. I regret to say this is an area in which we have been flat-footed. I think it is important for us to take some new measures in order that bureaucratic ways do not have the upper hand, that in our diplomacy a new sense or dynamism is brought to bear on, and our external publicity is streamlined. It is not enough for ambassadors to be seen. It is necessary that they should be heard.

Let us pray for the success of the visits of our Prime Minister to Sri Lanka and his endeavour in evolving a common agenda with Pakistan for some of our bilateral problems and some of the problems which are common to Asia. We do not rejoice or bloat on Pakistan's misfortune. We have always extended to them our hand of friendship. But friendship cannot be one-sided. They have to understand that they cannot bargain for a territory of India in exchange for peaceful relations and in exchange for not exporting terrorism to India. I think it is important that we begin to see our role in the world and our role with our neighbours. The Prime Minister, Shri Vajpayee has a glorious record in terms of establishing cordial relation with our neighbours during the last time when he was the Foreign Minister. I am sure that will happen again and that will be a source of strength to us in SAARC, in the commonwealth and in the United Nations, we must build up pro-active initiatives reflecting a new dynamism in our approach to foreign affairs.

**श्री ईश दत्त यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश):** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश मंत्रालय के कार्यक्रम पर बहुत ही अच्छी चर्चा हो रही है। विदेशी नीति का यह अर्थ है कि हमारे पड़ोसी देशों और दुनिया के देशों से अच्छे संबंध हों, सहअस्तित्व हो, दूसरे और हमारा सहयोग करें हम दूसरे देशों का सहयोग करें, हमारे हर प्रकार के दूसरे देशों से आर्थिक और राजनयिक संबंध अच्छे रहें। स्वर्गीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जो इस देश के प्रथम प्रधानमंत्री थे, उनके समय से ले कर के और पोखरण परीक्षण तक इस देश की एक कॉन्स्टेंट विदेश नीति रही, एक स्थायी विदेश नीति रही है। हम समझते हैं कि इस बीच जितनी सरकारें आई हैं, उन्होंने इसमें कोई ज्यादा परिवर्तन नहीं किया है और यदि कोई परिवर्तन किया है तो वह देश हित में और राष्ट्रहित में था।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जॉन एफ. फर्नांडिस) पीठा सीन हुए**

लेकिन इस सरकार ने पोखरण परीक्षण कर के, विदेशों से राजदूतों को वापिस बुला लिया। अभी सिंचवी जी बोल रहे थे, चले गए, इनकी नियुक्ति नरसिंहराव जी के कार्यकाल में हुई थी। देवगोड़ा जी आए, हमारे दूसरे

प्रधानमंत्री गुजराल साहब आए, इन्होंने किसी को वापिस नहीं बुलाया। सिंचवी जी अपना कार्यकाल पूरा होने के बाद भी ज्यादा समय तक रहे लेकिन इस सरकार ने 6-7 राजदूतों को वापिस बुलाया और इसलिए वापिस बुलाया कि वह इनकी विचारधारा के नहीं थे। संसदीय कार्य मंत्री जी बैठे हुए हैं। मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि किसी पार्टी की विचारधारा का राजदूत नहीं होना चाहिये, वह देश की विचारधारा का होना चाहिये, इस राष्ट्र की विचारधारा का होना चाहिये। लेकिन आपने उसी दिन अपनी विदेश नीति पर हमला कर दिया और दूसरा हमला किया पोखरण परीक्षण कर के। जो सन् 1952 से ले कर के पंडित नेहरू के जमाने से विदेश नीति थी, उस नीति पर आपने हमला बोल दिया, एटम बम चला दिया। कारण क्या था आपके पोखरण परीक्षण करने का? सभी लोगों ने कहा कि स्वर्गीय इन्दिरा जी के समय में भी हुआ था। कहीं कोई जश्न नहीं मनाया गया। तब उन्होंने अपने आदमी दुनिया में भेजे कहीं हमारे संबंध खराब न होने पाएं। लेकिन आपने कुछ नहीं किया। पोखरण परीक्षण किया और पूरे देश में थाली बजा कर के आपकी पार्टी के लोग जश्न मनाने लगे, विजय दिवस मनाने लगे। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि अखिर इनकी उपलब्धि क्या रही है जिसका जश्न मनाया गया? आपको पोखरण परीक्षण की क्यों आवश्यकता पड़ी? यह हम बतला रहे हैं कि क्या आवश्यकता पड़ गई थी? कई समाचार-पत्रों में मैंने पढ़ा और हिन्दी की एक पत्रिका में भी छपा था। जब आपकी यहां पर सरकार बन गई, अल्पमत वाली सरकार बन गई, यह सरकार शाम को जाएगी, सुबह जाएगी, कोई पार्टी समर्थन वापिस ले लेगी और आपकी सरकार गिर जाएगी, आप बहुत चिन्तित थे। आपके मंत्रिमण्डल में, आपकी पार्टियों में एकता तो है नहीं। मैं नहीं जानता कि यह समाचार कितना सही था। लेकिन लखनऊ के एक समाचार पत्र में यह छपा, हमारे जो प्रधानमंत्री जी हैं, जहां इनका चुनाव क्षेत्र भी है, इनके क्षेत्र के उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार के एक मंत्री हैं, प्रमुख मंत्री हैं, उन्होंने प्रधानमंत्री जी को सलाह दी कि इस समय तो आपको खतरा लग रहा है। वे बोले किस बात का खतरा है? पाकिस्तान से? बोले नहीं। किस देश से? इनके मंत्री ने, लखनऊ वाले ने कहा कि नहीं आपको खतरा है आपकी कुर्सी के लिए। इसलिए कुछ करिए। बोले क्या करें? कहा कुछ कमाल करें। कुछ तोड़फोड़ करें। कुछ ऐसा करें और कुछ नहीं हो सके तो पटाका ही छोड़ दें कहीं पर ले जाकर। पटाका क्यों छोड़ें? इसलिए छोड़ा कि जो अल्पमत की सरकार है, जो कुर्सी का खतरा है, जो सरकार गिरने का खतरा है और जो इस सरकार की ओर से लोगों की अपेक्षा है गरीबों के

लिए, बेकारी के लिए, भ्रष्टाचार के लिए और सरकार की अस्थिरता के लिए, यह सही केन्द्रित हो जाएगा कि इस सरकार ने बहुत बड़ा कमाल कर दिया। पोखरण के बाद कमाल हो गया। इसलिए अब इस सरकार को खाने का एक है और वह सरकार बनी है। इसलिए पोखरण परीक्षण कर दिया। पोखरण परीक्षण करने के बाद डिंडोर आपने पीछा। डिंडोर इस तरह से पीछा जैसे प्रधान मंत्री जी का यह सरकार जो है सारी सामग्री अपने केब में रखे थी और ले जाकर पोखरण में छोड़ दी और विस्फोट हो गया। वह नहीं है। वह बीसियों सालों से वैज्ञानिक लोगों की उपलब्धि है। यह तो देश को और सरकार को सम्मान देना चाहिए उन वैज्ञानिकों को जिनकी यह उपलब्धि है। वैज्ञानिकों के प्रति आपकी दृष्टि क्या है? ए०पी०जे० अब्दुल कलाम जो इस देश के सबसे बड़े वैज्ञानिक हैं जो आपके वैज्ञानिक सलाहकार हैं जब इलाहाबाद विश्वविद्यालय में उनका सम्मान किया जा रहा था—माननीय संसदीय कार्य मंत्री जी आपको बताना चाहूंगा तो आपकी उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार के एक मंत्री ने अब्दुल कलाम के खिलाफ वहां पर नारे लगवाए। उनको अपमानित किया गया ....(व्यवधान)

श्री के०आर० मलिकानी: क्या लगाए गए आप बताइए...(व्यवधान)

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: आपको क्या बताऊं...(व्यवधान) सुनिए, आप बैठिए...(व्यवधान)

श्री के०आर० मलिकानी: नहीं बैठता...(व्यवधान)

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: क्यों नहीं बैठते हैं...(व्यवधान) हम जो बोल रहे हैं सुनिए...(व्यवधान)

श्री के०आर० मलिकानी: ए०पी०जे० अब्दुल कलाम के लिए हम सबके दिल में बहुत इज्जत है। आप ऐसा क्यों कह रहे हैं?...(व्यवधान)

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: अब आप सुनिए...(व्यवधान) हम जो कह रहे हैं उसको सुनिए...(व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जॉन० एफ० फर्नांडिस): मलिकानी जी, प्लीज...(व्यवधान)

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री तथा पर्यटन मंत्री (श्री मदन लाल खुराना): ऐसी बात न कीजिए...(व्यवधान)

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: हम उचित और सही बात कह रहे हैं...(व्यवधान)

श्री संजय निरुपम: उसका सबूत क्या है?...(व्यवधान)

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: सबूत हम देगे आपको ....(व्यवधान)

श्री के०आर० मलिकानी: ले आए...(व्यवधान)

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: सबूत हम ले आएंगे...(व्यवधान) मैं सही कह रहा हूं।

श्री सतीश प्रधान: यदि आपके पास सबूत है तो सदन में रखिए किसी पर ऐसे जो इल्जाम लगा रहे है यह ठीक नहीं है....(व्यवधान)

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: आप बैठिए प्रधान जी। सुनिए ....(व्यवधान)

श्री सतीश प्रधान: मैं बैठता हूं। लेकिन आप जो ऐसा आरोप लगा रहे हैं वह सही बात नहीं है....(व्यवधान) आप बहुत सीनियर हैं।...(व्यवधान)

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: मैंने कहा कि यह इलाहाबाद यूनिवर्सिटी की बात है। कहीं छिपी-लुकी बात नहीं है....(व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जॉन० एफ० फर्नांडिस): यादवजी, प्लीज एड्रेस द चेयर....(व्यवधान)

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: यह इलाहाबाद विश्वविद्यालय की बात है जहां पर आपके एक मंत्री ने उनके खिलाफ नारे लगवाए....(व्यवधान, तो मैं कह रहा था कि इस देश के वैज्ञानिकों को सम्मान देना चाहिए....(व्यवधान))

श्री संजय निरुपम: ...भारतीय जनता पार्टी के कुछ कार्यकर्ताओं और मंत्रियों के बारे में गलत आरोप लगा रहे हैं। अगर ये आरोप सही हैं तो इन्हें साबित करें वरना इन आरोपों को वापस लें ....(व्यवधान)

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: मैं जो कह रहा हूं माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, वह पूरे कान्फेडेंस के साथ और सही कह रहा हूं....(व्यवधान) यह इलाहाबाद विश्वविद्यालय में हुआ था....(व्यवधान) इन लोगों की आदत यही है कि ये जब बोलेंगे तब हम लोग शांति से सुनेंगे और हम जब बोलेंगे तो ....(व्यवधान)

श्री के०आर० मलिकानी: आप "क्यों बोल रहे हैं....(व्यवधान)

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: सही बोल रहा हूं ....(व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष: यादवजी, प्लीज कंटीन्यू ....(व्यवधान)

\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

**श्री ओंकर सिंह लखावत:** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यादव जी का हम बहुत आदर करते हैं। वे बहुत वरिष्ठ नेता हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि जैसे परमाणु बम को पटाका बोल रहे हैं वैसे ही कलाम साहब के लिए हल्की बात कैसे कह रहे हैं... (व्यवधान) ये परमाणु बम और पटाके में अंतर समझ लें। कृपया ये ठीक बात कहें... (व्यवधान)

**श्री ईश दत्त यादव:** सर, पोखरण आपरेशन के बाद क्या परिणाम आए देश के सामने? जिस दिन 11 मई को आपने परीक्षण किया, उसी दिन और उसके दूने दिन 13 मई को तथा 13 मई के दूसरे दिन कितने देशों ने आपका सम्मान किया? कितने लोगों ने आपका समर्थन किया कि आपने अच्छा काम किया? आपकी निन्दा की। आपका विरोध किया और आपके जो राजनयिक संबंध थे इन देशों से वे संबंध खराब हो गए केवल आपके प्रोपेगंडा करने से, केवल आपके जश्न मनाने से केवल आपकी अदूरदर्शिता के कारण सारे देशों से संबंध खराब हो गए।

अमरीका ने प्रतिबंध लगा दिया, दूसरे देशों ने आपके काम की निन्दा किया। मैं फिर दोहरा रहा हूँ, पं० नेहरू जी के जमाने से जो कांस्टेंट विदेश नीति थी, उसके ऊपर आपने हमला कर दिया और दुनिया में आपकी पिछूर खराब हो गई। केवल आपके कामों की वजह से, केवल आपकी गलत नीति की वजह से आज दुनिया में आपके संबंध खराब हुए, जिस पर आज गंभीरता से विचार करने की जरूरत है। आपकी सरकार को इस पर विचार करना पड़ेगा कि जो संबंध खराब हुए इन संबंधों को कैसे सुधारा जाए, ताकि हमारी जो 50 साल की सफल विदेश नीति थी वह आगे बढ़े। जिस विदेश नीति को इस देश के अंदर स्व० पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने बनाया, स्व० इंदिरा जी ने और हमारे दूसरे नेताओं ने जिस विदेश नीति को चलाया था, उस विदेश नीति को आगे कैसे बढ़ाया जाए आज इस पर गंभीरता से विचार करना पड़ेगा। हम जो कह रहे हैं इस पर केवल शोर करने से आपकी विदेश नीति को सफलता नहीं मिलने वाली है।... (व्यवधान) मान्यवर, अभी सिंघवी जी कह रहे थे कि हम लोग प्रयास कर रहे हैं, चाइना का उदाहरण दे रहे थे कि जो वहां के विदेशी लोग हैं, विदेश में रहने वाले हैं, उसी तरह से हम इन्वाइट कर रहे हैं दूसरे देशों को और आपके बहुत इन्वीटेशन के बाद भी, सही आंकड़े मेरे पास नहीं हैं, लेकिन जो हमारे विपक्ष के नेता डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी बैठे हैं इनको ज्यादा जानकारी होगी कि जो एन०आर०आई० लोग हैं वे अब हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर पैसा लगाने के लिए साहस नहीं कर रहे हैं।

हम समझते हैं कि चाइना के अंदर जो एन०आर०आई० हैं वहां के लोग 80 परसेंट पैसा चाइना में लगा रहे हैं और आपके देश में दो परसेंट भी लगाने का अब कोई साहस नहीं कर रहा है, जहां तक मेरी जानकारी है, हो सकता है आंकड़े सही नहीं हों। इसलिए मान्यवर, आपने देश को पीछे धकेल दिया, बीसों साल पीछे धकेल दिया। हमारे संबंध खराब हो गए। नहीं तो हम आज व्यापारिक दृष्टि से आगे बढ़ते, आर्थिक दृष्टि से आगे बढ़ते और दूसरे देशों के साथ हमारा सहयोग बढ़ता। आज उस रास्ते में इस सरकार ने रोड़ा अटका दिया, स्पीड ब्रेकर का काम कर दिया। आपको इस गंभीरता से विचार करना पड़ेगा। केवल पार्टी के नाते एक साथ जोर-जोर से शोर मचाने से काम नहीं चलने वाला है। यह पूरे राष्ट्र का सवाल है। सरकारें आती हैं और जाती हैं, आपकी सरकार रहे या हमारी सरकार रहे, किसी की सरकार स्थायी नहीं होती है, लेकिन जो नीतियां हैं और जो राष्ट्र धर्म है यह स्थायी होता है। इस स्थायित्व में आप रोक न लगाइये, बल्कि इस स्थायित्व को आपको प्रगति देनी पड़ेगी। आपको संबंध सुधारने पड़ेंगे, पाकिस्तान से संबंध सुधारने पड़ेंगे। हम फिर कह रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान से कोई खतरा नहीं है, दूसरे देशों से कोई खतरा नहीं है, खतरा इस राष्ट्र को नहीं बल्कि खतरा खुदरा जो आपकी और प्रधान मंत्री जी की कुर्सी के लिए है। इसलिए यह सारा बकाल किया जा रहा है और सारा तिकड़म किया जा रहा है। देश की जो एक नीति थी वह स्थायी नीति थी, उस नीति पर हमला किया जा रहा है। इसलिए माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि आप पाकिस्तान से संबंध सुधारिए। आपके मंत्रिमण्डल में कोई एकता नहीं है। आपके एक मंत्री, जो रक्षा मंत्री हैं, वे चीन के खिलाफ बयान दे गए, चीन के खिलाफ वक्तव्य दे गए। आज मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी की प्रशंसा करूंगा एक आपके मंत्री हैं, वह मंत्री जी बोल दिए कि रिजर्वेशन होना चाहिए, कांस्टीट्यूशन का संशोधन हो जाना चाहिए और प्रधान मंत्री जी मैं आज कहा, स्वीकार किया कि यदि ऐसी बात है तो मैं उनसे एक्सप्लेनशन कल करूंगा। खुदरा जी, मैं आप लोगों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब जाऊँ साहब ने चीन के संबंध में भाषण दिया तो उसके साथ हमारे संबंधों में कटुता बढ़ी, तब क्या आपने उनसे एक्सप्लेनशन लिया? आपका मंत्रिमण्डल भानुमति का पिटाटा है, इसलिए जो चाहे जो विचार प्रकट कर दे, और आपके मंत्रिमण्डल में एकता नहीं है। इसलिए देश की विदेश नीति प्रभावित हो रही है।

मान्यवर, मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा, केवल, आपके माध्यम से इस सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप

पाकिस्तान से वार्तालाप कीजिए, आप चीन से वार्तालाप कीजिए, आप अमरीका से वार्तालाप कीजिए और दुनिया के देशों से आप संबंध स्थापित करिए। हम और हमारी पार्टी से यहां तक विश्वास करने वाले हैं कि पाकिस्तान और बंगलादेश जो हमारे इमीडिएट पड़ोसी हैं, ये हमारे भाई हैं।

दुर्भाग्यवश आज से पचास साल पहले हम एक-दूसरे से अलग हो गए। न जाने क्या कारण था। यह दुर्भाग्य था देश का और देश के बड़े नेताओं की लोगों को एक रखने की शक्ति में कहीं कमी रही होगी कि हम किसी कारण से अलग हो गए। हम भाई-भाई थे। यह एक विशाल देश था। दुनिया का गुरु था हिंदुस्तान। वह दुनिया को शिक्षा देता था। यहां से दुनिया में लोग शिक्षा देने के लिए, नसीहत देने के लिए भेजे गए। आज फिर आवश्यकता है पड़ोसियों से संबंध सुधारने की। हमारे संबंध एशिया के दूसरे देशों के साथ सुधरने चाहिए। मैं तो यहां तक कहना चाहता हूं कि आज हिंदुस्तान, पाकिस्तान और बांग्लादेश का एक महा-संघ बनना चाहिए। जब बांग्लादेश और पाकिस्तान के साथ संबंध सुधर जाएंगे और हमारा महासंघ बन जाएगा, भाईचारे के संबंध बन जाएंगे, व्यापारिक संबंध बन जाएंगे तो किसी को कोई भय नहीं रहेगा। न अपने देश को कोई भय रहेगा, न पाकिस्तान को कोई भय सताएगा और न बांग्लादेश को भय सताएगा। वे समझेंगे कि ये तो हमारे भाई हैं और हमारे ऊपर हमला करने वाले नहीं हैं तो पोखरण जैसे परीक्षणों से देश के ऊपर कोई भयावह आपदा आने की संभावना नहीं रह जाएगी।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जॉन एफ. फर्नांडीस)** ईश दत्त जी अब खत्म कीजिए। आप ने पांच मिनट ज्यादा ले लिए हैं। प्लीज खत्म कीजिए।

**श्री ईश दत्त यादव:** उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं तो अंत में सुझाव दे रहा था और सरकार से अनुरोध कर रहा था कि पड़ोसियों से संबंध सुधारिए, अच्छे संबंध बनाइए और जहां-जहां आप ने मंत्रिमण्डल में एकता न रहने के कारण गलतियां की हैं, उन को सुधारिए। आप की सरकार रहे या जाए, इस से हमें कोई मतलब नहीं है। रहे तो भी ठीक और चली जाए, तो भी ठीक लेकिन विदेश नीति न जाने पाए। आप विदेश नीति को बचाइए और देश को बचाइए। धन्यवाद।

**श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत:** उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, परमाणु बम को पटाखा कहना उचित है क्या यह आप देखें? महोदय, यह राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा का प्रश्न है, देश की अस्मिता का प्रश्न है, इसलिए मेरा यह निवेदन है कि

आप का हम से मतभेद हो सकता है, पर परमाणु बम से कोई मतभेद नहीं हो सकता। जो हम ने परीक्षण किया है, उसे पटाखा कहना क्या उचित होगा, यह माननीय सदस्य सोचें? हम तो अखंड भारत के विचार में आप के साथ हैं।

**श्री ईश दत्त यादव:** यह हम ने नहीं कहा। आप के मंत्री ने कहा था। वह अखबार में छपा था, पत्रिका में छपा था कि पटाखा ही छोड़ दीजिए। यह मैं अपनी ओर से नहीं जोड़ रहा हूं, यह आप के मंत्री हैं लखनऊ वाले उन से पूछिए।

**THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES):** I have to make an announcement. Shri Malkani had said: *"\*mat-boliye"*. That is unparliamentary. That will not go on record. That will be expunged.

Now, Shri Krishna Kumar Birla, please.

**SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA (Rajasthan):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to offer a few comments regarding the working of the Ministry of External Affairs, the discussion on which was initiated very ably by my friend, hon. Pranab Mukherjee.

Firstly, Sir, I would like to offer some comments regarding the efforts being made by some of the countries to isolate India. It is an accepted axiom of all the countries in the world that Government may change, but the foreign policy remains steady.

As far as India is concerned, fifty years back, our Government, under the able leadership of Panditji, made many suggestions. These are still holding good. One of the concepts was peaceful co-existence and co-operation between the different nations. After that, in 1954, when Mr. Chou-en-Lai, the Prime Minister of China, came to this country, Panditji further elaborated his idea regarding this concept of peaceful co-existence by evolving the Panch Sheel. Owing to paucity of time, I am not elaborating the principles underlying

Panch Sheel. These are well-known-mutual respect for each other, non-aggression, mutual benefit, peaceful co-existence, etc. In view of the exhaustive principles which we have been following, it is a matter of great distress that some countries are trying to isolate India. Why? Because as far as we are concerned, we had the audacity of conducting these tests at Pokhran on the 11th and the 13th of May. Sir, without going into the merits or demerits of the case, I certainly feel, as was said by Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, that on such an important matter it would have been much better had the top leaders of various parties been at least sounded about what India was proposing to do.

Anyway, Sir, action has been taken, and now we as a country have got to defend that action. Our best defence will be that every country has got to look after its own security in the best possible manner and that India has broken no law by conducting the Pokhran test. It has been recognised by all countries that we have not broken any law.

Now, Sir, pressure is being applied to sign the NPT and the CTBT. The behaviour of some of the countries is very strange. They are preaching non-proliferation, and yet they have got large arsenals, including nuclear bombs, with them. They are preaching non-proliferation, but clandestinely they are exporting nuclear technology and missile material to other countries. This is most amazing. In view of this, I think that it was a very good step on the part of the Government that it sent Shri Jaswant Singh to meet Mr. Talbott on the 12th of July in Washington. He is meeting him today also at Frankfurt. It was again very nice that Smt. Vasundhara Raje was sent to three South-Asian countries and also to Azerbaijan and Armenia.

Mr. Brijesh Mishra, the Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister, was sent to Moscow and Paris.

I would certainly like to advocate that the language that we use, the language that we speak should be a diplomatic language. It should be an accommodative language. It should not be a language of defiance or of confrontation. In some of our speeches, unfortunately, very harsh expressions have been used against the USA and China. We have adopted a posture of confrontation. This, Sir, is not in the best interests of the country.

I would particularly like to draw your attention to our relations with China. In the last ten years, efforts have been made to improve our relations with China. Why last ten years, even at the time of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi we started making efforts to see that our relationship with China improved, and we succeeded in this to a great extent. The hostility between the two countries froze. Our differences got narrowed down, and the cordiality between the two countries improved.

Sir, the visit of Mr. Jiang Zemin, the Chinese President, was an event of great importance. There was a better understanding between the two countries. That was all the more reason why we should have been very careful in the choice of our words. I want to mention to you that had our relations with China been good, had they been good or cordial at least outwardly, the situation today would have been much better than what it is now.... (Time bell)

Sir, Just two or three minutes more. Sir, Russia is a friend of ours and we should try to build our relationship with them. France is also a friend of ours. President Chirac is a very bold man. He is a man who can stand against the bullish behaviour of the United States. We should certainly try to improve our relationship with France as well. As far as UK is concerned, I would not like to enter into the question as to whether it was proper or not to recall Mr. Salman Haidar. All that I would like to state is that during the days of the Conservative Government, our relationship with UK



was very good. I also would like to state, as I have heard, that Prime Minister Tony Blair is a very decent human being. I do not know what could be the reason why the Foreign Secretary is taking an anti-India attitude. I have no doubt that in case we send some good person to London, things will improve.

Regarding USA, it is important that we try to improve our relationship with them. But, Sir, side by side, I would also like to mention that we should not sign CTBT under pressure. We should sign it in case our viewpoint is met.

I would also like to mention that there is a widespread reservation expressed in the US media regarding the Clinton Administration's one-sidedness towards China. Even some important statements, like the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Gingrich, spoke in favour of India. He said the Clinton Administration policy was in stark contrast. On the one hand it was accommodating Communist China, on the other it felt outraged when democratic India chose to test its nuclear capacity. He further said that this double standard in the Administration's action disregards China's far more dangerous actions while it is imposing sanctions against India. Sir, earlier I did not use the word China, because I said we should develop a good relationship with China. But, this is regarding what US Statesmen have said on China. He further said two dozen transfers of missile technology and material by China to Iran and Pakistan are clear violation of US laws and international treachery. Likewise, Democrat Frank Pallony, who is co-Chairman of India caucus in the House also spoke in India's favour. So did Henry Kissinger, the former Secretary of State, who is no friend of India. But, he also spoke in favour of India. He said that India is a sovereign country and it is within its right to explode the bomb.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN. F. FERNANDES): Please conclude. There is no time left for your party.

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA: I will conclude within two minutes. We have to use our mature response against such pressures so that they are to our advantage. It is good that we have found some lobbying agencies. I am sure, if we explain to them, they will be able to do a good job as far as India is concerned. I would certainly endorse what one of our friends said that as far as Pakistan is concerned, even though US, Pakistan and China form an axis, we should try to have friendly relationship with Pakistan. The fact that Pakistan is in greater difficulties than ourselves, should be no matter of satisfaction. Their currency has devalued by 20 per cent, while our currency has devalued by seven per cent. This is the time when we should try to build our relationship with Pakistan. Sir, I would like to mention that Kashmir is an issue which may take quite sometime before it is resolved. As far as we are concerned, the people of Pakistan are friendly towards the people of India. We should try to take advantage of this situation.

Sir, our policy towards our neighbouring countries should be on the basis of the Gujral Doctrine. We should try to follow that Doctrine towards Nepal, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. We should follow this policy and try to practise co-existence.

I would entirely endorse the opinion expressed by Shri Pranab Mukherjee that we need a full-time Minister of External Affairs. Thank you.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जॉन एफ. फर्नांडिस): नरेश सादर जी, आप बोलिए। आपकी पार्टी के 12 मिनट हैं।

श्री नरेश सादर (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर बोलने का मौका दिया। इसके पहले मैं प्रणब मुखर्जी साहब को सुना जिन्होंने बड़े निष्पक्ष भाव से

अपनी बात को रखा है और लिहान अरुण शोरी जो को सुना जिन्होंने पक्ष के भाव से अपनी बात को रखा है। फिर कुलदीप नैयर साहब ने अपनी पाकिस्तान की यात्रा के अनुभव सुनाए। हमारे दूसरे साधियों ने भी जो विद्वतापूर्ण बातें यहां रखी हैं, उन्हें मैंने बड़े धैर्य से सुना है और मैं भी अपनी पार्टी की ओर से, राष्ट्रीय जनता दल की ओर से विदेश नीति के बारे में जो चर्चा यहां हो रही है, उसमें भाग लेते हुए कुछ महत्वपूर्ण बातें आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं।

महोदय, विदेश नीति किसी पार्टी की नीति नहीं होती है बल्कि विदेश नीति, पूरे देश की नीति होती है और राष्ट्र के हित के लिए होती है। इसलिए 1947 में जब हम आजाद हुए, तब से आज तक की नीति, पंडित नेहरू से लेकर आज के हमारे आदरणीय प्रधानमंत्री श्री वाजपेयी जी की नीति, विदेश नीति है। वह किसी दल की, किसी सरकार की नीति नहीं है। अन्य देशों में विदेश नीति के सवाल पर आंदोलन हुए हैं लेकिन कभी भी इस देश में इस सवाल पर आंदोलन नहीं हुआ। भारत एक ऐसा देश है जहां महागाई, भ्रष्टाचार, बेरोजगारी के बारे में आंदोलन हुए लेकिन यह देश विदेश नीति के सवाल पर एक-साथ खड़ा रहा, चाहे वह पंडित नेहरू की नीति हो या गुजराल साहब की नीति हो या वाजपेयी साहब की नीति हो।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर घरेलू नीति के बारे में हम भूल करते हैं तो उसका परिणाम हमें 5 साल तक भुगतना पड़ता है या जब तक उस पार्टी की सरकार रहे, तब तक भुगतना पड़ता है लेकिन अगर विदेश नीति के बारे में कोई भूल हो जाए जैसे 1947 और 1949 में हुई तो वर्षों तक देश को उसका परिणाम भुगतना पड़ता है। इसलिए बहुत समझ-बुझकर इस बारे में निर्णय लेने की जरूरत है। जो भी सरकार आए, चाहे हमारी सरकार आए, चाहे आपकी सरकार आए, उसे इस बारे में सोच-समझकर निर्णय करना चाहिए।

महोदय, मैं जानना चाहता हूं सरकार से कि जब सारा मामला ठीक-ठाक चल रहा था, देश की सारी नीतियां अच्छी तरह से चल रही थीं, विदेशों से हमारे संबंध सुधर रहे थे, तो यह कदम उठाने की क्या आवश्यकता थी? महोदय, वही परिवार सुखी होता है, वही परिवार पसंद किया जाता है जिसके सदस्यों के आपस में अच्छे और मधुर संबंध होते हैं और विदेश नीति में भी यही बात लागू होती है कि आस-पड़ोस से हमारा संबंध कैसा है। हमारे पड़ोसी देशों नेपाल, पाकिस्तान, भूटान, श्रीलंका, बंगला-देश, इनसे हमारे संबंध अच्छे हो रहे

थे। हमारी पिछली सरकार में महाकाली नदी पर नेपाल सरकार के साथ समझौता किया, संबंध की। हम लोगों ने गंगाजल के बंटवारे के सवाल पर बंगला देश से समझौता किया। जो मामला बरसों से चल आ रहा था, उसे हमारी सरकार ने सुलझाया। इसके लिए बिहार को और बंगाल को छामियाज भुगतना पड़ रहा है, हमें घाटा हो रहा है लेकिन चूंकि देश का सवाल था, इसलिए छामियाज भुगतकर भी देश के सवाल पर हम लोगों ने बंगला देश से संबंध की, बंगला देश से गंगाजल के बंटवारे पर समझौता किया। इसी के साथ हमने यह भी देखा है कि नवाज शरीफ जो पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री बने उन्होंने चुनाव के समय अपने मैनफेस्टो में, चुनाव प्रचार में यह कहा कि हम भारत से संबंध सुधारना चाहते हैं। वहां की जनता ने उन्हें वोट दिया, उनको जिताया इसलिए कि उनका एक इश्वर यह भी था कि वह भारत से संबंध सुधारना चाहते हैं। श्रीलंका से हमारा संबंध बहुत अच्छा रहा है। जब सारी चीजें देश में अच्छी तरह से चल रही थी तो अचानक वह कैसे हो गया? हमारे देश में पहला परमाणु विस्फोट 1974 में हुआ था। वैज्ञानिकों को परमाणु विस्फोट के लिए बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद है। हर किसी देश के वासियों को नाज होगा इस बात से कि हम परमाणु सम्पन्न देश हैं। लेकिन अकारण किस बात के लिए आखिर किसलिए कौन सी आवश्यकता पड़ गई है कि 11 मई और 13 मई को देश को परमाणु विस्फोट करना पड़ा? ऐसी कोई देश में आवश्यकता नहीं थी। जब हमारा संबंध पड़ोसी देशों से सुधर रहा था, पड़ोसी देशों से हम अच्छा रिलेशन रखते कर रहे थे और उसमें हम जानते हैं इस बात को कि हमारा दुश्मन निकट का देश है और निकट का देश कौन हो सकता है। सब से ज्यादा निकट का देश पाकिस्तान है और हम पाकिस्तान को दिखाने के लिए परमाणु विस्फोट कर रहे हैं। इसकी आवश्यकता क्या है? हमारी जनसंख्या के सामने उसकी जनसंख्या कुछ नहीं है, हमारी शक्ति के सामने पाकिस्तान की शक्ति नहीं है। लेकिन महज राजनीतिक कारणों से और कोई कारण नहीं हो सकता, राजनीतिक कारणों से अपने परमाणु विस्फोट किया। सभी जानते हैं, दुनिया जानती है इस बात को कि हम परमाणु सम्पन्न देश हैं तो फिर बताने की क्या आवश्यकता है? आप शक्ति सम्पन्न देश हैं, परमाणु शक्ति सम्पन्न देश हैं और आप पाकिस्तान के साथ में खेले। पाकिस्तान को चाहता था वहीं आपने किया और पाकिस्तान इस बात को भुना रहा है। पाकिस्तान अन्य देशों में इस बात को भुना करके वहां जाकर के बोरो में पैसा ला रहा है और आपके सारे देशों

से स्रोत बंद हो रहा है। आपका स्रोत सारे देशों से बंद हो जाए और पाकिस्तान का स्रोत खुल जाए और पाकिस्तान जो चाह रहा था आपसे करवाना वहीं आपने किया है। यह नफरत का बीज बोने की क्या जरूरत थी आपको? आप जानते हैं, दुनिया इस बात को जानती है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का जो बंटवारा हुआ वह नफरत के बीज पर हुआ और जब तक उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम इस नफरत के बीज को प्रेम में नहीं बोएंगे, नहीं पनपाएंगे, हम जब तक इस नफरत को नहीं त्यागेंगे तब तक इन दोनों देशों का संबंध नहीं सुधर सकता है। हिन्दुस्तान का विकास तभी सम्भव है जबकि पड़ोसी देशों से हमारा संबंध सुधरे, अच्छा हो। जब तक हम पड़ोसी देशों से संबंध नहीं सुधारेंगे तब तक विकास नहीं होगा। हमने क्या पाया, पूरे देश ने क्या पाया? हमने लड़ाई कर-करके देखा। 1962 में लड़ाई हुई, 1971 में लड़ाई हुई और आज की डेट में भी 17-18 हजार वर्गमील जमीन आज दूसरे देशों के कब्जे में है।

कुल मिलाकर के पुराने बोर्डर को मान लीजिए एक लाख वर्गमील से ज्यादा देश की जमीन आज दूसरे के कब्जे में है। हमने इससे क्या पाया? हमने नफरत पायी। हमने विदेशों से अपना संबंध बिगाड़ा है। पंडित नेहरू इस विदेश नीति के निर्णायक थे। उन्होंने गुटनिर्पेक्षता की नीति प्रारम्भ की और कुल मिलाकर सौ से ज्यादा देश उसमें शामिल हुए। उससे घट करके हमने साउथ एशिया किया और आज हम सार्क कर रहे हैं और सार्क देशों से भी हमारे संबंध सही नहीं चल रहे हैं और सबसे आपस में हम एक दूसरे से लड़ रहे हैं, भिड़ रहे हैं। इसलिए उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम आपके माध्यम से यह कहना चाहते हैं कि महज राजनीति को विदेश नीति का कारण नहीं बनाया जाए और जब राजनीति विदेश नीति में समायोजित हो जाती है तभी देश में कोई बड़ा खतरा आसन्न हो जाता है और यही कारण है आज तक। आज तक इस देश में कुछ ही सरकार को छोड़ करके किसी ने भी पूरी पाँवर के साथ विदेश मंत्री को यह विभाग नहीं दिया। आज भी प्रधान मंत्री इस विभाग को अपने पास रखे हुए हैं। इससे पहले भी रखा गया था। हमारी सरकार रहे, आपकी सरकार रहे, उनकी सरकार रहे कोई फर्क नहीं। लेकिन यह ऐसा निर्णायक महत्वपूर्ण मंत्रालय है जिस मंत्रालय में आज किसी मंत्री को हम यह विभाग पूर्ण रूप से नहीं दे सके हैं जिसके कारण से हमारा विकास नहीं हो सकता, हमारे देश की नीति अच्छी नहीं हो सकती। महोदय, हमने आपने देखा जार्ज साहब के बयान। जार्ज साहब नम्बर वन का दुश्मन चीन को मान रहे हैं और कुछ हमारे

माननीय मंत्री बयान देते हैं कि समय और तिथि की घोषणा करो हम युद्ध के लिए तैयार हैं। यह आखिर क्या बात है? युद्ध करके आप किस का क्या कर लोगे।

युद्ध हम कभी नहीं कर सकते। युद्ध तो विनाश का कारण होता है। कोई भी देश उसकी समृद्धि के लिए युद्ध नहीं कर सकता है, यह बयान करके आप चीन को हमारा नंबर एक का दुश्मन होने की घोषणा कर रहे हैं किंतु प्रधान मंत्री इसे कॉन्ट्राडिक्ट करते हैं कि नहीं, चीन हमारा नंबर एक का दुश्मन नहीं है। तो आखिर आपकी भी एक केबिनेट है, आपका एक समूह है, उसमें भी एक तरह की बात नहीं आती है। कभी आपके किसी एक मंत्री ने कोई बयान दे दिया और कभी किसी मंत्री ने कुछ बयान दे दिया और उस बयान के चलते देश की हालत अच्छी नहीं होती है, उससे देश की प्रतिष्ठा पर आंच आ रही है इसलिए हम चाहेंगे कि जो हमारे रक्षा मंत्री हैं, वे विदेश मंत्री की तरह व्यवहार कर रहे हैं। कम से कम उन्हें रक्षा मंत्री की ही तरह व्यवहार करना चाहिए, विदेश मंत्री की तरह व्यवहार नहीं करना चाहिए।

एक बात की हम निंदा करते हैं। जब से यह भाजपा और एलाइन्स की सरकार आई है, यह पार्टी तो इस देश में सबसे अलहदा विचार रखती है। इस पार्टी के खिलाफ सब युनाइटेड हैं, जितने सेक्युलर फोर्सेज हैं, वे सब अलग हैं लेकिन जब से यह पार्टी सरकार में आई है, विदेश नीति में भारत पूरी दुनिया से अलग हो गया है। पता नहीं यह अलग रहने की आदत आपको कहां से पड़ गई है? और चाहे जो भी करो, अलग होने के लिए देश में खून-खराबा करो, अलग रहने के लिए विदेश में खून-खराबा करो, आपका विश्वास खून-खराबे पर है, आपका विश्वास प्रेम, स्नेह और सद्भाव पर नहीं है और यह बड़े दुख की बात है। इसलिए हम आपके माध्यम से इस सरकार को कहना चाहते हैं कि आपके कौन-कौन दोस्त हैं, ज़रा हमें बता दें। कोई हिन्दुस्तान को यह कह दे हिन्दुस्तान चीन के मुकाबले हमारा दोस्त है, कोई बोलने की हिम्मत नहीं करता। आज आपकी बहुत बड़ी नीति है लेकिन कोई देश यह कहने के लिए तैयार नहीं है कि चीन के मुकाबले हिन्दुस्तान हमारा दोस्त है लेकिन इसके बदले उल्टा यह कहने के लिए तैयार है कि हिन्दुस्तान के मुकाबले चीन हमारा दोस्त है। तो यह बहुत बड़ा फर्क है और कोई देश इस तरह से आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता जब तक उस देश को अपना कहने वाला कोई नहीं है। आपके पड़ोस का देश हो चाहे कोई देश हो, सिर्फ एक देश ने हर मामले में आपका साथ दिया है। कश्मीर के मामले में आपका हमेशा साथ दिया है

रूस ने। कश्मीर में हमेशा आपको मुंह की खानी पड़ी है, अगर रूस न होता तो। आर्थिक क्षेत्र में भी विदेशों के पैसे पर आपकी पंचवर्षीय योजना बनती है। आपकी क्या योजना बनती है, वह बताइए। इसलिए आज ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि देश के स्वभिमान को बचा कर एक सफल विदेश नीति को कायम करना आपका देश के प्रति कर्तव्य है। हमारा देश तभी आगे बढ़ेगा जबकि सक्षम विदेश नीति हमारी होगी और सक्षम विदेश नीति तभी होगी जबकि हम आस-पास के देशों से संबंधों को सुधारेंगे। आस-पास के देशों से संबंधों को बिगाड़ कर हम कोई भी निर्माण का कार्य नहीं कर सकते हैं। यह देश तभी आगे बढ़ा है...हज़ारों साल की कहानी है, यह देश तभी आगे बढ़ा है जब प्रेम और सद्भाव का भाव बढ़ाया गया है। इसलिए हम वर्तमान सरकार की विदेश नीति को निंदा करते हुए यह कहना चाहते हैं कि आपने परमाणु बम का विस्फोट अपने राजनीतिक हित के लिए किया है, देश के हित के लिए नहीं किया है। इस बात को हम लोग मानते और जानते हैं कि परमाणु बम का विरोध हम लोग कभी नहीं कर सकते इसलिए क्योंकि परमाणु बम के एक्सप्लोजन का हमने और हमारे नेताओं ने समर्थन किया है। हमें इस बात का गर्व है लेकिन जब इसका राजनीतिकरण किया जाता है तब यह शर्म का विषय होता है। आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया, इसके लिए बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES):** Shri K.R. Malkani, Mr. Malkani, your party has one minute. You can complete within two minutes.

**SHRI K.R. MALKANI:** Sir, I beg your pardon.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES):** Your party has one minute. You can take two minutes.

**SHRI K.R. MALKANI:** I don't want to speak for two minutes.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES):** You at least begin now.

**SHRI K.R. MALKANI:** I will need a minimum of ten minutes. I have been allotted twenty minutes and if it is one or two minutes, I better forego it. I don't want to speak for one or two minutes.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES):** We have to conclude by eight o'clock. You at least begin now.

**SHRI K.R. MALKANI:** No, no. I am making it very clear. I will not speak for a minute or two. I will not speak for less than ten minutes. Twenty minutes have been allotted to me. If you do not want me to speak, I will sit down. नहीं, अगर आप कहेंगे कि शुरू करें तो मैं शुरू करूंगा।

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES):** One minute is over.

**SHRI K.R. MALKANI:** Sir, just add zero to it.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am happy that we in this House are discussing this matter elaborately. The world is becoming one, globalisation is growing, the importance of External Affairs and, related to it, Defence is becoming very important and I hope that every year, whatever else we may or may not discuss, diplomacy and defence must be discussed in both the Houses.

Sir, what happened in India and Pakistan in May is something historic, something epic. For the last 50 years, the West has been dominating the world. A certain unfair world order exists. It is a challenge to them. We don't have to think only in terms of India-Pakistan, Hindu-Muslim. We must go above and beyond it. That is why, the Western powers are so unhappy and so tough with us. They are thoroughly disappointed because this becomes, whether it is from India or from Pakistan, a double challenge to their hegemony.

Sir, we have all heard of Samuel Huntington, the famous author of "Clash of Civilisations." Two years ago he wrote a book on that subject and in that, he said in so many words, "We felt reassured when the BJP was not able to form the Government here and the Welfare Party in Turkey was not able to form the Government there." Now the

reality is, even according to Huntington, whether it is BJP in India or Welfare Party in Turkey, these are parties of nationalism—if it doesn't suit America, it dubs them 'fundamentalists' or 'communal', whatever they like. But this is the reality today. The same Huntington says—I just quote a few lines from his Press-statement last week: "Globalisation is unlikely to defeat cultural nationalism wherever it arises. They know what a serious challenge this is, India-Pakistan coming up in this way." No wonder that Mr. Venkataraman, the ex-President of India and a lifelong Congressman, wrote a long letter to Mr. Vajpayee, heratily congratulating him and telling him how repeatedly the Congress was trying to go in for nuclear testing and under pressure it had to stop. I just quote the last line of his letter: "PMs are a dime a dozen and come and go unhonoured, unwept and unsung, but you will remain indelible in the nation's memory."

Sir, Pranab Da said in his very cool and balanced presentation that there was a consensus on keeping the option open. There was no such consensus. BJP has always been a major party and we were always for availing of this option and for not keeping it hanging in the mid air all the time. He said, "We have closed the option." We have not closed it. We have used it, we have availed of it.

Mr. Clinton said that the nuclear test of India was not Gandhian. For Mr. Clinton to lecture us on Gandhi is quite a joke. I am reminded of the devil who quoted the scripture. I don't know he is Gandhian, but, I am sure, he claims to be a Christian. How Christian was it for USA to drop those nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki? I think, it is time They stopped lecturing the world.

My good friend Kuldip is not here. He said many, many interesting things. He referred to Salman's withdrawal. I think, it was a very unfortunate statement. We have scores of Muslim Ambassadors.

Nobody has been recalled. Was it right for an hon. Member of this House to inject this kind of poison in a high level debate? He took objection to what Arun Shourie has said; "If this thing goes on, Pakistan will stop paying its debts." Our own Government also said within one week of the first nuclear explosion that if the foreign credits stop coming, we will stop repaying the old debts.

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN: Who said it?

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: It was said by the official spokesman. This is "The Times of India". I am coming to the date. It is within one week of this explosion. That is nothing unusual. The USA built its entire railway network with loans from England, France and Germany. They did not pay back a single penny. I am not saying that we should not pay back the money. But they don't play the game, if they don't play a ball, they cannot blame us for playing the same game. When Mr. Arun says that Pakistan is under great strain, it is a reality. It is like the competition between the USA and the USSR. They are unequal powers. When the less strong power tries to compete, it comes under acute strain. It is inevitable. We are very sorry that the USSR has broken. It kept competing blindly and the same is true of Pakistan. If it blindly keeps competing with India, it can be in serious trouble. I don't want it to be in serious trouble. I hope we will work together and we will develop our friendly relations. But nobody can escape this logic of competition between very unequal countries. We should not look into things only in Indo-Pakistan, Hindu-Muslim terms. We should look upon the Indian weaponisation and the Pakistan weaponisation as a dual challenge from South Asia to the western powers. I think we can become the best of friends, if we rise above the old dichotomy. Some friends have asked: Who have supported us? One hundred and thirty countries, of the Non-alignment Movement, refused to

toe the American line and they went along with us. Mr. Kuldip Nayyar said something also. I am sure it was in a lighter vein. He said that we went together to Pakistan and Mr. Malkani met the leader of POK and dined with him and got a present. He is welcome to his comments. We had been there. Many intellectuals, many Generals and many politicians from India had gone. They also keep coming here. There is no personal antipathy against anybody anywhere. Shall we go to Pakistan and say we refuse to meet you ABC? Shall we say, no, we will not talk to you? Shall we say that you are serving tea or snacks or whatever it is, we will not have it? हम रुठे हुए हैं तुम से, हम नहीं खाएंगे। There are the civilities of Public life. Is this the way? When they come here we also dine them, we embrace them. We also give them gifts. What is great about it? Interestingly I had got a note from a distinguished Member of this House. I cannot name the hon. Member because I don't have the permission. The note says. "Malkaniji, what was the gift?"

आप बड़े छुपे रूस्म हैं। सिर्फ मलकानी जी छुपे रूस्म नहीं हैं बल्कि हम सब पोलिटिशियन्स हैं, पब्लिक लाइफ में हैं और एम्पोज हैं, सब रूस्म हैं और छुपे नहीं, खुले रूस्म हैं। और क्या गिफ्ट दी थी, वह मैं कल आपके हाउस में आकर दिखाऊंगा।

I will be very happy to present it to the Chair tomorrow.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES):** Malkaniji, I don't think you mean it. Malkaniji, do you mean it; Will you bring it tomorrow to the House? I don't think that you will be permitted. There will be some objections.

**SHRI K.R. MALKANI:** Some of our friends are afraid of sanctions. We have a problem in this country. Some of us are afraid that if sanctions are applied to us, what will happen to us? We will be in serious trouble, etc. We must give up this fear. We must have *abhay*. We don't have to be afraid of our shadow. We

have seven billion dollars worth of to USA exports and we have seven billion dollars worth of imports from USA. If they stop our exports, we can stop theirs. What is the problem? What are we worried about? In our development, foreign money does not play even two per cent role. If you can finance the Development Budget to the tune of 98.5%, why can't we do it 100%, if it comes to that? What is the problem? We are all for exports, for earning foreign exchange. Nowadays, we earn 22 billion dollars from our exports. But we also earn 21 billion dollars through invisible imports, that is, the money remitted here by the Indians abroad. All right, export is to be increased. But we don't have to be obsessed with that. We can encourage people to go abroad. We should be free with issuing passports. We should consider giving dual citizenship to Indians living abroad. The Malaysian Prime Minister appealed to Malaysians abroad to send money and they are now flooded with it. What are we afraid of?

I am glad that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is sitting here. We have 20 billion dollars of foreign exchange. We keep it in America. Why? I see a danger in this. The experience of other countries who keep their foreign exchange abroad is not very happy. The Iranian Government had kept billions of dollars there. When the USA fell out with the Iranian Government, they froze those assets. The same thing has happened to Pakistan. Pakistan wanted to buy F-16 Fighters. They had paid the money. Now the great Americans have neither returned the money nor supplied the planes. Is it fair? We might have problems with Pakistan. But I think it is singularly unfair and unfortunate that the USA is neither returning the money nor giving the planes to Pakistan.

Two years back we had a fertilizer imports from Libya. We imported Libyan fertilizer because their tender was the lowest. Since we were keeping our money in America, we asked the American

Bank to make Payments to Libya part. They said, "Since America does not have relations with Libya, they will not transfer this money". The result was the following years, Libya refused to tender any quotation. We had to import more expensive fertilizer from USA.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): Please conclude.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: I am concluding. My last point is for the consideration of the Government. How is it that all the important international organisations are located in America? The UNO is in America. The International Monetary Fund is in America. The World Bank is in America. The WTO is in America. Why? I would earnestly urge the Government to consider this matter. We should make a move to see that at the most one of the international organisations may remain in USA. They don't even pay fee to UNO. But They keep dictating to the whole world. Let one of these organisations come to Asia. Let one of them go to Latin America and one of them go to Africa. This kind of hegemony must be stopped. If there is one country which can stop it, it is India. I hope we will strive in that direction. Thank you.

SHRI SANATAN BISI (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will concentrate on contradictions. I will not take much time.

The Defence Minister answered a question in this House on 27th May. The Pokhran tests were conducted on 11th and 13th May. Sir, you see the contradiction. I would read out the relevant paragraph. The Defence Minister said:

"In recent years there has been steady improvement in India-China relations. India believes that the five principles of peaceful coexistence, jointly

enunciated by India and China, are of continuing relevance to the development of inter-State relations. Government of India remains committed to the development of a good neighbourly and mutually beneficial relationship with China. It also remains committed to seek resolution of all the issues with China through mutual consultations and dialogues."

This is what the Defence Minister said. On 28th May he gave another answer in this House. He said, "The Chinese side have conveyed, with reference to the Raksha Mantri's statements pertaining to China's military capabilities and potential, that there has been improvement in India-China relations in recent years". In the next paragraph he says, "The two sides have agreed to build a constructive and cooperative relationship oriented towards the 21st century".

Sir, this is the document of the House. After these two answers, the Defence Minister again stated in the House, "China is a potential threat". Who is going to believe this Government? On 27th and 28th May the Defence Minister states that we are having good relations with China and all our relationship will be through the Panchsheel *niti* and we will abide by the Panchsheel *niti*.

The hon. Minister stated that our relations with China are very good and we are going towards the 21st century. Again the Defence Minister stated in this House on 28th May that China is a potential threat. Who is going to believe this Government? (*Interruptions*). The Pokhran tests were on 11th and 13th May. He made the statement on 27th and 28th May.

I am not talking of any outside statements. I am mentioning the statements made in this House. When Ministers are making such statements contradicting each other, who is going to believe this

Government? These are the documents of the House. These are the property of the House. I would like to know where the threat perception is. The second thing is that the Prime Minister has stated, in answer to a question in the Lok Sabha, through a written reply, the Government's eagerness to have a friendly, co-operative, good neighbourly and mutually beneficial realtions with China on the basis of Panch Sheel. This is the statement of the Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha. After going through all these things, I have an eagerness in my mind. And our hon. Prime Minister has given a letter to Bill Clinton of course without naming China and Pakistan. The Government had said, "China which was an aggressor in 1962 is having covert relations with Pakistan and Pakistan is creating problems in Jammu and Kashmir and Punjab." In the letter to Bill Clinton, the Prime Minister has stated that our nuclear tests are only for the purpose of security. Furthermore, he has stated that we are not going to use all these things against our own friends. What does it mean? Again they talk about the interference of third countries. By writing such a letter to Mr. Clinton, the Prime Minister has given an explanation to a third party. Why is it so? So, in Parliament you are saying something and you are writing letters to Mr. Clinton in a different manner. After seeing all these things, I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister seeking an explanation from him. I quoted from the Legal Maxims. He is not to be heard who alleges things contradictory to each other. I wrote: "You have written such a letter to Mr. Clinton but you had expressed something else in Parliament. Your Defence Minister is giving statements contrary to your views. In such circumstances, who is going to believe this Government?" You take the example of our former Prime Minister, Shri I.K. Gujral. When there was a discussion on CTBT, he said: "I am getting an inspiration from the House. We are capable of making Nuclear bombs. But we are not doing it as a

result of which America cannot say that we should sign the CTBT." That was the strength of the House. Why do we praise Mahatma Gandhi even now? It is because he followed what he preached. This Government is saying something and doing something else. If that be so, who will have faith in this Government? I don't have any faith in them. Whatever you are going to do in so far as foreign matters are concerned, there must be some consistency. You cannot have a dual policy. These are the grievances that I have. I would request that Gujral Doctrine should prevail. We should have good relations with our neighbours. Let us forget all about the past and let us start everything afresh with this principle in mind.

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN (Kerala): Respected Vice-Chairman, Sir, after listening to the eloquent speeches made by Mr. Arun Shourie and the arguments that he has raised, I am of the firm view that the Pokharan nuclear tests were a reckless misadventure. These tests were quite unwarranted. He had quoted from certain books written by the CII officers to prove that an avalanche or a mountain was going to fall on us. It was only an imaginary story. Sir, the question is, the time when the order was issued to conduct the test, was there any new development, was there any new threat perception which warranted such a thing? That is the question. That is to be answered. Sir, of course, between China and India, there are disputes, strained relationship. Once we had entered into an arm conflict or even a war. Same is the case with Pakistan. It is a fact that China is a country having nuclear weapons. It is not a new thing. For the last 30 years, they are having nuclear weapons. There was nothing new in that. What is new in the situation which warranted an action like this? That is the question which should be answered. According to me, there was no situation which warranted to order such a nuclear test.



Secondly, during the course of his speech, Mr. Malkani made a speech which is anti-imperialist, anti-American. I was quite surprised to hear it. I don't know whether the BJP as a whole or the Government itself will agree to those positions. Anyhow, the claim is that this is an anti-imperialist stand. Firstly, he said that Pakistan has developed nuclear weapons and India has developed nuclear weapons. Both these have become a challenge to the American monopoly. That is what he said. Hon. Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee wrote a letter to Mr. Clinton on 11th of May, on the very first day when the nuclear explosion was conducted. In that letter he has said, "The threat perception is from China. The threat perception is from Pakistan." Now, Mr. Malkani says that the development of these nuclear weapons is a challenge to America.

Let us look into another question. Sir, our country has been consistently taking a position not to sign the CTBT and we were taking such a position just because of the fact that it is an unequal treaty. It allows the P-5 countries to keep their monopoly of atomic weapons and it prohibits others to conduct tests as well as to make atomic bombs. Therefore, it is an unequal treatment. That is why the Indian Government refused to sign it and we were upholding that position till now. Does the Government uphold that position now? The Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister made a categorical statement that we are prepared to negotiate to agree to the CTBT provided one or two conditions laid down are amended. What are the conditions to be amended? India should also be included as the sixth nuclear power, then we will be satisfied. What does it mean? Do you stand by principles or do you stand on the basis of ourselves being accepted or recognised as a nuclear power? We have been taking a consistent stand on the basis of principles. Now, the question is the Government will have to make it clear as to what is its attitude towards

CTBT. Will they take a principled attitude which was being taken in the past? Will they come out as a champion for such a campaign agreeing to a justifiable principle? That is the question.

Then, there is another thing. Everything is talked against America and imperialism. But, what was being done on 11th May when this nuclear test was conducted? It was on the very same day the Prime Minister issued a circular to various Ministries asking the Ministries or directing the Ministries to immediately process and sanction all those applications from foreign countries which were there. Then on the basis of that, on 11th, 12th, 13th and up to 18th, several agreements had been entered into and now they are saying that they are against imperialists and against America. They are surrendering before them.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Sanatan Bisi) in the Chair]

Sir, after having done this and when the whole thing was recoined, they are retracting their steps and they are surrendering to imperialism, to America and to G-5 countries.

The next point is, we have got several neighbouring countries and China is also our neighbour. We have all along been taking the position of peaceful co-existence. Does this Government stand by this?

If you are concerned about the security of India by saying that security is one of the main thing required to have a better relationship, a friendly relationship with our neighbours, what is this Government doing? One of our best neighbours is declared as enemy number one. You declare that threat perception comes from there. I can understand if a person who is a China baiter all along making a statement but the Prime Minister Vajpayee writes a letter to Clinton saying that China is a threat. There is a threat from China. It is quite unfortunate. It is very dangerous. It will do much harm. My point is, does this Government stand

by the policy of peaceful co-existence? Does this Government wants to improve friendly relations with various countries, and in the neighbouring countries? The steps already taken are demolished: The best efforts made by the previous Governments to build friendly relations with neighbouring countries is vitiated. The achievements have been demolished. From the second day you have done that. What happened?

Therefore, what will they do with regard to these things? Then comes another question, what is their attitude towards NAM? You see, ours is a country which has taken initiative of building it. It is a combination of underdeveloped or developing countries which are comparatively newly liberated from colonialism. Would these countries, which have stood with us, will stand with us in many issues for which we are fighting in this new world? When a situation came, what was the attitude of the Government? They are approaching Clinton, the Government of America, they are approaching France, and Russia. What about the G-7 countries and P-5 countries? They are not making any earnest efforts to write to the Heads of States of those countries. They are not trying to contact those countries and make them understand our position. Why is this being done?

Then comes another question. Now, we are in a new situation. there is WTO. There is a tremendous pressure exerted on us through the WTO, and through other means like the IMF, the World Bank, to make a new world economic order wherein the U.S. will have its hegemony. The whole world economy will have to be changed according to their interest. That is being done by America. G-8 countries co-operate with them. How are we to face this if we are to face this? On the one side we will have to re-organise or regenerate the NAM and the unity of developing countries. That is number one. Number two, in the world, in so many regions now there are

regional economic blocks coming up. They are already built up now. What are we doing? Is this Government taking effective steps to build regional economic block here? There is SAARC, there is ASEAN. What is being attempted? SAARC meeting is going to take place in Colombo. There one of the matters seriously to be discussed really is to promote regional economic relations in trade, commerce and other things. But, I am afraid, it is not going to be the main subject there. Therefore, I do not want to take much time on it. The Government will have to reconsider it. They should not resort to weaponisation and they should try to mobilise the world opinion for bringing about a nuclear disarmament in the world.

They should try to improve relations with our neighbours. They should try to improve economic relations with all the countries in the neighbourhood and in the Asian region. We should stand for peace. With these words, I conclude.

DR. B.B. DUTTA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, today we are discussing the Foreign Policy. So, I do not like to commit myself to a second round of debate on nuclear tests though Foreign Policy is very much connected with them. But, I found that most of the time of the debate has been taken away by the speakers speaking on nuclear-related matters. Sir, for a country to conduct its Foreign Policy, it has to project itself as a power, a moral power, or a military power, or an economic power or a combination of some of them or all of these. So, there should be some kind of power. Otherwise, what is there to project through diplomacy? So, I am putting a question and not making suggestions. I would like to know, because the Minister of State for External Affairs is here, as to how we are projecting India in the international fora and what that projection is? I would like to know because it is for the New Government which has taken a momentous to put India into a new orbit to tell us to what should be its images.

After having nuclear tests done, do you think that you will confine yourself to project India only as a nuclear weapon State? Is it going to be the projection or do you have something else in your mind? I would like to know this. Sir, when there was a debate on nuclear test, I made my personal opinion very clear and I do not like to repeat it here. I am not going to say anything for or against it. It has already happened. Therefore, it is of no use talking about it. Now, the question is this, when we have gone in for certain things, we must have in our vision a range of formulations as to what we should do on the economic front, as to what we should do on weaponisation front and as to how to deal with certain countries who were our friends but who have gone against us now. How do you bring them back in the face of some other major countries with persistent animosity towards our interests and our well being mobilising everything against us. Who are the new friends we are going to get on our side? Now this kind of a thing requires for the External Affairs Ministry some kind of research. You must be in possession of facts. You have competent people to analyse these facts. You must see that out of these analyses, proper formulations are coming with short, medium and long-term views. You must have what is called strategic policy planning, once they are in place, the government must act upon them. I remember when Shri Gujral was the Prime Minister, and held the External Affairs portfolio with him, he in response to one of my queries admitted that the Ministry of External Affairs had no operational research at all. I would like to know whether the operational research is now an on-going thing or not because the Ministry of External Affairs of late has rotten a lot. Its functioning needs to be critically analysed because it has to improve to meet the immediate challenges we face. Once upon a time it was a prestigious Ministry. But, it is not so today. I am not blaming only the present Government. The rot started

much earlier. Therefore, we have to see how our embassies are working and how we identify the potential and actual diplomats and how do we mobilise them and despatch them to all corners of the world to be in touch with the right type of people and the powers so that a proper lobbying goes on in all directions. To be very frank, do not know as to what is happening to all these things. I would like to know that. Sir, on one thing I would like to caution the Government. The Kashmir dispute is a dispute strictly confined within India. We were a united India and through partition we got Independence. The Kashmir dispute is connected with that story. Nuclear tests should not have the effect of distorting that story through any nuclear-related speech or action of any one who has any thing to do with the present government.

The Kashmir issue cannot be internationalised and it can not become a part of our foreign policy? The tendency to internationalise which we notice today is very disturbing. The Government must go all out to ensure that it is a bi-lateral issue between India and Pakistan and it shall remain so. There are powers, there are international players who are trying in whatever garb they can to jump into the arena to become a third party. You do not know how and when in this subcontinent any area can become a third party's conquest — neither of Pakistan's nor of India's. This is something about which we must be very cautious and the Hon'ble External Affairs minister must ensure that we do not fall in to trap.

Sir, one last comment because there is no time. I think, there are only three or four minutes left for me. In foreign policy, we should not be obsessed only with the biggest powers. We must equally be attentive and careful with our smallest neighbour smallest friends. One such smallest neighbour is Bhutan. Now, you will find, when something is happening on the other side of the Brahmaputra Valley in Asam, insurgents sneak into

Bhutan, and a problem is created. You had put forth a proposal, let us have joint operations to cleanse all insurgents out of Bhutan. The Government of Bhutan had rejected it on another ground. They had other conditions to put before you. Now, freedom movement ie movement for democracy is going on inside Bhutan. They are demanding democracy. India need not be embroiled in that type of internal affairs of Bhutan. We must make it very clear that we do not like to intrude into the sovereignty of small neighbours. It should be made very clear so that we are not misunderstood. But, I tell you, I do not like to elaborate much. What has happened since 1996-97. The earlier Government was also involved and again we are creating chaos and confusion in our relationship with Bhutan and for which one day you will have to pay a heavy penalty. You will be misunderstood and face the attacks of the insurgents on the one side, the fighters, for democracy on the other and the wrath of the royal family in Bhutan and the international lobby making opportunistic exercises under the influence of super powers from yet another angle. Everything becomes a mess. We have already chaos in the North-East. I am just giving one example. I think, in conducting foreign policy, we should be careful about these things. By giving only concessions, you gain nothing. You have to give concessions so that it goes in the right direction. It can develop the strength of my neighbour, they also prosper and they also get a more peaceful atmosphere around them. Those concessions are good. But, there are other concessions. When a very wrong action is taken by a small neighbour, you condone it, because you think otherwise, it will spoil our relationship. This kind of shutting down of our eyes to certain things and endangering certain trends which are very disturbing for the future development is also not good. These are the things we are to be watchful about in our relationship with Myanmar and with Bangladesh. Forget about China because it is a big power. In our foreign policy, I, for one, would like

to say that we should not try want to be very clever where plain speaking is called for. We have to speak out our interests, India's interests. We have got one own precious set of values. We have got a heritage to protect and when we speak about foreign policy, we should be very forthright to guard those values and heritage we started in that tradition since Nehru's days. But now we are behaving in such a manner that we can be easily dubbed as the most mischievous and hence unappreciated. Sir, I would just read out a quotation of Mr. Bill Clinton with whom, of late, we are having a lot of problems as to what he has stated about his country's foreign policy. The U.S. President, Mr. Bill Clinton, in his State of the Union address on January 23, 1996 mentioned, I quote, "Spread of weapons of mass destruction and aggression by rogue States are amongst the major challenges which the U.S. faced in the spheres of foreign policy and security." He went on to say, "We cannot be everywhere, we cannot do everything but where our interests and values are at stake, we can make a difference. America must lead. We must not be isolationists or the world's policemen, but we can be its best peacemaker by keeping our military strong, by using diplomacy where we can and force where we must..." — "I repeat, "force where we must" — "...and by working with others to share the risk in the cause of our efforts. America is making a difference for people here and the world around."

Sir, a country of India's size, a country of India's heritage, has got an automatic responsibility towards its neighbours. A weak India — economically weak, militarily weak, diplomatically weak — is a problem for small neighbours, even if they are our friends. They want to look forward to India as a resurgent India, a lot of help for their development as India which can also give them a lot of protection, that they badly need. So, when we formulate our foreign policy, I think we should be equally blunt, we should be equally straightforward to say that we

must keep our values because our values are being threatend from North-East from North West from this quarters and from that quarters. We are also endangered. We have lot of threats around us. Thank you.

**SHRI M. SANKARALINGAM** (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to say a few words on the foreign policy of our great nation. The major focus-of our foreign policy, all these years, has been on creating an atmosphere of trust and cooperation. Broadly, if we look at the foreign policy of our country, we can divide it into two periods, that is, the period of Nehruji's foreign policy and the post-Nehruji period. If we look into the matter deeply, during Nehruji's period the emphasis was on Cold War rejection, quest for world peace, nuclear disarmament, Asian unity, opposition to military pacts, opposition to power politics, on doctrines advancing the cause of Non-Alignment, Third World development, and international cooperation. In the post-Nehruvian period, if you analyse it very carefully, the thrust was on regional security and on bringing South Asia into serious consideration. India had to shape itself as the South Asian leader and it had to develop not only itself, but also the South Asian countries so as to provide a strong economic basis to itself and its allies in South Asia. All these things were continuing since our independence. Now, within the framework of SAARC, we are able to achieve to a great extent the development of our country as well as collectively of our neighbours. The ninth SAARC summit held in Male in May, 1997 took some landmark decisions which will give significant impetus to strengthening cooperation among the countries of South Asia. The significant development was the decision to speed up trade liberalisation and advance the time-frame for achieving South Asian Free-Trade-Area by the year 2001.

To strengthen our relations with neighbours in the Asia Pacific Gulf, on the West Asia, North-Africa, North-West

and Central Asia, necessary steps had been taken effectively in time. The role played by our great nation in the Indian Ocean Rim association for regional role proved to be a major initiative in this direction. There are high level contacts with the United States. The former Prime Minister talked to President Clinton in New York. In September 1977, a broad-based official level dialogue re-activated our peace mission. Steps were also taken to consolidate progress in our relations with Russia and other western countries. Our close friendly relations with Nepal further developed to our mutual advantage. Our former Prime Minister's visit to Nepal in June 1977, strengthened our relations with Nepal. And the Mahakali Treaty in June 1977 added new dimensions to our relations.

Our relations with Bangladesh consolidated to a great extent the water sharing arrangements. Established in 1996 by a treaty of sharing the Ganga waters was implemented in the spirit of mutual understanding. India-China relations witnessed steady progress. While maintaining our commitment to work with China to develop peaceful cooperative relations, we also made note of our continuing concern about the Chinese assistance to Pakistan. We failed to insist on this. In the nuclear and missile fields as well as China's position on certain issues had a bearing on India's sovereignty, territorial integrity and security. This is happening periodically. At a time when we had to express, we never failed to express. So, it is not a sudden development against these things. Much has been said about our nuclear explosion of May 11 and 13. If we watch the earlier period, this Government assumed power only 70 days before the explosion. Within a period of 70 days, they cannot explode these things. It is a continuous process. All the Prime Ministers have developed the nuclear technology in their security field and it is a continuous process. Whatever be the nature of explosion, it is a *fait accompli*. We need not go through it. Whether it is correct, whether it is an aggressive

act, that aspect we need not go into. It has taken place. Now the Government's position is what the reaction will be. What have we to do to rectify it? I am very alert to the Vice-Chairman. Whenever I see him, he shows the time.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI):** Airedy your eight minutes are over.

**SHRI M. SANKARALINGAM:** Sir, I have to represent my party; so, I should be given two or three minutes more. There is a steady expansion of relations with all other countries. This explosion only shows our might and our capability to rise to the occasion. More than once our Prime Minister has said, "We won't resort to nuclear weapons as a first use." We have said that we won't use it first. At the same time, we have said that we won't fail to retaliate, if necessary. That is understood.

Sir, this is a mighty country. Many Members have expressed concern about the economic situation. It is said that a large number of people are living below the poverty line. That is true. But even if we are struggling, we won't open our doors to others. Even if we have to face starvation, we won't change our stand. The whole country stands as one man in this. We will face all these things, as one country.

I would like to remind this august House about what happened in 1971 when Pakistan committed an aggression on us. I do remember how our present Chief Minister Dr. Kalaignar Karunanidhi who was the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu at that time also addressed the masses and how he rallied the people of Tamil Nadu behind the whole country. He did a strenuous propaganda and gave full backing to the Central Government. If I remember correctly, at that time, we contributed, our State Government contributed, Rs. 8 crores, besides essential items worth more than Rs. 10 crores. We did it at that time.

Today also, if the occasion demands, all the States, all our people, irrespective of their differences, would rally behind the Government. While it should be so, we are always ready for negotiations. We want to have friendly relations with our neighbours. We do not want to antagonise our neighbours. We are not for that.

Our hon. Prime Minister, Shri Vajpayee, was the Foreign Minister in the post Emergency era, immediately after the second Independence struggle. He had a chance at that time to articulate our foreign policy among the different countries in the world. He is now the Prime Minister. He would have the chance to meet many leaders, particularly, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, during the SAARC Summit scheduled to be held at Colombo towards the end of this month. The feelings of the people of India would be reflected in his talks there. We stand as one nation, irrespective of parties, irrespective of the fact as to who holds the position as Prime Minister. This message must be conveyed by him to the Prime Minister of Pakistan as well as the other leaders.

As you know, Economic Banks sanctions have been imposed on us. We have to find ways and means as to how we can overcome the effect of these actions. It is unfortunate that in spite of the repeated statements by our hon. Prime Minister, America had imposed economic sanctions on us. But I would say that we should take the challenge in the right spirit. It must be taken as a blessing in disguise and we should face this challenge. We should stand united and show our power to the world.

Thank You

**SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu):** Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to take part in the discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs.

We conducted nuclear tests at Pokhran on the 11th and 13th May. Some Members from the Opposition referred to the position before the nuclear tests and compared it with the position after the nuclear tests. After the nuclear tests by India, Pakistan also conducted nuclear tests. Some of the political parties—I do not say 'all political parties'—are criticising our foreign policy. But Sir, we have good relations with Pakistan, Sri Lanka and China. But I put an Unstarred Question on the 27th of May, whether the Government had any evidence of Pakistan funding insurgency in India. The reply was that the recent happenings in Tamil Nadu, including the serial bomb blasts were the results of insurgency by Pakistan. I want to know whether Pakistan was funding the insurgency before the tests. Why? What is the reason for this even though we have good relations with Pakistan? What is its intention? After the Pokhran tests, immediately after that, tests were conducted in Pakistan. We have an international security problem.

My next point is that we have good relations with Sri Lanka. Mrs. Chandrika, after becoming Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, made a statement in the Srilankan Parliament and other places that she wanted to have peace with the Tamil people. But till today she has not settled that problem.

As far as China is concerned, we have good relations with it.

My point is whether Pakistan has any evil intentions against India. Our political parties have criticised the ruling party on the Pokhran tests. What was the reason? I am not able to understand it. We have the Kashmir issue, the issue of Tamilians in Sri Lanka and also the problem of Indian fishermen from our own State. We have not solved this problem till today. The Srilankan Navy is killing Indian fishermen everyday. Is this due to Pokhran? This is a long chain process. I urge the Government kindly to settle this issue.

My second point is that as far as our State is concerned, Pakistan is funding the insurgency in Tamil Nadu, particularly in Coimbatore. What is the reason? This is the way in which Pakistan is behaving with this country. It is not because of the Pokhran tests. What is the result of Pakistan's funding the insurgency? What is the reason? They are threatening India. We are not able to understand this. Our learned Members are saying that we have good relations with Pakistan. Yes, we have good relations with Pakistan. Even though we have good relations with Pakistan, we have a lot of problems with it because everyday in our State we are facing the problem of the insurgency being funded by Pakistan.

What is our country's position after the Pokhran tests economically and culturally? Is there an loss to India after the Pokhran tests? I cannot understand this. What is the policy of India?

We have good relations with countries throughout the world. But we should not entertain anybody in our country. If we are going to open our doors, we will have a problem.

Sir, I will finish soon.

All these problems are not due to the Pokhran tests. They are a long chain process. How are we going to prevent the ISI activities in India? We have interaction with the Pakistani people. We have interaction with the Chinese people. Then, we have interaction with the Srilankan people. When the Government is having interaction with these three countries, we can solve the problems.

First of all, my request is that our Tamil fishermen should be given good security because this is a major problem of our State.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): Yes, yes, you have said that already.

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: I am concluding now.

*Working of the*

My point is that, as far as India is concerned, nothing will happen after the Pokhran tests. Our problems are continuous. How are we going to settle them?

As far as the Budget is concerned, more than Rs. 60 crores has been allotted. Most probably, the previous Government allotted Rs. 12 crores. I urge the Government to take necessary steps to solve the issue of Tamilians in Sri Lanka.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa): Sir, in this debate we are supposed to speak on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs, but right from the afternoon we have seen Member after Member speaking on the nuclear explosions, because they found nuclear explosions which India conducted on May 11 and 13, has become synonymous with the foreign policy of this country.

With the post cold war and post disintegration of USSR era and with the coming about of liberalisation and globalisation, economic diplomacy has taken a front seat in the foreign mission of any country. We have seen that way back in 1996, when six officials from the External Affairs Ministry were sent abroad by the then Government to lobby for the temporary seat for India at the United Nations Security Council, there were no takers. We have seen how even the third world countries, the NAM countries, sided with Japan instead of India. Therefore, what I am saying is that our diplomatic missions should be geared up to play a major role in economic diplomacy. I do not think our officials, who are trained in the Indian Foreign Service, are capable of doing so. Unless our economic foundation is strong, no third world country will come to us, because we do not have anything positive to offer to them. The old slogan of anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism and anti-racism are outdated now. The last vestiges of colonial pocket of Macao will be transferred to China next year by the Portuguese. So, I do not think we have any relevance by shouting the old slogans. I do not think these countries can be fooled any longer, as

*Affairs*

we, political parties in our country fool the people during elections. I hope the Government will take note of it and see that our missions abroad are geared up to face this economic challenge. The other day also I put a question to the hon. Minister whether we have geared up to face the task of campaigns against India vis-a-vis nuclear tests. We have not done anything wrong. We have not violated any law. Nor have we violated the NPT or CTBT, because we are not signatory to it. India is a sovereign country. So, I would like to know whether the Government has geared up the foreign missions to train and educate the Indians abroad. When the nuclear explosions were conducted, NRIs were the happiest people we have seen internationally. They were the people who came forward and pledged support to India economically, because of the imposition of sanctions. But, we have also seen that in 90s all the foreign remittances, which were there in the coffers of the Government of India were withdrawn. I would also like to know whether the Government will see that the foreign missions are trained and geared up to build a bridge between our Indian communities in those foreign countries, whenever there is a campaign, because we are only employing the lobbies. It has been mentioned in the House that we have four lobby firms at the Capitol Hill. What is the purpose of our Missions abroad? Have we geared them up to meet the challenge?

Secondly, when we talk of foreign policy, we come to a matter, the matter of nuclear explosions, which should have been dealt with by the Defence Ministry in this country. We had the nuclear explosions on May 18 in 1974. We had said at that time that explosion was detonated for peaceful purposes. The then Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, did offer her capability even to our neighbour, Pakistan. Again, we have conducted nuclear explosions on May 11 and May 13, 1998. That was done with an euphoria in this country. So, I think it is



not the prerogative of any political party or any Government. If any decision is to be taken on the nuclear issue, it should be the prerogative of the scientific community and the military community. The PMO should have no role to play in it. It was pathetic how the BJP took credit for it and how they wanted to have celebrations. You know that they have made it a prestige issue. I don't want to go into those details because this Government till date has not replied why the nuclear explosion was done at that time. There is no reply from the Government. Was it because this Government was in turmoil? Was it because of internal contradictions within coalition Government? Was it done to divert the attention of the people? If that was the intention, then, I think it is not a proper thing. The Government should not have exercised this nuclear option because some years back Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said that we should have no reason to block the option of future generations. So, the option was open before us. The option belonged to the people of this country, not to any political party. We did not take credit for the nuclear explosion in 1974. We had offered it to the country. As Mr. Malkani said—I am very glad that he said so—this country, the Third World countries should be proud of it. India and Pakistan have to be proud of it. If anything good happened in this country for the last 50 years, it is this nuclear explosion which we have done. It is a good sign for the Asian countries to come together, for China, India and even Iran to come together and face the imperialism and high handedness of the Western power.

I don't think that there should be a need for war hysteria. It was done by certain Ministers of this Government. For example, the Defence Minister, who said that the main enemy is China, the main threat is from China. So, way back, when we did not have the fuel for the Tarapur atomic power plant, the fuel came from China. Though we had a Memorandum of Understanding with France to supply

the fuel, they did not supply us the fuel under pressure from America. I think we should not forget it.

I am not for supporting any country against the interests of our country. But the question is that in spite of having the biggest working democracy in the world, in spite of having the largest working democracy in the world, if we are just going to lower ourselves, if we are not going to maintain that standard and behave as a matured nation, if we are going to give war cries and shout hysterically, I don't think we are doing any service to the scientists of this country, military intelligence of this country. It is a nuclear option. It is a deterrent. It is not to be used. It has not been used for the last 50 years after the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

As far as conventional weapons are concerned, India was superior to Pakistan. After the 1971 war there was no misadventure. But by exercising our nuclear option, we have done one thing. We have brought Pakistan on par with India. We have been brought on par with Pakistan, on the same footing. I don't blame it. It was also mentioned here. It is a fact that the CTBT whether we sign it or not will come into force from the next year. But what we are concerned with is the timing of it and the motive behind it, whether it was done to take a political mileage, whether it was done because there was an internal contradiction within the coalition Government.

I would request the External Affairs Minister to see that our missions are upgraded with proper additional officers posted there from our Revenue Department and see that these missions are used for economic diplomacy. Thank you.

श्री संजय निरुपम (महाराष्ट्र): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज हम विदेश मंत्रालय के काम-काज पर चर्चा करने के लिए इस सदन में बैठे हुए हैं। दुर्भाग्य से चर्चा का ज्यादा हिस्सा पोखरण पर चला गया है। मैं पोखरण पर ज्यादा नहीं बोलना चाहता हूँ लेकिन

औपचारिकता के कारण दो-तीन बातें ही रखना चाहेंगे। पोखरण में 11 और 13 मई को जो नाभिकीय परीक्षण हुआ, उस परीक्षण का हम समर्थन करते हैं और उस परीक्षण के लिए प्रधानमंत्री श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी का अभिनन्दन करते हैं। हमारा मानना है कि शांति की बात बगैर अपने आप को ताकतवर रखे नहीं की जा सकती है। दिनकर जी ने एक कविता लिखी थी। उस कविता की आखिरी पंक्ति मुझे याद है। उस कविता की आखिरी पंक्ति मैं यहां पर सुनाना चाहता हूं।

"क्षमा शोभती उस भुजंग को जिसके पास गरल हो"

इसका मतलब मैं आप को बता दूँ कि भुजंग का मतलब होता है सर्प। जिस सर्प के पास विष नहीं होता वह क्षमा करे या न करे कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता। अगर हम अंतरराष्ट्रीय शांति और सद्भाव की बात कर रहे हैं तो अगर हम ताकतवर नहीं हैं, हम ताकत-हीन हैं, हमारे पास शक्ति नहीं है तो शांति और सद्भाव का कोई मतलब नहीं है। इसलिए हम सबसे पहले उस पोखरण के परीक्षण का अभिनन्दन करते हैं। महोदय, पोखरण परीक्षण के बाद पश्चिमी देशों की तरफ से हमारे ऊपर आर्थिक प्रतिबंध लगाए गए, यह तो एन्टीसिपेटेड था और प्रतिबंध लगाए भी गए। उन आर्थिक प्रतिबंधों का जवाब देने की कोशिश भी की गई। लेकिन मेरा ऐसा मानना है कि यह कोशिश बहुत अच्छी नहीं रही। हमने उस संकट का बहुत अच्छे ढंग से जवाब नहीं दिया। अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति बिल क्लिंटन ने, जो लोन हमारे पास आते थे उनको जो सस्पेंड किया, उसका जवाब अच्छे ढंग से दिया जाना चाहिए था। हालांकि कोशिश की जा रही है और आज भी जसवंत सिंह जी फ्रैंकफर्ट में टालबोट से बात कर रहे हैं। लेकिन मेरा मानना है कि इस सैंक्शंस का जवाब देने के लिए हमें और भी हथियारों का इस्तेमाल करना चाहिए था। हथियारों से मेरा मतलब नाभिकीय हथियारों से न लगाया जाए। अमेरिका के कई बैंक आज हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत बड़े पैमाने पर बिजनेस कर रहे हैं। सिटी बैंक है, अमेरिकन बैंक है, स्टैंडर्ड चार्टर्ड बैंक है, इन बैंकों का व्यवसाय हिन्दुस्तान में तकरीबन 3 हजार करोड़ रुपए से ऊपर है। पेप्सी और कोला तो बहुत छोटी बातें हैं। अमेरिका का इतना बड़ा व्यापारिक हित हमसे जुड़ा हुआ है। जब उन्होंने हमारे ऊपर सैंक्शन लगाई तो हम उसका विरोध यह कह कर सकते थे कि अगर आपने सैंक्शन वापस नहीं ली तो यहां जो आपके व्यापारिक हित जुड़े हुए हैं हम उन हितों को तोड़ देंगे, उन संबंधों को तोड़ देंगे। अगर हम ऐसा करते तो शायद कहीं न कहीं अमेरिकी राष्ट्रपति, अमेरिकी प्रशासन दबाव में आकर, जिन सैंक्शनों की उसने घोषणा

की थी जिसे उसने एक महीने बाद लागू भी कर दिया, वे दबाव में आकर इन सैंक्शंस को नहीं लगा सकते थे। महोदय, मेरा कहना है कि हिन्दुस्तान एशिया में ही नहीं पूरी दुनिया के बड़े बाजारों में से एक है। पश्चिमी देशों की बहुत सारी कंपनियां हैं, मल्टीनेशनल कंपनियां हैं, बहु-राष्ट्रीय कंपनियां हैं जिनके व्यापारिक हित हमारे देश से जुड़े हुए हैं। ये जो मल्टीनेशनल कंपनियां हैं अगर उनके हितों पर चोट की गई होती तो शायद वह अमेरिकी प्रशासन पर दबाव डालकर हमारे ऊपर लगे सैंक्शंस को लागू करने से रोक सकते थे। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से ऐसा किया नहीं गया।

महोदय, यहां पर फारेन पालिसी की बात हो रही है, विदेश मंत्रालय के कामकाज पर चर्चा हो रही है। यहां पर चाइना के संदर्भ में बात उठी और उसमें यह भी बात निकली कि रक्षा मंत्री महोदय ने एक बार कहा कि चाइना हमारे देश का नंबर एक शत्रु है। लेकिन उसके बाद संभवतया किन्हीं कारणों से उन्हें अपनी बात वापस लेनी पड़ी। महोदय, मैं इस बात का विरोध करता हूँ कि वह हमारा दुश्मन है। वह नम्बर एक रहेगा या नहीं रहेगा यह मुझे पता नहीं। लेकिन चीन के साथ रिश्ते बनाने में हमें अपनी शर्तों को ज्यादा महत्व देना चाहिए। आप सब लोग मेरे से विरुद्ध हैं, ज्यादा अनुभवी लोग हैं। लेकिन जितना मैंने पढ़ा है उस हिसाब से नेहरू जी ने अपनी पूरी जिंदगी में चाइना के प्रति बहुत मोह रखा, उस से उनको बहुत मुहब्बत थी। लेकिन उनको चाइना ने बड़ा धोखा भी दिया। सुरक्षा परिषद में सदस्यता का जो प्रश्न है, स्थायी सदस्यता का प्रश्न, इस प्रश्न को लेकर हम बहुत दिनों से लड़ रहे हैं। बहुत दिनों से एक तरफ से हम लाबिंग कर रहे हैं। मेरे पास एक दस्तावेज है उसको मैं सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। 1955 में हमें पश्चिमी देशों द्वारा आफर किया गया, उन्होंने भारत के सामने पेशकश की कि आप सुरक्षा परिषद का सदस्य बनिए। लेकिन नेहरू जी ने उस पेशकश को ठुकरा दिया। जब 1955 में सन फ्रांसिसको से वे लौटे तो उन्होंने यहां के सारे मुख्य मंत्रियों को पत्र लिखा। उस पत्र में उन्होंने लिखा था कि:

"अनौपचारिक रूप से ऐसा आश्वासन दिया गया कि चीन को संयुक्त राष्ट्र में ले लिया जाएगा परन्तु सुरक्षा परिषद में नहीं। इसके स्थान पर भारत को सुरक्षा परिषद में आने के लिए कहा गया। हम निश्चय ही यह स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते थे क्योंकि इसका मतलब होता कि हम चीन के साथ नहीं हैं। और फिर सुरक्षा परिषद

में चीन जैसे महान देश का न होना एक अनुचित बात भी है। इसलिए हमने यह स्पष्ट कर दिया कि हम इस प्रस्ताव से सहमत नहीं हो सकते। हम एक कदम और आगे गए और कहा कि भारत इस क्षण सुरक्षा परिषद् में जाने के लिए इच्छुक नहीं है चाहे एक महान देश होने के नाते इसे उसमें होना चाहिए। पहली बात यह है कि चीन को उसका उचित स्थान मिले। तब भारत के बारे में अलग से विचार किया जा सकता है।"

नेहरू जी को चीन से इतना प्रेम था और उसी चीन ने हमारे साथ क्या किया? हम सभी जानते हैं 1962 में जो हुआ। मैं अभी हाल ही की बात बता रहा हूँ। एक पुस्तक में एक रेफ्रेंस है। यह पुस्तक मेरे पास है। इस पुस्तक में बताया गया है कि चीन जो एक वोटोघारी सदस्य है, क्या भारत को सुरक्षा परिषद् का स्थायी सदस्य बनाने का समर्थन करेगा? इसका जवाब दिल्ली स्थित चीनी राजदूत पेई युआन इंग के बयान में पाया जा सकता है। इंग के अनुसार चीन सुरक्षा परिषद् के विस्तार का समर्थन तो करता है परन्तु इसमें सावधानी बरती जानी चाहिए कि विश्व के उत्तर और दक्षिण में तथा विभिन्न क्षेत्रों के प्रतिनिधित्व का ध्यान रखा जाए सुरक्षा परिषद् में। कूटनीतिक भाषा में यदि कहा जाए तो इस घुमावदार भाषा का तात्पर्य यह है कि सुरक्षा परिषद् में एशिया विशेषकर दक्षिण एशिया के प्रतिनिधि के रूप में चीन तो पहले से मौजूद है अतः पहले अफ्रीका, आस्ट्रेलिया और दक्षिण अमरीका का प्रतिनिधित्व होना चाहिए। यह है सुरक्षा परिषद् के संदर्भ में जो हमने गलती उस समय की, हमारे महान प्रधानमंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी ने गलती की, उस गलती की आज हमें सजा भोगनी पड़ रही है। महोदय, चीन के संबंध में नेहरू जी ने क्या कहा, मैं बताना चाहता हूँ। जार्ज फर्नांडिस ने जो कहा उस पर बहुत हंगामा हुआ लेकिन नेहरू जी का भाषण मैं पढ़ रहा था तो मुझे उसमें एक जानकारी मिली। यह भाषण लोक सभा में दिया गया था 8 नवम्बर, 1962 को जबकि तत्कालीन अक्टूबर, 1962 में चीन ने हम पर अटैक किया था। तब नेहरू जी ने लोकसभा में कहा था—

"चीन एक बिलकुल गैरजिम्मेदार देश है और वह किसी भी झगड़े को निबटाने के लिए लड़ाई में विश्वास करता है, शांति से उसे कोई लगाव नहीं है। मैं कुछ लोगों की तरह कम्युनिज्म के समर्थन या कम्युनिज्म के विरोध के प्रश्न में नहीं

पड़ता। मेरे विचार में यह इस अथवा अन्य किसी भी मामले में कोई बड़ा सवाल नहीं है। बड़ा सवाल यह है कि एक विस्तारवादी और साम्राज्यवादी देश जान-बूझ कर हमारे देश पर हमला कर रहा है।"

यह हमले के समय की पृष्ठभूमि में है। उसके बाद से चीन ने लगातार जो किया है, वह हम सब जानते हैं। आज भी बकायदा उसकी रिपोर्ट आई कि पाकिस्तान ने जो नाभिकीय परीक्षण किया, उसमें सब से ज्यादा योगदान चीन का है। मैं दो तीन मिनट में समाप्त कर रहा हूँ। उस चीन के साथ जब हमें अपने संबंध सुधारने हैं तो हमें अपनी शर्तों पर सुधारने चाहिए। सिर्फ चेतावनी देना या धमकी देना या इस दिवास्वप्न में रहना चीन के साथ हमारे संबंध सुधार जाएंगे या व्यापारिक रिश्ते डवलप हो जाएंगे, मेरे ख्याल में इस दिवास्वप्न में रहने की जरूरत नहीं है। चीन की नीयत खराब रही है। आज भी उसकी नीयत खराब है। चीन पर हमें आंख मूंद कर या आंख बंद कर विश्वास नहीं करना चाहिए।

महोदय, चीन के बाद पाकिस्तान से जुड़े हुए प्रश्न रहे हैं। पाकिस्तान का यहां पर बहुत जिक्र हुआ। सचमुच में भारत की विदेश नीति का यही ध्रुव रहा है पाकिस्तान। पिछले 50 सालों से हम पाकिस्तान से निबटने, जुझने और उलझने में व्यस्त रहे हैं। महोदय, पाकिस्तान से हमारा संबंध अच्छा है, पाकिस्तान से हम को अपना संबंध सुधारना चाहिये, यह बात करना ही बेमानी है। आज पाकिस्तान ने क्या किया है। हमारे देश में कश्मीर से ले कर केरल तक आई० एस० आई० ने अपना नेटवर्क फैला रखा है। कोई ऐसा राज्य नहीं है जहां आई० एस० आई० की कांसपिरेसी से कोई बम बलास्ट न हुआ हो या कोई हिन्दुस्तानी नागरिक मारा नहीं गया हो। हमारी मुंबई में जितना बड़ा बम बलास्ट हुआ है, वह एक इतिहास है और इतिहास का एक पन्ना है। बम बलास्ट का जो मेन एक्ज्यूज था, मुख्य आरोपी था उस आरोपी को पाकिस्तान ने आज कराची में शरण दे रखी है। पाकिस्तान के बारे में जब यहां सदन में या सदन के बाहर से उसके पक्ष में सहानुभूति में लोग कुछ बात करते हैं तो मुझे बहुत दुख होता है, अफसोस होता है। कम से कम पाकिस्तान के बारे में हमारे बीच में असहमति नहीं होनी चाहिए, कम से कम पाकिस्तान के बारे में यह सोच नहीं डवलप करनी चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान हमारा एक दोस्त है। वह हमारा कभी दोस्त नहीं हो सकता है। आज कश्मीर का प्रश्न उठा। जैसे आज हमारे नैयर साहब बोल रहे थे। मुझे इस बात का

दुख हुआ जब उन्होंने आज़ाद काश्मीर शब्द का प्रयोग किया, मैंने इस पर ऑब्जेक्शन लिया क्योंकि उन्होंने आज़ाद काश्मीर कह दिया। आज़ाद काश्मीर हम कभी नहीं कह सकते। हमारे डिफेंस डिपार्टमेंट का जो अपना एक कोनोटेनशन है उसमें उसको पाकिस्तान आक्रूपाइड काश्मीर कहा जाता है और वह एक सच है। काश्मीर कभी गुलाम नहीं रहा। काश्मीर हिंदुस्तान का हिस्सा है। पाकिस्तान का यह नज़रिया है कि काश्मीर गुलाम है हिंदुस्तान में और उस काश्मीर को उन्होंने आज़ाद कराया है। मेरा मानना है कि काश्मीर के प्रश्न पर जब चर्चा हो, जैसा कि यहां पर माननीय सदस्यों का मुझाव आया तो उस चर्चा में पहला प्रश्न पाकिस्तान आक्रूपाइड काश्मीर हो। उसके साथ साथ जब चाइना के प्रश्न पर चर्चा हो तो सबसे पहले वह जो उन्होंने हमारी जमीन हड़प ली है, 50 हजार स्क्वायर मील के आस पास वह जमीन है, शायद मैं कम बोल रहा हूँ, इससे बड़ा आंकड़ा है—वह जो जमीन, जो हमारा भूखण्ड पाकिस्तान और चीन ने हड़प कर रखा है, अपने कब्जे में कर रखा है पहले उसको छुड़ाने की उसको वापस लेने की बात की जानी चाहिए।

काश्मीर के अंतर्राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात होती है। काश्मीर का अंतर्राष्ट्रीयकरण नेहरू जी ने किया। हमने नहीं किया। वाजपेयी जी ने कभी नहीं किया काश्मीर का अंतर्राष्ट्रीयकरण जो आज वाजपेयी जी और उनके सहयोगी दलों पर आरोप लगाया जा रहा है। उन्होंने कहा कि यू एन ओ को इसमें इंटरफेयर करने दीजिए। उन्होंने ज़नमत संप्रह की बात स्वीकार की थी। यह एक बहुत बड़ी भूल थी। उस भूल को आज तक हम सुधार नहीं पाए हैं। हम सिर्फ डिफेंस करते रह जाते हैं जबकि पाकिस्तान लगातार हमारे ऊपर आफेंस करता जा रहा है। हमारे ऊपर हमला करता जा रहा है। युद्ध की बात करता है। युद्ध का उसने कोई ऐलान नहीं किया है लेकिन पाकिस्तान अधोषित तौर पर हिंदुस्तान से युद्ध कर रहा है, हिंदुस्तान से युद्ध लड़ रहा है। पाकिस्तान और हिंदुस्तान की सरहदों पर महोदय जो हो रहा है आज वह एकदम युद्ध है और उस युद्ध के खिलाफ मैं बार-बार सुन रहा हूँ कि सिर्फ चेतावनी दे दी जानी चाहिए। मुझे लगता है कि उस युद्ध के खिलाफ सिर्फ चेतावनी नहीं दी जानी चाहिए, युद्ध पुकारना चाहिए, बल्कि युद्ध करना चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सनातन बिसि): यू कन्क्लूड। हो गया। आपने बोला था 2-3 मिनट। वे तो हो गए।

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत: दो मिनट में कभी हो सकता है?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सनातन बिसि): आपने तो खुद बोला था।

श्री संजय निरूपम: आप समय नहीं देते हैं तो मैं बैठ जाता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सनातन बिसि): वह बात नहीं है। आपकी पार्टी के टाइम के हिसाब से जो चार मिनट थे वह आप ले चुके हैं। आपने तीन मिनट फिर लिए। फिर तीन मिनट और बोल दिया... (व्यवधान)...

श्री संजय निरूपम: ठीक है मैं बैठ जाता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सनातन बिसि): नहीं, नहीं। कंकलूड कर दीजिए।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम: उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, कितनी देर तक बैठेंगे? कितने स्पीकर्स अभी और हैं?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सनातन बिसि): ओनली वन। एक और है।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम: 8 बजे तक खत्म करना था और 8 बज चुके हैं। ... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सनातन बिसि): प्लीज कंकलूड।

श्री संजय निरूपम: महोदय चीन और पाकिस्तान के संदर्भ में ... (व्यवधान).... मैं कंकलूड कर रहा हूँ। मेरे कहने का आशय सिर्फ इतना है कि चीन और पाकिस्तान के संदर्भ में कम से कम इस देश के जो सच्चे नागरिक हैं उनके बीच में मतभेद नहीं होना चाहिए। चीन और पाकिस्तान के प्रति जो लोग सहानुभूति रखते हैं मुझे लगता है कि जैसे वे कहीं न कहीं इस देश से प्यार करने में कोई गुनाह कर रहे हैं, कुछ कमी रख रहे हैं। सिर्फ इतना ही कहना है मुझे। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सनातन बिसि): श्री रहमान खान ... (व्यवधान).... इट अपीयर्स। अगर कोई आ जाएगा तो फिर वे बोलेंगे। नाम तो कर्ण सिंह जी का है, और नहीं है। उनका नाम है।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: और कोई नाम तो नहीं है ना?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सनातन बिसि): और नहीं है। उनका नाम है।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: और तो नाम नहीं लेंगे?

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN (Karnataka): Sir, we are today discussing the working of the External Affairs Ministry. We have not really discussed the working

of the External Affairs Ministry, but we have discussed only the Pokhran nuclear tests. So, we have not done our duty to review the working of the External Affairs Ministry. Sir, the foreign policy should lay more emphasis on people-to-people contact. Our Missions alone will not be able to lobby for the cause of India. We have to review our foreign policy. In our neighbouring countries, misleading statements are being made about our country. Just issuing statements from India or wholly depending on the Missions would not do. I would request the External Affairs Ministry that laying emphasis on lobbying in the Middle East is as important as that of lobbying in the U.S. We have employed persons for lobbying in the U.S., but something more is required to be done in different parts of the world keeping in view the anti-India propaganda that is being made by other countries. The entire emphasis was on America. That is why I feel that there is something lacking in our foreign policy itself. Now we have to develop people-to-people contact. We have to send our NGOs abroad. We have to send our cultural delegations abroad. That is how we can spread the message of India and India can become a dominant country.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to come to a different thing because we have discussed so many things regarding foreign policy. I am coming to an important aspect of Haj. India is the second largest Muslim-populated country in the world. Nearly one lakh pilgrims go for Haj every year. The functioning of Haj is controlled by the Haj Act of 1953. It is a very old Act. Now in this House and in the other House some assurances have been given that some changes would be brought in the Haj Act and it will be implemented. Nothing has been done so far and I don't foresee that any change is going to come in the near future also. As a result, there is a chaos in the entire Haj management. Today a Haj Conference is going on. The hon. Minister of State for External Affairs was also present there.

The Chairman of the Haj Committee made an attack on the functioning of our Consulate in Jeddah whereas our Consulate levelled charges against the Haj Committee. I would not like to go into it in great detail. The Chairman of the Haj Committee levelled charges of discrepancy in the pattern of accommodation—all these charges are levelled against our Consulate—collapse of schedule of movement of pilgrims from Mecca to Madina, irresponsible behaviour of administrative staff in attending to the problems of the pilgrims, errant behaviour of doctors and paramedical staff, misuse of ambulance by the Consulate staff, improper distribution of medicines, etc. I don't believe that these charges are correct because there is the other side of the story. Now the Haj Committee has completed its tenure. You are allowing it to continue. You are not concerned about the functioning of the Haj Committee. Nearly Rs. 400 crores are collected from the pilgrims by the Haj Committee. Neither the Haj Committee nor the External Affairs Ministry is accountable. Nobody is accountable. There is no balance-sheet. The Annual Report of the Haj Committee is not placed before the Parliament. There is not a single word about such an important event in the Annual Report of the External Affairs Ministry. There is no mention about the management of the Haj affairs. That means nobody wants to be accountable and the Haj affairs are going on just like that. We, Members, raise it here.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is very important. I would like to have five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): Madam, are you taking down notes regarding Haj?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI VASUNDHRA RAJE): Yes, Sir.

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN (Karnataka): Sir, I am leaving out Pokhran and I am not bringing various other things. I want to give some practical suggestions regarding Haj. Now the major problem of Haj is carrying the pilgrims by Air India. It is an annual affair. Nearly one lakh pilgrims go for Haj every year. There are also other pilgrims than Haj pilgrims. They come to one lakh. So, almost two lakhs of pilgrims visit the pilgrimage centres. There is an *ad hoc* arrangement with Air India and the air charter is going on. There is a subsidy element. People are asking why so much of subsidy is given. Last time also I raised this issue. There is a deliberate attempt on the part of Air-India to make up the losses. If I go to Mecca on my own, I have to pay Rs. 20,000. But if a pilgrim goes through the Haj Committee, he pays or the Government pays Rs. 30,000. Air-India charges Rs. 30,000. If I go on my own, then Air-India charges Rs. 20,000. So there is a difference of Rs. 10,000. I would like to know: Why is Air-India charging Rs. 10,000 more? Let them explain it. If Rs. 10,000 is multiplied by 60,000 it comes to Rs. 60 crores. Air India is making up the losses. The public perception is such a big subsidy is being given. I had written a detailed letter to the Minister of Civil Aviation. I also wrote a letter to the Prime Minister. But nobody has replied to my letters. The Prime Minister directed the then Civil Aviation Minister to reply to my letters. But the Ministry of Civil Aviation has not answered my letter. I also wrote to the Minister of External Affairs. They also have not replied to my letter. I have also sent reminders. But I have not received any reply. Every year the Government is giving subsidy. I would like to make a suggestion. Let the Haj Committee raise funds. The Government can contribute. My suggestion is, let us form a separate corporation, Haj Air Corporation of India. Instead of giving subsidy every year, let them give a lump sum amount of Rs. 100 crores or Rs. 200 crores. Let the Haj Committee also contribute Rs. 200

crores. Let the Haj Air Corporation of India buy two or three aircraft. Let the Haj Air Corporation of India manage it; otherwise, two or three aircraft may be leased to Air-India. Then the total expenditure will come down and the Haj management will be proper. There will be no need of giving subsidy every year to Air-India.

Lastly, a Committee of MPs was constituted by the Ministry of External Affairs to go into the Haj Act. We all discussed it. A draft Bill was given to the Ministry of External Affairs. After all those negotiations and discussions, they are again trying to delay the Bill. They are saying that they want to send it to the State Governments. Sir, today they have replied to my Starred Question. A Committee of MPs constituted by the Ministry of External Affairs went into all the details and prepared a draft Bill. At that time, the then Minister stated that within 15 days he would send the Bill to the Law Ministry and then they would come forward with a Bill. But it was not done. In reply to my question they have said that they are going to circulate it to the State Governments to get their opinion and then they will make necessary changes. Nobody knows when this Bill is going to come. These problems will continue. Every year something or the other will be coming. We are not asking for any grants. If they can manage the Haj affairs properly and if there is proper application of mind, probably we will be able to set an example.

Our demand is that the Haj accounts should be published and they should come out with a Haj report. So far as subsidy is concerned, the Ministry should do something about it. Everybody is saying that there is a huge subsidy. Actually it is not true. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): Now discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs is over. The hon. Prime Minister will reply to the debate tomorrow at 12 o'clock. I thank all the Members and also

the Ministers. I adjourn the House till 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty-five minutes past eight of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 10th July, 1998.