

**STATEMENT AND DISCUSSION ON
RECENT NUCLEAR TESTS IN
POKHRAN—Contd.**

MR. CHAIRMAN: We continue with the discussion. Dr. Raja Ramanna.

DR. RAJA RAMANNA (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir, as a Nominated Member of the Rajya Sabha, I feel I should intervene if I think that there has to be a second opinion on matters concerning science and technology. Of course, my first duty as a scientist Member is to congratulate the scientists of the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre and Defence for their excellent work. I take pleasure in the fact that many of them are those whom I can refer to as my former students. I was also pleased to read in the British Newspaper—'TIMES'—that our experiments were described as being the most sophisticated weapons of modern designs and there was a whole variety of them. Not that I think quoting the British makes them any the better. They were already very critical. But they have gone out of the way to make this particular statement, and this summarises the scientific situation that we have these weapons and they are of the highest quality and very sophisticated. However, in the present case, the object of the debate is not only the concern of science and technology but also geo-politics, ethics, of the use of nuclear armaments and the associated economic implications. I think, of these, only ethics and economic implications have been discussed widely. I am happy that the recent decision of the Government to conduct this test is being discussed not as a party issue. From what I can recall from previous years, nearly seven successive Prime Ministers have declared the need for keeping our nuclear options open, and I recall one Prime Minister, who I am not quite sure whether he was legally a Prime Minister or not, made a statement at the Red Fort that we should become a weapon country. Of course, there is no point in my going back to the old history. All that I say is that all these matters are not matters of party approach, and it

seems to me that the decision has become necessary because of the threats from Pakistan, and all the previous Governments had agreed on the need for a nuclear option. But, I may recall that many, many years ago, when we tried to believe that the world had respect for people who tried to keep away from nuclear weapons and the like, when Dr. Sarabhai was the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. L.K. Jha, then a very senior Secretary, was sent to the United States to ask for a possible nuclear umbrella. Of course, it did not come through because it was neither realistic nor possible. The important decision that has to be taken with respect to the recent experiment was the date and time when the experiment had to be carried out. This is a matter in which there has been much controversy because one would like to know why these particular dates were chosen. I am going to give some points which may be different from those points which have already been expressed earlier. The choice of the time, of the dates, depends on many factors. In this case, perhaps, it was "Ghauri" missile tested by Pakistan or the readiness of our own scientists who cannot be kept in a state of suspended animation for ever, a point which we should take note of. It was already 24 years after 'Pokhran-I' and something had to be done sooner or later. Well, at some early stage, an effort was made and it was withdrawn. I do recall and it is no longer a secret any more that the holes that were in Pokhran were made long time ago, but could never be used till now.

The exact time depends on the weather. I say 'the weather' because in 1974 we took great precautions to see that the wind was towards the east and not the west because we know that Pakistan might give some trouble. You will be surprised to know that in Geneva, in the Vienna meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Chairman of the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission started putting a graph on

the projection: "This is the activity we got from Pokhran, so dangerous and all that." And yet we were right on top of the creator trying to find out where the activity was because it had been contained underground. I am mentioning this to only tell you how on this particular issue political misinterpretations can take place. It is a great relief that the Prime Minister has declared a moratorium. He has stated that these tests were essential to show our defence capability. I believe, we should sign the CTBT as CTBT was actually proposed by us quite a long time ago. The CTBT that we proposed was converted into a partial Test Ban Treaty. It was good that we carried out our first test under the ground to make sure that the atmosphere was not polluted with radioactivity, and the CTBT was essentially to show that no activity would come out besides the other aspects of security, etc. Since we have demonstrated our capability, the countries in the neighbourhood, including Australia, will not treat us as a country with no capability for modern technology in defence. I specially mention Australia because there was a seminar in Singapore recently. It was on defence capability in the coming century, and the Australian delegate referred to us as not being able to be listed even amongst the last of the second class in the use of modern technology for defence. And another German said that it was not even worthwhile mentioning India as an important country by way of defence in the coming years of the next century. I mention this because of the reputation we have abroad in some circle—perhaps a misinterpretation of Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy. When it comes to brass-tacks, I keep quoting that old proverb, we should have perhaps the strength of a giant but not use it like one. Now if we could knit it into our philosophy, we would have made some progress.

Having made the demonstration of our capability of carrying out several devices, such as a thermonuclear explosion, which

is called a hydrogen bomb, many people come and ask me, "Sir, when it is called a hydrogen bomb, then why did you call it a thermonuclear explosion?" The name suggests its correct meaning that if you can heat up the isotopes of hydrogen to sufficient temperature, it gives you a tremendous amount of energy, but to heat it up, we will require another small fission bomb to provide the necessary energy. I want to make it clear that you have thermonuclear; there is no-limit to the amount of energy you can get in the form of explosion. Many years ago, Khrushchev in the Soviet Union told the people to make an explosion as big as possible. And a 60 megaton bomb was exploded in Siberia. And here, people ask why a 45 kiloton was exploded.

Of course, this is small for a hydrogen bomb and people ask "why as did you make this small one?" Yes, of course, we made it a small one, otherwise we would have to put it in hole of greater depth to avoid the earth spurring out and spreading the activity everywhere, and it would have simulated an earthquake of a reasonable size and all the villages nearby would have been affected. When people make various comments that this is not a hydrogen bomb but it is a thermonuclear booster, they are talking nonsense. Sub-kiloton devices are very, very complicated and technically difficult. If you have some sub-kiloton devices, you are really in the realm of weapons. In this case with some nuclear devices and the hydrogen bomb, the entire spectrum of possible explosives is known to us and is completely under our control. One is, of course, a little worried when high-level statements are made that the intension is to arm the military personnel with nuclear weapons and that was the reason for this experiment. As a general philosophy, in my view, we should have a strong conventional force and the possession of nuclear weapons is to give the necessary morale to the forces by the fact that in the last resort all this will be behind them as support. I have often heard these from the Army Generals

during the years I was associated with the Defence Ministry. But no amount of conventional warfare will give the necessary morale to the fighting forces, unless you have the nuclear device behind you somewhere. It doesn't matter where it is. Very few people realise that a lot of military activity depends on the morale of the fighting forces. I agree with the previous speakers that we should not get into the spiral of a cold war preparation. I did not make a mention during one of the sessions when it was suggested that it would cost us a tremendous amount of money to produce nuclear weapons. This was not so. Broadly the reason for that was during the cold war Washington was aiming to destroy Moscow, not merely the top of it but deep inside it, to erase it from the earth and *vice versa*. I think, perhaps, 65 such bombs, hydrogen bombs, have to hit the same place to achieve such tremendous destruction. We are not going for any such things. I think both the Americans and the Russians will admit that this was a typical case of the cold war going out of control, out of hand. It is a good thing that the cold war has disappeared but the weapons are there and keep moving and this is the situation that we have to face. Besides destruction by known enemies, destruction by other methods, is also very important. One hon. Member of this House mentioned in the morning about Diego Garcia and the tremendous amount of weapons that had been built on that small island as a source of US power. One does not realise that nuclear weapons are now carried in submarines. I am told that the Indian Ocean is full of submarines. One usually does know the position of a submarine at any time that is the submarine discharged the weapon and above all to which country the submarines belongs. I mention all these things to make you aware that when you get into the nuclear regime you have to draw lines for the future.

I was taking part in a seminar in Coonoor, Wellington. We were discussing as to what should be our defence strategy

in the coming century and how much of nuclear energy are we going to use for even propulsion in submarines. These are matters which have to be discussed in greater detail. One fact which you probably don't know is that CTBT or any of these treaties don't apply to submarines. They don't apply to defence equipments. Why have submarines been completely eliminated from the control of international organisations? I do not know. But the fact is that a submarine can carry any amount of weapons and we are not breaking any law. It means that all the five countries have these weapons and are merrily multiplying whenever they want to. So signing the CTBT is one thing, but watching the weapon-like operations which don't come under international treaties does not mean that the world has become free of nuclear problems. In fact, nuclear problems have become bigger and greater. Now I believe, having done this set of experiments we have reached a stage where people will listen to us and a new regime will have to be created in the field of disarmament. It is a very difficult proposition. Therefore, you must take into account what Prof. Teller, the father of the first hydrogen bomb, has said recently. He said, "Proliferation is already there. But we have to contain it and this requires a new regime in the field of world disarmament".

I am sure, today we will discuss the five experiments that we have done which have taken us to the level of international status and which have given us sufficient powers to discuss things. We now have to go into a regime where in the next century world disarmament has to take place. It is going to be very difficult because everything in the military forces of different countries has to come out. I feel that this question of submarines containing nuclear missiles is probably one of the very big problems of the future because you would not know as to whom a missile belongs and as to whom a submarine belongs and why it has come to attack you. That is one thing.

The question of missilery itself and is about using not only bombs but even nuclear energy to send missiles from one point of the earth to the other.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to thank you for giving me this opportunity of looking at the problem in a slightly different way. We have exploded these five devices. I think the discussion on that completes the picture in so far as it reaches a certain stage. Whether threatening a neighbour or a neighbour threatening us, is comparatively a smaller issue when you come to think of new discoveries and new technologies that have already been prepared in various places which can be done without any testing. Powerful computers simulate everything and every aspect of the behaviour of bombs because the physics involved is very straightforward which is not mysterious like quantum mechanics. It is essentially a mechanical item. These five experiments have given us those basic parameters and these can project to any length that we want.

Before concluding, I would like to again stress the point that the five major countries of the world would like to have a new regime of their own so that they will go on becoming stronger and making more powerful things and we will be left alone! But, fortunately, we have reached a stage when we can go into computers and keep ourselves at an equal level. You may ask: How? Why do you want this equal level? What is security? What is the limit to security? These are deep philosophical questions which I would like to pose to you to discuss because just saying, "security against Pakistan, security against China, security against Diego Garcia" will lose its meaning very much.

What can be the only solution? It is that we come to a general agreement on total disarmament and these points like scientific capability and other things should be taken up rather than smaller issues. But the fact is that the big five countries are not going to give up that easily and we must be prepared for a dialogue at a much higher level, looking

well into the coming years of the next century.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI (Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to felicitate, congratulate and salute the Government and the people of India, particularly the scientific community. They have done us proud. I understand that these tests were so sophisticated that they have taken us technologically ahead of the U.K., France and China. I am particularly happy that the foreign countries which are trying to spy on our country and many other countries 24 hours a day could not catch this. The general impression in India is that New Delhi is a whispering gallery and that the Government is something of a sieve. But is obvious that where there are matters of national interest and national honour, we can be as good as anybody else on earth. Sir, what happened on May 11 is something nothing short of historic.

Up till now, the five powers which emerged after World War II and monopolised the permanent seats in the U.N. Security Council have been brow-beating and blackmailing any other country which stood in their way. But on May 11, we breached this monopoly, of these five *dadas*. It is not just an Indian bomb, it also means empowerment of Afro-Asia and Latin America. It is a great day in the history of the world. It is significant that apart from our friends in Pakistan, no other country in our neighbourhood has thought ill of this. There have been celebrations in the Arab land; sweets and chocolates have been distributed. Saudi Arabia itself is very rational in this matter. The only comment that they made on these nuclear tests was, "India is a friendly country" and they have also added, "Pakistan is a friendly and sisterly country", whatever that may mean. They have not taken ill of it at all. So, this is a great thing of which not only India but also all Afro-Asia will feel proud. There has been some dissent abroad. I can understand the objection of Japan. They have suffered a nuclear explosion. They know

what it means. They are opposed to it in principle. I respect their protest. But I am sorry to say that the U.S. attitude in this matter is entirely hypocritical. These are people sitting on thousands of atomic bombs telling the whole world to refrain from going and nuclear. Why do they think that other countries are a lesser breed?

But it is also significant that even in America, more thoughtful people have appreciated India's test. Former U.S. President, Carter; Kissinger, former Secretary of State, Brzezinski, former National Security Advisor, even the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives they have all said that India has a right to go nuclear. And they have come out against any sanctions against India. A very distinguished American journalist Rosenthall, New York Times man, who was here for years, said that the whole western approach to India is as much of arrogance, ignorance and condescension. General Colin Powell who retired as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, U.S.A. says, "U.S.A. should embrace India." He adds, "India has great intellectual power and has very gifted people. If it could bring all its gifts and resources together, it certainly has the potential to be a major global power." This is exactly the course on which we are set. People have been talking of sanctions. They are talking of sanctions as some people try to frighten the children with *ginnbhoot*. But the reality is U.K., France and Russia have made it clear that they do not want sanctions. The sanctions law of America was enacted four years ago but the rules are yet to be framed. Many distinguished Americans have opposed imposition of sanctions against India. Not only that, in having these tests, we have not violated any international law. We have not breached any international treaty. I will go as far as to say that if, as and when, U.S.A. does decide on sanctions, they will be violating the World Trade Organisation. I am not sure whether it is going to be good for them. But assuming the sanctions come, what will be the result? How will it hurt us? The trade between

U.S. and India is almost balanced at 7 billion dollars plus on both sides. If they deny us the Most Favoured Nation position we can do the same to them. If our business suffers, theirs also will suffer. How does it help them? Many people have all kinds of ideas about foreign investments. Foreign investment in India is less than two per cent of our total investment. If we can finance 98.5 per cent of our investment, we can finance the remaining 1.5 percent also. People talk of aid. I think much mischief is made by wrong use of words. This "aid" is not some kind of a gift to anybody. They lend you money, they charge you interest and they call it aid. Not only that, these are just credits. And you are required to spend those credits, to use those credits in those same countries. When you buy something there, you are supposed to bring those things in the bottoms of that country and you are supposed to use the banking and insurance companies of that country. Aid is an illusion. Aid helps these people more than it helps us. As Mr. Brailsford put it many years ago, "the old imperialism levied tribute, the new imperialism lends money on interest". In this connection I would only say one thing more. I was very happy to see soon after the eleventh, the Government said that if any country declares economic war on India, we can consider retaliation. We can also stop payment of interest and repayment of loans to them for the duration of this economic warfare. I would like to remind this House, U.S.A. built its entire railway system with loans from England, France and Germany. They did not pay back a single penny. I am not saying that we should do it. But this is their tradition. This is what these people have been doing. Many friends raised the issue of cost. One gentleman who was in those power said, "We also could have gone in for a nuclear bomb but it costs so much money." But it cost so much money. When it is a matter of national defence, money becomes a very secondary consideration. But does it really cost all that much money? Firstly, nuclear defence is much cheaper than conven-

tional deference. It is elementary. The present tests have cost us, according to Dr. Kalam, less than one crore of rupees. Of course, there are the regular nuclear establishments. DRDO is there. The Department of Atomic Energy is there. Everybody is there. That goes on in any case, all the time. But these particular tests have cost us less than one crore. I will give you a small example from the recent history. Dr. Bhabha said at a Press Conference in 1963, that "Since 1959 we have been in a position to produce Hiroshima type bombs". He also said in that Press Conference, "That if I had been asked to do it, I could have produced these bombs within two years at a cost of five lakh rupees each". My question to friends on the other side is: If the then Government had had the wisdom to ask Dr. Bhabha to go ahead in 1959, in 1961 we would have had a few bombs. Would China have then dared to attack us, in 1962? Would Pakistan have dared to attack us in 1965? I am sorry to say that many times the defence of India has been handled casually.

Some friends in India also have been critical. This is a free country. We all have the freedom of speech. Anybody can say anything. I wasn't surprised that our Communist friends have been critical. By and large on all major issues they have never been on the same wave-length as the rest of the people. At a time when Gandhi and Subhash were the heroes of the whole country, our comrades were dubbing them as 'running dogs of imperialism'. These were the friends who supported the partition of India. They supported Emergency. They opposed the Quit India Movement. So, I am not at all surprised that in the present situation also they are against national opinion and national interest. One nice exception is... *(Interruption)*

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): What about Godse?

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: Please. Why do you ask about Godse? Godse killed Gandhi and he was hanged for that. But all these people have killed Gandhism

and you have supported them. *(Interruptions)* I can only say that the Kerala unit of the Communist Part has conducted ... *(Interruptions)* Please. *(Interruptions)* Please. Have the capacity of listening to the bitter truth. *(Interruptions)* Only two years back... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: We know very well. Don't invoke all those things.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, he is... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You address me. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Malkani, you address me. *(Interruptions)* Please, come to the subject now.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Can I make a request, Sir? Let us not pollute further the pollution that has taken place already. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Karnataka): Excuse me, Sir. Everytime they start talking about Godse. Who is a fool that is supporting Godse? What is this *amasha* everyday?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Your party has been supporting him. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: You are making irresponsible charges. *(Interruptions)* You can't make irresponsible charges. You have been supporting China. You supported Russia. You supported many such countries. *(Interruptions)* You can't make charges like this. You have already been reduced in size. Please understand people's ... *(Interruptions)* You can't make charges. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us stop it now. Please wind up, Mr. Malkani. *(Interruptions)* Please wind up.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: Not so soon, Sir. This should not be counted. ... *(Interruptions)*...

But, I must give credit to the Communist Party unit in Kerala. They have had the sense to welcome tests. I remember that a few years back Mr. Namboodiripad also

had said that if we think we should have a bomb, we should go in for it what is wrong?

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN (Kerala): This is not true.

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PIL-LAI (Kerala): He has not said it.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: You can go to the Library and find out. ... (*Interruptions*)... I am surprised at the response of the Congress Party to the whole thing. Some of them have welcomed it; some of them have not welcomed it. Someone welcomes it one day and does not welcome it the following day; Some do not know what to say. Why are their tongues tied? When Mrs. Gandhi came up with that Pokhran thing in 1974, the whole country supported her. We did not ask her what she had done, "She had done it, why she had done it now, why not before, why not after?" I am surprised and pained that in this Congress nobody says, Mr. Vajpayee, well-done, thank you. We can discuss the thing further.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa): We did not explode a nuclear bomb then, Sir. So, there was no question...

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: We have to have the elementary decency. Did Mrs. Gandhi consult us before 1974? You wanted us to consult you. You decided about keeping the nuclear option open. ... (*Interruptions*)... This is what I say. Did Mrs. Gandhi consult us when she said that she was going to keep this option open? Are these things discussed in public? The Government knows what is in national interest, what is in public interest, what the people want. Go to the people, 91 per cent of the people have said, "Very well done". Where are you? Where are you even in Bengal? Where are you going?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: We do not have a nuclear bomb there.... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: Some kind of grace, some kind of decency is essential. Any system can work only if you work as

a gentleman. But if you say, Mrs. Gandhi did such things which were wonderful, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi did these things which were wonderful. Very good. Okay. No quarrel. But, not a word about what this Government is doing! Is this proper? Is it decent? Why is grace so short in the Congress Party? You know, we know, all of us know that... (*Interruptions*)... Please, mind your business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You go on speaking. Why are you bothered? ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: Sir, the whole country knows that in 1983 and again in 1995, in both years, the Congress was in power. They wanted to have another experiment, another explosion and you know, we know, the world knows that there were pressures and they yielded before those pressures. Why don't you admit it? Now because this Government has had the courage to keep its word to do what it said it would do, you are tongue-tied. I am sorry to say this. Some voices that I hear in India, they seem to be from abroad. Some people are dancing to foreign tune. What America says today, somebody here says the following day. What is happening in this country?

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA (Bihar): This should be deleted from the records.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: I take strong exception to it. He is saying indirectly that somebody is acting at the behest of America. If this is true, he should come out... This is absolutely false. This is false insinuation and derogatory. I hope the hon. Prime Minister takes note of what his party man is saying. ... (*Interruptions*)...

प्रो० विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दिल्ली): इन्होंने किसी का नाम नहीं लिया... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI. JOHN F. FERNANDES: Let the hon. Member substantiate it; otherwise, it should be expunged.

प्रो० विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: इन्होंने चीन नहीं रूस नहीं कहा। ... (व्यवधान) ... कोई नाम नहीं लिया।

MR. CHAIRMAN: you have not mentioned any name. *...(Interruptions)...* he has not put any blame on anybody.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Who are they? If the hon. Member has the courage, he should speak out.

Let him speak up. *...(Interruptions)...* Let him speak up. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI K. R. MALKANI: If this cap does not suit one let him put it off. *...(Interruptions)...* If this cap suits somebody, let him put it on. *...(Interruptions)...* But this is a fact. *...(Interruptions)...* In 1974 there was no protest. *...(Interruptions)...* But what is going on now? *...(Interruptions)...* What is going on now? *...(Interruptions)...* In conclusion, I would like to make a few humble suggestions for the consideration of the Government. I was very sorry to hear the other day that after Dr. Bhabha died—some people think it was an air accident; some people think it was not an accident and it was something more serious—it was suggested that he might be given the Bharat Ratna. The comment of the Government of the day was that he was “not big enough” for Bharat Ratna. I was very sorry and I was shocked. I would like to suggest to this Government—the previous Government had the grace to confer Bharat Ratna on Dr. Kalam—that distinguished scientists—one of them Dr. Raja Ramanna is here right now and is an honour to this House—should be suitably honoured.

I do not think that sanctions will come to anything much. And whether they propose it or not do it, it is immaterial. I think we have to have a new positive approach to NRIs. We must encourage them. We must encourage them to invest here. We must see to it that they are not bothered at the Customs or any other place. Recently the Malasian economy was in a serious trouble. The Prime Minister of Malasiya appealed to overseas Malasians to invest their savings in Malasia. The surprising thing is that Malasia got about 17 billion Ringits and one Ringit is equal to ‘ten rupees’. You

can imagine that if our NRIs conduct themselves in the same way, how much money and business will land up in this country. In this connection I would like to suggest that the Government should seriously consider giving dual citizenship to NRIs. We should have some of them sitting here in this House. Why not? Pakistan has done it, Bangladesh has done it and China has done it. It is a very sensible and obvious thing to do. We should do it too.

Since years we have been keeping our foreign exchange abroad. We might have some 20 billion dollars in foreign exchange. But 19 million dollars is kept in US. I suggest that the Government should consider getting our foreign exchange back to India. You never know what happens there. They froze Iranian assets.

Lastly, I would like to say a word to our friends in China and Pakistan. Whether it is India or China or Pakistan or many other countries, we have suffered from 200 years of imperialism and exploitation. We do not have to be treading on each others toes. We should all be happy if we all come up. When China became nuclear, we did not go into a tantrum; we did not ask for sanctions. But now China has gone into a tantrum. It wants sanctions against India. Why is Pakistan afraid of it? Pakistan is 1/10th or 1/15th of India. We have never attacked them. We will never attack them. We are brothers. Basically all people of Hindustan peninsula *...(Interruptions)...* I think that is a very happy phrase used in by the Indo-Russian Friendship treaty that all people of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are one people. We might be three states. But we are one people. I would like to suggest that Pakistan should relax and think about it. They should regard this progress in India as their own progress. It is a credit to them also. Dr. Kalam has said in half in humour that missiles can be used even for showering flowers. We can do the same if Pakistan is willing. We can shower flowers on them on their National Day. They, can

return the compliments by showering flowers on India on our National Day. Sir, a question has been raised as to where do we go from here. We are going out of the treadmill. If we want to take this country forward, if we want to become great in all senses of the word politically, socially, economically, morally and militarily, we have to have this strength. A country of 100 crores cannot be treated as dirt. I conclude with a few lines from Kipling. He was known to be the poet of imperialism but he was a man of great sense and great idealism. He said, "Oh, East is East and West is West, and never the twins shall meet, ...But there is neither East nor West; Border nor breed nor birth; When two strong men stand face to face, though they come from the ends of the earth." This is what we want India to be. Let India be great. The U.S.A. is great. Let China be great. Let Pakistan become as great as it can be and let us treat each other respectfully on terms of equality. Thank you.

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PIL-LAI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to express my strong disagreement with the Pokhran Nuclear Tests and my opposition to them. I consider these nuclear tests unnecessary and unwarranted. I also consider that the present Government has clearly and deliberately departed from the established foreign policy positions and nuclear position. I fear that these departures will adversely affect our efforts for development, our efforts for finding solutions to the problem of unemployment, poverty, backwardness, unevenness in growth and also our efforts in building close friendly relations with our neighbours and the countries in the developing world. We all know that the foreign policy positions are not the product of a single day. It has been evolved through our pre-independence experiences and the fifty years of post-independence. It is also not a product of a single factor. While formulating the foreign policy positions, we have taken into consideration almost all aspects—our centuries long history, our centuries—long independ-

ence struggle, the geographical factors, the vastness of the country, the religious and ethnical composition of our population, our economic needs, the security needs, the world in which we live the objective situation—and the changes that are happening in the world. While formulating our foreign policy positions, we have considered all these aspects. Sir, there is also another important factor. For every foreign policy position, there may be two or more options. We have to judiciously weigh the balances. We have to exercise our discretion judiciously to find out the best course of action with minimum, least, adverse effect. Of course, all these factors we consider while formulating our foreign policy position. That is why we came to the firm conclusion that peace and disarmament and also improving friendly relations with our neighbours, improving friendly relations with the developing countries in the world, are the most important components of our foreign policy, because peace is absolutely necessary for our economic development. It alone can ensure a new atmosphere, a favourable atmosphere, for making economic advancement. We also need to improve our friendly relations with our neighbours and with the developing world.

Now we know that the developed capitalist countries, particularly, the imperialist countries, are trying to impose their economic regime, their military regime over India and other developing countries in this world. They are making use of the international institutions. They are making use of the United Nations. They are making use of the International Monetary Fund. They are making use of the World Trade Organisation. They are also making use of various treaties. They are making use of NPT. They are making use of CTBT. We alone cannot challenge these attacks. So, we need the cooperation, we need the solidarity of our neighbours, of the developing countries in this world. That is why, we give more and more importance to improving our relations with our neighbours and with the Non-aligned countries, the developing

countries in this world. We also see that it is all the more necessary to find a solution to the disputes, which we have with our neighbours. We are doing that exercise because we had a bitter experience of the colonial past—the British colonialism. They made use of the conflicts and contradictions in the princely States in India. They instigated the contradictions and conflicts and made use of them for establishing their colonial rule.

Now the very same powers in the world are trying to make use of the contradictions and conflicts among the developing countries. So, we do not want any foreign country in settling our disputes with Pakistan, in settling our disputes with China. That is why, we entered into the Shimla Agreement. So, the most important thing we consider is, strengthening of our relations with our neighbours. It is also absolutely necessary to contain the terrorist activities in the country. So, we consider our relations with our neighbours and developing countries dearer than our relations with other countries. That is our basic approach.

Our Nuclear Policy was also formulated on the basis of an objective world situation. Now, how do we safeguard our security? There are two options. One is, make nuclear bombs, establish your superiority, and then protect your security. The other option is, let all the havenots of the nuclear power in this world rally together and try to exert pressure, try to persuade, and through them try to establish peace, disarmament. Of course, both these options are very difficult. But, we consider the first option as more difficult than the latter option, than the second option. We have been trying these things. In 1974, India conducted a nuclear test at Pokhran. We did not make any nuclear bomb. This was meant for peaceful purposes only. But, we established our capability. Our restraint in making nuclear bombs has become a deterrent. So, the restraint we showed, paid us rich dividends during the last more than 20 years. Now, some of

my honourable friends are trying to compare the present nuclear explosions with the explosions we had in 1974. The statement of the Prime Minister is just before us. We also know what the then Prime Minister in 1974 told the Lok Sabha. Smt. Indira Gandhi said, and I am quoting from the Lok Sabha debate of 22nd July, 1974 : "I have repeatedly reaffirmed our policy on using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and have specifically stated that we have no intention of developing nuclear weapons." What is the present stand of the Government? They have done these explosions in order to make nuclear, bombs. Not only that; she continued:

"I have explained in my letter to Prime Minister Bhutto about the peaceful nature and economic purposes of this experiment and have also stated that India is willing to share her nuclear technology with Pakistan in the same way as she is willing to share it with other countries provided proper conditions of understanding and trust are created. I once again repeat this assurance and hope that the Government of Pakistan will accept India's position in this regard." This is about the attitude of the then Government. But what is the attitude of the present Government for making bombs and making use of those bombs as a deterrent on others? It is clear departure from the 1974 position. That is why we consider the present departure a danger to our national interest.

Sir, as I have said earlier, the present Government has departed from the foreign policy and nuclear policy decisions. But, they have not cared to inform the political parties in India, not cared to inform the public in India. There are also reports that they have not even cared to discuss this matter inside their Cabinet. I do not know the reality. How can such a decision, which is a clear demarcation from the 50 years of policies and which has very serious implications on the life of the people, on the fate of the country, be taken? But they tried to write to

Clinton and others. This is a most undemocratic act that the present Government has done. The Prime Minister now explains the compelling reasons in his statement. I am not reading paragraphs 7 and 8. So, he says that the nuclear and missile proliferation is one of the causes for taking these decisions. Another cause is the externally aided and abetted terrorism and militancy and clandestine war. Sir, can we compete with the 'haves' in making atomic bombs and establish our superiority? They have been doing it for the last so many years. Can we compete with them? Can we catch up with them? Can arms race be a solution to the problems we face? Nuclear weapons cannot find a final solution to any of the international issues.

America had all these weapons, but they could not defeat Vietnam. They could not cow down Iraq, Cuba and other countries. Our attempt to build nuclear weapons and establish nuclear superiority would only create apprehensions in the minds of our neighbours. This would only create apprehensions in the minds of the Third World countries. This would isolate us. This would isolate us from our close friends.

Not only this, Sir. How are we going to meet the economic sanctions? I have no doubt that the 'nuclear haves' have no right to impose sanctions on us. We all would join together to fight against these sanctions. That is one aspect. But how are we going to face this? It is not only the United States. Yesterday, there were reports about the decisions by the European Union.

Of course, two solutions have been proposed in the Prime Minister's statement. What is the first proposal? He says, in paragraph 12: 'The policies of economic liberalisation introduced in recent years have increased our regional and global linkages and my Government intends to deepen and strengthen these ties'. By opening up the economy further, the Prime Minister is thinking of toning down the severity of the sanctions. Sir,

this would be a very, very serious thing. If you do that, it would be very, very dangerous to our economic development.

Already, the Government has taken certain decisions on these lines. They have given counter-guarantee in the case of three power projects. The Ministry of Mines have now cleared a whopping 34 large proposals. One of the proposals is from Messrs. Phelps and Dodge. The Government has given licence to this multinational company for prospecting of copper, covering a massive area of 2472 sq. kms. Not only this. The Government has also given sanction to multinational companies for oil exploration and production-sharing contracts. The Government has also given the green signal to multinational companies for holding eighty-nine per cent of the equity in joint ventures for developing India's ports. In future we will not be in a position to stop American nuclear submarines from visiting Indian coast. So, this opening up is an opening to the imperialist dangers.

Sir, the second option is this. The Prime Minister says in paragraph 14 of his statement:

"We have also indicated willingness to move towards a de-jure formalisation of this declaration."

What does it mean? Is the Government going to sign the NPT and the CTBT? There are many statements from the side of the Government. They ask for acceptance of the nuclear status. If others accept it, the Government is willing to sign the NPT and the CTBT. What have been our objections to the CTBT and the NPT? We consider them unjust. We consider them discriminatory. We consider that they protect the monopoly of the haves. Now we declare ourselves to be a nuclear power, and all of a sudden we turn around and say "If you accept us, we are ready to accept the unjust, discriminatory CTBT and NPT." We are giving up all our moral strength in dealing with other countries of the world. It is a very very preposterous

stand any civilised country has taken. You are proposing that thing.

So, Sir, the present Government is treading a very very dangerous path. This will have very very serious repercussions. I ask of the Government not to make nuclear weapons. I ask of the Government not to sign the CTBT and the NPT. I ask of the Government: let us have a meeting of all the political parties and try to evolve a consensus on how to wriggle out of the present situation.

Sir, the Prime Minister's statement asks for "avoiding triumphalism". He asks for this in paragraph 16 of the statement. Who is glorifying these nuclear explosions? His own political party and his own allies are glorifying these. Humanity considers nuclear bombs as weapons of mass destruction. No civilised people in this world have ever glorified building of weapons of mass destruction. Some of their close allies are trying to construct a temple there. They are speaking of India's ethos. What is India's ethos? *Loka samastha sukhino bhavantu*. You are constructing a temple because you have the capacity to kill lakhs and lakhs of people. You are polluting, you are misinterpreting India's ethos, and you are leading the country to chaos and difficulties.

So, Sir, history will not absolve them of the wrongs they have committed to the people of this country.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI (Karnataka): Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I would like to join the Prime Minister in congratulating our great scientists and technocrats, who are responsible for achieving our expertise in building up nuclear strength. I salute them. But, I am extremely sorry that up till now we have not been able to know from the Government—except in the statement of the Prime Minister—what security reasons had made us to take the decision to explode the bomb.

Sir, I do not want to go into the details of the National Agenda for Governance signed by 17 parties. There they had promised 60 per cent of the expenditure for agriculture, removal of unemployment, elementary education and so many other things. After having said it, they talked of rule of consensus, which has already been referred to by my good friend, Mr. Prnab Mukherjee. I am sorry my good friend, Mr. George Fernandes, Who belongs to the socialist thinking and who is a staunch and ardent supporter of social democracy in the world, has made a statement saying that China is our enemy number one so far as security is concerned. It was later on supported by PM also. I will come to that later.

Sir, another surprising thing is that the next day, for the first time, I think, the United States Defence Minister invites my good friends, George Fernandes. I am really unable to understand why my good friend has fallen a victim to such a wrong thinking. I really never expected this from him. Still I am not able to understand it. It is, perhaps, because of the company that might have influenced him that way. He is not easily influenceable. But, still, why should the American Defence Minister invite him.

प्रो० विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: ताकतवर आदमी को सब बुलाते हैं।

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: That is not so, It was before the explosion took place that he got the invitation. Here, Sir, I want only to attribute these things to my good friend, George Fernandes.

The Prime Minister writes a letter to Mr. Clinton. Sir, on 13th, the Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee had cited an atmosphere of distrust in India's relations with China and Pakistan's status as over-nuclear weapons State as the reason behind the Pokhran nuclear tests. In his letter, he has not named the countries, but inferences could be properly drawn. I do not want to take the time of the House. But, he said: "The country which attacked our country in

1962, the country which helped Pakistan to have nuclear weapons", all these references clearly go to show that the danger stemmed from China and Pakistan. Here comes the main question. In 1996 and in 1997 when Mr. Gujral was the Minister for External Affairs, he made a statement in Parliament. There was a discussion about signing the CTBT. Both the Houses unanimously agreed not to sign it. The present Prime Minister, honourable Shri Atalji was also a partner to it. Having taken that stand and having said in his statement that for 20 years the country had to show restraint—which has been properly explained by Shri Pranab Mukherjee, I will not repeat it—what was the hurried reason for this Pokhran test? They are yet to give us the reasons for this test. Was there any movement of Armed Forces on our borders with China and with Pakistan? Were there any significant positive signs of war endangering our borders? Let them take us into confidence. Let them take the people into confidence. Otherwise, only irresistible influence could be the cause to divert the attention of the country from the quarrels with their allies and disunity in the coalition Government. They could not do any single work for 50 days. If they have done any work, I would like to hear from them. They have not issued a single order in the interest of the people. They have not done anything in the interest of the people. Just to suppress it and divert the attention of the entire nation, this bomb explosion was done. I must say that one should ponder over it. I am glad that it is being done now. Let them give us the reasons for the bomb explosions. Let them convince us. Then, what is the next thing that they want from us? They want consensus. I do agree with it. An hon. Member from the BJP spoke about it. They did not take us into confidence. They did not inform any party. I do not know what happened. I was not here. I was in my State. Having taken a decision, not to sign the CTBT, having taken a consistent policy on nuclear weapons, our options were open. That was our stand. How is it that

suddenly, unilaterally the Prime Minister took a decision. I do not know whether my good friend, Shri George Fernandes, the Defence Minister was informed about the tests. I think he was informed after the explosion, not before the explosion. If it was before, then I am happy about it. Otherwise, he has to think... (*Interruption*)... It was not discussed in the Cabinet meeting also.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: He is a member of the inner-Cabinet.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: I do not know. I do not know whether he was informed before the tests or after the tests. I feel that the Prime Minister could have invited leaders of the Opposition and explained the reasons for the tests instead of going to the press. He could have taken us into confidence and explain the reasons before the explosions. Then, there would have been some understanding. Then, we would have thought that there is a Prime Minister who took us into confidence and who gave the reasons for the explosions, before going to the press. That also did not happen. After that the Prime Minister says one thing. His statement here is different. I am extremely sorry for it. We appreciate many parts of his statement. He has paid tributes to all those people all the successive Government who have contributed towards this development. It did not happen in 30 days. It has taken 30 years to build it. We salute all those people who have contributed towards this development. Whatever it may be, if he has taken us into confidence, it would have been a different story. But how the Prime Minister issues one statement and the Home Minister issues another statement.

The President of the B.J.P issued another statement; the Sangh Parivar—the Bajrang Dal and the Vishwa Hindu Parishad—made some other statement. Everybody is speaking in a different way. Some of them want to build the temple. Some of them want to do something else. This has given the impression that the ruling party wants to have a political advantage out of the *tapasya* of

scientists. I am also told and I do not know whether this is true or not that they want to go in for mid-term elections after the Budget Session to get rid of the alliance. This is a very important thing for us and I would like the Prime Minister to clarify this thing. We, the Members of Rajya Sabha, are not worried about the mid-term polls. But the Members of Lok Sabha are worried about this thing. We do not know what the people of this country will do. The people of this country are matured enough. The most unfortunate part of the entire thing is that they are making it a party achievement and taking a partisan view of the whole thing. This should be stopped. I would like to know from the Government as to what the fall out on the economy would be. We are in a crisis. The value of rupee is falling every day. We are getting more than Rs. 4,000 crores help from Japan, from the World Bank, from the IMF and from different countries. As a Human Resource Development Minister, I know that we are getting a lot of foreign aid for the benefit of children. I don't know whether after the nuclear explosion, that help will come to India or not. If the same is stopped. What is the alternative arrangement? A number of small-scale industries are being closed down; a number of medium industries are being closed down. We have an assurance from the multinationals that we would be helped by them in the power sector. We have signed agreements for power projects in Karnataka, Maharashtra, Orissa for almost all the States, agreements have been signed for power projects. They are half-way. We are in a real power crisis. Though the entire power is with Atal Ji, I do not know whether it is fully with him or whether there are some people who control him. The Prime Minister said that there is no remote control. But there are a number of remote controls there. Sometimes, I sympathise with him. I would like to know as to what the economic fall-out is.

Then I come to the social fall-out. I would like to know what social effect it

will have. Lastly, I would like to know about the environmental fall-out. Some people say that the heat in Delhi is because of the explosion. (*Interruptions*)

P. FRO. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Mr. Bommai, it is not expected of you to make such a statement.

SHRI S. R. BOMMAI: I am not saying it. Some people said it. It was in a lighter vein. I would like to know about the long term effects of the nuclear explosion. In Japan, even today the Government have to take care of the new born children. They have to spend money and take care of mothers even after so many years. That is the effect of nuclear bomb which was dropped there fifty years ago. Therefore, I would like to know that the long term effect is. If there is no effect, let the Government say it.

Sir, we belong to the *raj* of Gandhi and Buddha. We won freedom through non-violence. These weapons were necessary. To that extent, I am not a great Gandhi follower. I would only say that strong weapons do not make a country strong. Russia had exploded 750 times. They were all nuclear bombs. Despite that, the entire Federation is broken now. Almost all the Communist countries, including Poland, liberated themselves from a strong Communist army by Gandhian methods. By non-violent methods they have freed themselves from the entire Europe. Africa is following Gandhism, but we Indians are thinking of deserting Gandhism and taking to arms. In my view, a strong country should have a strong economy and a strong society first. Strong people make a country strong, and not the weapons. If our economy is weak, we will be nowhere. Japan has a strong economy. Every year it changes its Prime Minister. Recently, I have been to Italy. Italy has 58 Prime Ministers in 50 years. Still its economy is strong, its people are strong, its industries are all right, its agriculture is all right. Therefore, a strong economy, a strong society and strong people are more important than the weapons.

Sir, I am going to conclude. I would like to know from the Prime Minister what the real intention was, what the fallout was and how he wants us to cooperate, if at all he wants. Otherwise, we will have to tell the people what we feel. We will have to tell the people what we feel, is right and ultimately I would like to know from my good friend, George Fernandes, when he would come out of the evil influence. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Alladi P. Rajkumar. He is not here. Dr. Manmohan Singh.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH (Assam): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Until 11th of May, there was a broad national consensus about the country's foreign policy, defence policy and nuclear policy, and it has been the good fortune of our country that despite different perceptions, differences amongst various political parties in these matters, there has been a meaningful, broad national consensus. I note with regret that this consensus has been sought to be disrupted by the events of May 11 and May 13.

Sir, until now, there were three pillars of India's nuclear policy. First, nuclear weapons being weapons of mass destruction and their use being a crime against humanity, India should be in the forefront of international efforts to work for a non-discriminatory, multilateral arrangement to have these weapons outlawed. Second, at the same time, India would not be a party signifying its assent to the unequal rule signified by the nuclear apartheid whereby the five nuclear weapon States kept to themselves the monopoly of nuclear weapons. It was for that reason that we did not sign the NPT or the CTBT. The third element, which goes back to the days of Jawaharlal Nehru, is that in this imperfect world that we live in, we must keep the nuclear option open and that we must develop capabilities to harness modern science and technology, operate at the frontier of knowledge... so that even though our goal is to work towards universal nuclear

disarmament, in terms of our capability, mastery of the nuclear science, nuclear technology, we should not lag behind. This was the essence of the consensus. After these tests and after the declaration that India is a nuclear weapons State, I submit to you, Sir, that this consensus has been sought to be disrupted.

When we said the nuclear option was open, I could recognise the circumstances in which the nuclear weapon option could be exercised. Keeping it open also kept open the possibility that this option could be exercised. The essence of the matter is to explain to our people as to what were the compelling circumstances which made it necessary for this option to be exercised now. Sir, in vain we have asked the spokesmen of the government for an answer, a credible answer, to this question. The Prime Minister's statement does not deal with this issue at all except for general statements with regard to deteriorating security environment. While speaking in the other House yesterday the hon. Defence Minister referred to the reports of the Ministry of Defence. He also referred to the Reports of the Standing Committees of the Parliament. I do agree with him that these Reports emanating from the Standing Committees and the reports of the Ministry of Defence are important inputs which would go to determine our perception of the security threat. But that does not constitute total summation of what can be called as the national security concept. If I read the National

Agenda correctly, that agenda of the ruling party and its allies clearly recognised that national security had many dimensions—military dimension, social dimension, economic dimension, political dimension. It is only after evaluating these inputs from other wings of our system, the Ministry of External Affairs, the Economic Ministries, the Ministries dealing with social services that one could develop a coherent security threat perception. If I may quote from the docu-

ment that was adopted by the ruling party, paragraph 26 clearly states—

“We will establish a new National Security Council to analyse the military, economic and political threats to the nation as also to continuing advice to the Government. This Council will undertake India's first-ever strategic defence review to ensure the security, territorial integrity and unity of India. We will take all necessary steps and exercise all available options. Towards that end we will re-evaluate the nuclear policy and exercise the option to induct nuclear weapons.”

It was clearly envisaged that they would undertake the first-ever strategic defence review. If they are so sure that they have conclusive evidence from the reports of the Ministry of Defence, on 19th March they did not have to say that they would conduct India's first-ever strategic defence review. They themselves were not clear at that time that nuclear weapons option had to be exercised then and there and that is why we have been asking them to tell us what the compelling circumstances were, and we have not received any answer to this date. I submit that the hon. Defence Minister's quoting from the reports of the Ministry of Defence or from the Reports of the Standing Committees is no substitute for providing us with a coherent answer.

As I said, the reports of these Committees contain valuable inputs. But if I add all the recommendations of the Standing Committee with regard to what should be the Government expenditure, that would far exceed the total amount of resources available to the Government of India as a whole. Therefore, we cannot conclude on the basis of these reports that you have established a credible threat perception. Once again I would request the Government to come clear on this subject. If they don't come clear then there will be doubts and there will be valid reasons for doubts that this is an attempt for political consolidation through the bomb that this is an attempt

to consolidate the political power through the bomb on the part of a Government which was tottering, which was far from cohesive and which did not know how to work cohesively. This is the first point which I wish to make.

My colleagues have already mentioned that in terms of technical virtuosity of science and technology establishment we salute our scientists. They have once again reaffirmed the scientific and technological capabilities of our scientists, technologists and engineers. This is a matter of pride for all of us.

But the real issue is how do we even now make an attempt to repair the damage that has been done? How do we go from here to once again construct a meaningful national consensus on defence policies, on nuclear policies and on foreign policies which we need. We desperately need to meet the challenges of the 21st century. Sir, I would like to say a few things in regard to this issue.

First of all, I do not buy the argument of Shri Malkani and the likes of him who believe that the economic sanctions will not hurt us. I am one with him. We are all one with the Government that these sanctions are wholly unjustified. The Government and the country must face the challenge. The Challenge posed by these sections unitedly and on this point there can be no compromise with the nation's honour. But let us not close our eyes and assume that these sanctions will not hurt us. Indian economy does not function in an international vacuum. It is true that foreign investment is only a small part of the total investment in our country. But there is such a thing as expectations and one has to take note, of the adverse effects of the climate of uncertainty that has been created. You can see its effect on the share market. You can see its effect on the exchange market. In days to come if you don't take adequate steps, the situation could deteriorate. In this context, I would like to quote from the Economic Survey which has been

placed before the Parliament only this morning. It says,

"As of mid May (when this document goes for printing) it is too early to assess the implications of these reactions (referring to international reactions the nuclear tests for the short and medium term development prospects of the Indian economy. One thing, however, is clear to the extent to which these reactions render the external economic environment less friendly, to that extent it becomes more urgent to implement the policy decisions necessary to ensure macro economic stability and rapid and sustainable economic growth".

How are we going to do that? We are not going to do that if we treat these tests as a partisan achievement. We are not going to achieve the unity that this nation needs by the type of words which are being used by some members of the ruling coalition. In this connection I have come across a document which talks about what has been stated by Shri Singhal, who happens to be the President of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad.

He says, "This is a Hindu bomb." He says, "We should use this opportunity to amend the Constitution of India, to declare India as a Hindu State." He says, "We should use this opportunity to go to war with Pakistan". And he says, "As far as the previous Governments were concerned, they were all controlled by *hij-das*." Is this the language to be used by the presidents, of one of the foremost frontal organisations of the BJP? I submit to you that utterances like this...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL (Madhya Pradesh): It is not correct to say that the VHP is the frontal organisation of the BJP....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal): we not know whether the BJP is the tail of the VHP or that the VHP is the tail of the BJP....*(Interruptions)*

श्री वसीम अहमद (उत्तर प्रदेश): इतना इन्सेसन्ट मत बनिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: It is not for me to describe the relationship. The relationship that exists between the BJP and the VHP or the Bajrang Dal or the RSS is the subject-matter of wide knowledge. I would not like to quarrel on this subject. My friend has a different perception. He is entitled to his perception. But I would like to say that no responsible person who takes the interest of India to heart.

should be saying, should even dare to think, all that Mr. Singal has been saying. Sir, this is the first thing that I would like to say. Also, if you want to maintain social cohesion, if you want to maintain social peace in our country, nothing should be done which will disturb the peaceful atmosphere in our country. We read today in newspapers that attempts are being made to construct the temple at Ayodhya, that pillars are being got ready in some villages of Rajasthan, that in some places of Ayodhya the dome is being built. If you carry on these activities, I submit to you that you will be endangering the nation's cohesion, social equilibrium, which is necessary if this nation has to meet unitedly the challenge of economic and other sanctions that lie ahead.

Sir, in the same spirit, I would like to say to the hon. Defence Minister, who has declared that he is in favour of weaponisation, that we must make a distinction between the capacity that we have built to build weapons of mass destruction and the nuclearisation of our armed forces. I say it for more than one reasons. The Prime Minister has said that we are not going to enter into an arms race. But history is a witness to a large number of regimes, with good intentions, but being sucked in by circumstances beyond their control and nations ending up piling up military budgets which, ultimately, proved their undoing. The Soviet Union is the most recent example of that. Now, if we are not going to go on that path,

then it is quite necessary that before the Government undertakes the weaponisation of our armed forces, it must spell out its nuclear doctrine, its doctrine of national security. What is the critical, effective and yet affordable national deterrent that this Government will seek? Do they have a command and control structure in place which is necessary to use these weapons of mass destruction? All these issues, I think, will have to be dealt with. What is the cost of having a minimum credible nuclear deterrent? Mr. Malkani said that the nation's security comes first. I do agree with him. But I do submit to him and through you, Sir, to the Government that the national security has several other dimensions. There are military dimensions; there are economic dimensions; and there are social dimensions. And a single-minded pursuit of military objectives at the cost of all other national objectives, is not necessarily conducive to the development of a balanced, sober, doctrine of national security. Therefore, if we do not develop a coherent national security doctrine, I have fears that this country will be sucked into an arms race and all these promises of health for all, education for all, employment for all which figure prominently in the national agenda of our ruling group, would remain an empty rhetoric. If we do not want to go that route, then before undertaking the crucial decision of weaponisation of our armed forces, the House should be taken into confidence, the nation should be taken into confidence as to the type of nuclear doctrine on which we are operating. I noticed that the Prime Minister referred to the fact but he is thinking of a doctrine which would involve that India would not be the first to use this nuclear weapon. But, Sir, the archives of the Soviet Union and other countries which have now become available; show that even when countries stated that they would not be the first to use nuclear weapons, their opponents never took that seriously. Therefore, willingly, or unwillingly people were sucked into large uncontrollable increase in expenditure on these armaments and I do not want this

thing to happen to our country, in a country where 36 per cent of our people are still living below the poverty line, where the infant mortality rate even 50 years after independence is 70 per thousand, where the literacy rate even after 50 years, of our independence is no more than 53 per cent. So I urge the Government to spell out their doctrine of national security, a doctrine which takes care of military threat but at the same time which takes care of the threats to the nations, social cohesion, and the economic equilibrium arising out of ill health, illiteracy, ignorance and disease. If we do not attend to these threats, you will have weapons of mass destruction like the Soviet Union had but the Soviet Union still withered away. Therefore, think before you act, think before you weaponise our armed forces. At least try to enlighten us about the nuclear doctrine on which you are going to operate.

Sir, at the same time I would also like to say that India must use its diplomatic skills to minimise the damage that has been created world-wide. Let us not be euphoric that such and such country is not going to impose sanctions. The statement of the European Union, I think, is a pretty harsh statement. They have also said that they would review not only their lending through the multi-lateral fora but also that they will review India's access to generalised system of tariff preferences and if these preferences are withdrawn, Indian exports would suffer 30 per cent of our exports go to the Countries belonging to the European Union. There may be trouble there. We will meet that threat unitedly. But let us not go out of our way to create more enemies, that we can avoid. Therefore, it is necessary that our position should be explained in as sober a manner as possible. If India has to be a nuclear power, it must be a sober power. Therefore, whatever we say and whatever we do, we must convey the impression that we have not given up our commitment to universal nuclear disarmament, that there is no change in our peaceful intentions, that there is no

change in India's resolve to seek peaceful mechanism of resolving our disputes with Pakistan in the spirit of Shimla agreement which binds us to find a durable structure of peace. Therefore, when I see the picture, I see the picture in this respect. Certain things do disturb us, certain Members have already referred to the statements with regard to relations with China. I think the letter of the Prime Minister to President Clinton was a very poorly drafted letter. I think it gives our diplomacy very low marks. Singling out a country, and that too knowing full well that if this letter goes to America, there are people who have every reason to leak out that letter because there are many people in the United States and elsewhere, who want Asians to fight Asians, is nothing but playing into the hands of those people. Therefore, do not be very pleased when you find that so and so finds our stand respectable, so and so supports us. There are many people, for example, who want to egg on India to become involved in a confrontation with China so that the pressure on other countries can be released. India should do nothing to halt the pursuit of negotiations, to resolve our problems both with China and Pakistan. Last year when President Ziang Zemin came here, he made a very helpful statement, for the first time probably, on the Indo-Pakistan relations. He repeated that statement when he went to Islamabad. He said that the Kashmir issue should be put on the back-burner. He advised the same thing to Pakistan when he was there a few days later. That was a helpful development. After many many years the Chinese stance on Jammu and Kashmir had softened and I don't wish that anything should be done or said on our part which leads to a change in that stance of China on the Jammu and Kashmir front. We cannot have a situation where China, Pakistan, United States and all other countries unite against our country. We are a great country. We can meet this challenge. But I think it would be foolish to create an environment where even those who can be friendly to us are also asked to join

the ranks of our foes.

In the same way I would urge that when talking about Indo-Pakistan relations we must exercise greater degree of sobriety. There is no doubt, as the Home Minister has said this morning, that Pakistan has inspired, aided and abetted militancy in Jammu and Kashmir. It is a fact of life. We are one with the Government to meet the challenge of this militancy. But you don't help matters by saying that Pakistan should roll back its policies because there has been a change in the geo-strategic situation after the 11th of May. I submit to you, Sir, that by this statement Mr. Advani has played straight into the hands of Pakistan. What has been Pakistan saying in the international fora? Pakistan has been saying that South Asia has the great danger of being consumed by a nuclear conflict and this is because of the unresolved nature of the Kashmir dispute. Therefore, Pakistan has been arguing in international fora that, if the international Community wishes to avoid a nuclear flare up in South Asia, you must intervene to resolve the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. If the Indian spokesmen start saying that because of the nuclear tests there has been a change in the geo-strategic situation, I submit to you, Sir, that we are strengthening the hands of those in Pakistan who want to see international involvement in the affairs of the sub-continent. When you read the statements of the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs who wants Pakistan to name the date, the time and the place of a fourth war, I could not think of a more irresponsible behaviour. Therefore, Sir, if you want to unite the nation to meet the challenge of the sanctions, you must control your thoughts, you must control what you say and, therefore, use the opportunity once again to build durable, meaningful consensus on our defence policy, on our nuclear policy and on our foreign policy. We need this. When I intervened for the first time in the debate on the President's Address, I said that parties are important but more important is the nation. Therefore, while we may have differences

among our-selves, no party should do anything which harms the interests of this nation. I submit to you, Sir, that the behaviour of at least some elements of the ruling Party in recent days has not been conducive to creating a climate to strengthen the united resolve of our people to meet the formidable challenges that this nation faces. Mr. Malkani is saying that those who differ with him, they dance to the tune of United States; that is a cheap sort of rhetoric. This is not worthy of a great democracy. These things used to be there in the Fascist Germany; these are not the type of things which are worthy of politicians in the great democracy that we have. Therefore, Sir, with these words I once again submit to the Government that they must enlighten us about their perception of the security threat. It is not enough, as I said, for the Defence Minister to quote from the Ministry of Defence reports, from the reports of the Standing Committees. This is not what anybody would consider as a comprehensive strategic security doctrine. If the Government has no such doctrine, if the Government has not produced any such review, I think the impression will go round that the Government has used these tests as a political lever to strengthen its hold on the people. I think that would be a sad thing. I, therefore, conclude by appealing to the Government not to play politics with our Defence Policy; not to play politics with our Nuclear Policy. As Smt. Sonia Gandhi has said, the nuclear issue is a national issue. It is not a partisan issue and any attempt to derive partisan benefits out of these tests would not be an act of service but an act of great disservice to our nation. thank you very much, Sir.

(The Deputy Chairman in the chair)

DR. GOPALRAO VITHALRAO PATIL (Maharashtra): Hon. Deputy Chairperson, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this issue. the five underground nuclear tests are a grand scientific success and nothing succeeds like success. This has brought

glory to our country and mother India and we feel proud of it. A wave of jubilation has swept the country and it has enhanced the prestige of our country in the comity of nations and built a new confidence in the people. Therefore, I take this opportunity to congratulate the team of scientists under Rajagopal Chidambaram and assisted by our Bharat Ratna A.P.J. Abdul Kalam, who have led to this grant success. Along with that, the people who are associated with these tests deserve to be complimented and congratulated. The nation is proud of these people.

Madam, with these tests, India has become a credible nuclear power and we are now a nuclear weapon State., It is not of concern whether this is accepted by the world community or not. This process is a national achievement and it should not be seen that the BJP is going to take political mileage out of these tests because we and our leader, the hon. Prime Minister, feel that this is a national achievement. It is done in the interest of the nation, and after taking and weighing all these considerations of defence and security environment in our neighbourhood, the decision was taken. Here I may say why this decision was taken. The decision-makers recognise that the cost of inaction out-weighs the cost of action. Therefore, they have taken this decision. We are living in a world which is a no non-sense world in the sense that from the days of our Independence to after Independence, from Mahatma Gandhi to Jawaharlal Nehru, Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi we have been pleading not only in India but in all international forums that India stands for universal disarmament. This has been our first and last plea in these forums. Our leaders of the then ruling party, that is, the Congress Party, have been pleading this for the last 50 years. But the world gave a deaf ear to our pleas. We are living in a world where strength respects strength and might is right which is the law of the jungle. This is the reason why we have to

think in some different ways. We have to strengthen ourselves and with whatever technology and weapons which are available. Here I would like to say that our pioneer scientists, Dr. Bhabha, Dr. Sethna, Dr. Raja Ramanna and others have done great service to the nation. When Cirus reactor was started, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru said, "We are approaching a stage when it will be possible for us to make atomic weapons." He said this in 1960 that atomic weapons were needed by India. That was the concept of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru. This is the reason that our own people who were rulers in those days had also been pleading for disarmament. But the whole world was indulging in proliferation and proliferation to such an extent that the five nuclear power states have conducted, as figures have been given in this House this morning, more than 2000 nuclear tests. America conducted 1032 tests and it possesses, it seems, about 35000 nuclear warheads. Russia has conducted 715 tests and they possess more than 3000 nuclear warheads. The same is the case with China which has conducted 45 tests and it possesses, it seems, about 200 to 500 nuclear weapons. Britain also possesses about 100 nuclear warheads. The same is the case with Israel. Israel has not conducted any tests but it possesses a few scores of atomic warheads. Our neighbour Pakistan is also possessing, it seems more than a dozen warheads. All this means that we are living in a dangerous nuclear neighbourhood in which our seas are having a flotilla of the Seventh Fleet which is armed with nuclear weapons. There are bases of America and Russia in the India Ocean. Diego Garcia is just about 100 Kms. from our shores. It has also a nuclear base. Then Sparta is the Russian base in the Indian Ocean which has nuclear weapons. The same is the condition when we come to our nearer neighbours. Pakistan and China are our neighbours. China is a full-fledged nuclear deterrent power. As I said just now, it has not only the nuclear weapons but it has got missiles. It seems China

had got 17 ICBMs. It has about 300 I.R.B.M. (Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile) and with this force, it is a challenge to many other countries. I means, this is a nuclear neighbourhood. Pakistan is already having nuclear warheads. It has missiles. The evidence is already there. Last month only it has conducted the test of Ghouri Missile which is an I.R.B.M. of 1500 k.m. range. It has many other missiles. It means, not only do they have warheads, they also have missiles. The U.S. Congress has a taskforce and a work has been assigned to one, Mr. Yousuf Godanskey. He after investigating, found that Pakistan is likely to use nuclear weapons to promote terrorism in Kashmir. That is his opinion which he has given to the American Congress. After considering the danger from the dangerous nuclear neighbourhood, it has become inevitable for India to start testing. This is one of the reasons why India has taken this decision. Why was this decision taken at this time? What was the immediate danger? There cannot be any immediate danger when we analyse the security threats. They are not always immediate. They are there for ever. When China invaded India, there was no danger and Nehru never knew. When we were talking of Panchasheel and Hindi-Chini *bhai-bhai*, it stabbed at our back. Where was the danger? Who pursued this danger? Similarly, with Pakistan, we had three wars. It was an aggressor-country and with those three wars, we never knew as to when Pakistan will start a war. Whenever it is convenient for them, they start a war. With regard to nuclear weapons, it must be known and some more education and enlightenment is needed. The nuclear weapons are weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, they are not to be used in war. Nuclear weapons, as I said, are the weapons of mass destruction. There is a 'MAD' race going on. Madam, 'MAD' means, Mutual Assured Destruction. In a nuclear war, nobody can be a winner and nobody can be a loser. Therefore, one U.S. strategist,

whose name is, Bernard Brodie, said, after introduction of the absolute weapon—nuclear weapon—the role of military had changed from fighting and winning of wars to prevention of war. So, nuclear weapon is necessary only to deter the nuclear blackmail because we are likely to be submitted by nuclear blackmail. That is the reason why we should have nuclear weapons. Here, there is no question of a parity as we talk in conventional armaments. If Pakistan is having two squadrons of F-16, India should have the same number of Mirage-2000. It is not like that. So, China, as I said, is having 17 and 400; whereas, America is having 35,000. Therefore, as people are saying, there will be a race and that too a very 'MAD' race of nuclear armaments in South-East Asia. That is not true because of the very fact that we must also have a nuclear policy that India should have a minimum nuclear force, as has been suggested by our hon. Member Dr. Manmohan Singh. We must choose our softer options. There should be a limited nuclear deterrent and a few nuclear bombs and with them the vehicle, that is the missile. And, similarly, the nuclear bombs which we tested are slightly different and therefore, the whole world intensity of the action and hostility is because of the very fact that India tested a hydrogen bomb. People know that hydrogen bomb is quite the last weapon in destruction and it is a very difficult technology which can be exploded. When I was in college, I learnt that China has tested a nuclear hydrogen bomb. I felt that India should test a hydrogen bomb and, therefore, I was very happy when I learnt that a hydrogen bomb was tested and therefore, there had been a very severe reaction from the nuclear weapon powers. Now, we know that there are five nuclear weapon powers. They are practising nuclear apartheid that no country should join them. They are having discriminatory policies. They are discouraging others but they are having their own way and monopoly in this world and, therefore, in our own interest if we manufacture and

test a nuclear weapon, we have done no wrong. It is a right decision. We have never violated any commitment, we have not violated any laws and, therefore, it is within our limits that we have done this thing. The second thing is: what will be the result of these tests? As I said there will be economic sanctions, but we are accustomed to these sanctions since 1956 when sanctions were applied. Then in 1974 when the first nuclear test was conducted by Indira Gandhi in Pokhran that was a good decision. At that time also Indira Gandhi, I believe, never consulted anybody. The CIA was taken by surprise and they also could not monitor this decision, as has happened in this case also. Such decisions are never shared and such momentous historic decisions are taken without consulting anybody. And therefore, this decision was taken. As far as sanctions are concerned, Madam, the sanctions are not going to affect much but definitely there will be difficulties, we will face some difficulties depending upon the time of the sanction. In short-term we may be able to manage, but if they are pulled out for two to three years we will be affected more. For example, after the application of sanctions what happens is that the Government-to-Government aid is prevented. The third thing is the institutions, the international financial institutions, which are under the control of USA, it gives them directions. I am to state here, Madam, today that the World Bank has signed an agreement on 22nd of May, that is, after the conduction of the nuclear test, and sanctioned 1524 crores of rupees to Gujarat Government to complete its Road Transport projects. This is one good significant incidence which has taken place. As sanctions may affect us, sanctions also affect the countries who apply sanctions. For example, India is emerging as a very big market. 250 million people who are from the middle class are coming up in India and, therefore, this market nobody would like to lose. There is no other place to invest money. The whole of South-East Asian countries have crashed. Their

economy crashed because they were more dependent on foreign aid and foreign loans. And, therefore, their condition is not like that in India. India is built by its own people in agriculture. Foreign investment is zero, in industry it is about ten per cent, in Service Sector it is about 2 to 3 per cent, our international trade is less than one per cent and, therefore, even if sanctions are applied, I feel that we will not be very much adversely affected. Therefore, we have to consolidate the gains which we have made. Before concluding, I would say that we hope to pursue this matter in consultation with the Leader of Opposition and many other eminent people. We should not stop here. It is a long gestation period. Missiles take ten years for development. We have to develop an ICBM, test "Surya" missile and develop hydrogen bomb capability. In the end, I quote a *sher*:

ना मुंह छिपाके जिये हम, ना सिर झुकाके जियें।
सितमगरो की नज़र से नज़र मिलाके जिये।
अब एक रात कम जिये तो कम ही सही।
यही बहुत है कि हम मशालें जलाके जिये।।

उपसभापति: गोपालराव जी, आप इतनी अच्छी शेरे-शायरी भी करते हैं। इससे तो अच्छा असर पड़ेगा। Now, has the Defence Minister intervened or will he intervene later on...(Interruptions)... Then, I would call Mr. Ram Gopal Yadav.

श्री रामगोपाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): धन्यवाद मैडम। मैडम, सेक्रेट वल्व बार के बाद कोरियाई युद्ध से लेकर ईराक और युनाइटेड स्टेट्स के बीच में जो लड़ाईयां हुई थीं, इस दौरान दर्जनों जगह युद्ध हुए थे और इसमें ऐसे देश भी इन्वॉल्व रहे जिनके पास बड़े पैमाने पर न्यूक्लियर वेपन्स थे। कोरिया के युद्ध में अमरीका पार्टी थी युनाइटेड नेशन्स के कवर में। कई देशों ने युद्ध लड़े थे। वियतनाम युद्ध में अमरीका को अपमानजनक स्थिति में पहुंचना पड़ा और उसे युद्ध से विद्रुह करना पड़ा अन्ततोगत्वा। ईराक के साथ जो युद्ध हुआ उसमें भी अमरीका एक पार्टी थी। लेकिन किसी भी लड़ाई में कहीं किसी न्यूक्लियर वेपन्स का प्रयोग नहीं हुआ।

मुझे आश्चर्य होता है कि एक तरफ हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं—

"Now, India has a big bomb." और एक बड़ा बम होते ही हम महाशक्ति हो गए? महाशक्ति होने के बाद हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री यह कहने से भी नहीं चूकते कि जरूरत पड़ने पर हम इसे एक्सप्लोड करेंगे। बड़ी से बड़ी ताकत ने कभी यह बात नहीं कही है। हिरोशिमा और नागासाकी पर बम गिरने के बाद इतनी विषम परिस्थितियों में अमरीका वियतनाम युद्ध में पहुंचा लेकिन कभी एटम बम, हाईड्रोजन बम या न्यूक्लियर मिसाइल्स के प्रयोग करने की बात नहीं सोची गई। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान ने एक बम के एक्सप्लोजन के बाद एटोमिक, न्यूक्लियर वेपन्स और मिसाइल के प्रयोग की बात की।...(व्यवधान)।

They were conventional missiles. Missiles without nuclear warheads were used either on Iraq or by Iraq.

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जैसा प्रणब मुखर्जी साहब ने कहा था कि लगभग 2447 परीक्षण अभी तक हो चुके हैं और यह सारी दुनिया जानती है कि उन सारे परीक्षणों में एक भी परीक्षण ऐसा नहीं हुआ जो फेल हुआ हो। तो क्या आप समझते हैं कि जिन देशों ने अभी तक एटोमिक एक्सप्लोजन्स नहीं किए उनके पास एटम बम नहीं हैं? क्या आप समझते हैं कि पाकिस्तान या इजराइल जैसे कई और देश हैं जिनके पास एटोमिक वेपन्स नहीं हैं? केवल एटोमिक एक्सप्लोजन्स करके अपने को महाशक्ति कहने लगे, तो फिर जिनके पास हजारों न्यूक्लियर वार हेड्स हैं उनसे आप कैसे कम्पेरिजन करेंगे? ऐसे देश हैं जिनके पास बम होने के साथ-साथ एक नहीं हजारों न्यूक्लियर वार हेड्स होंगे, स्टेटिस्टिकल्स पर जो किताब है, उसके अनुसार पाकिस्तान के पास लांग रेंज मिसाइल की संख्या हिन्दुस्तान से ज्यादा है।

मेरा कहना यह है कि पहली बार इस गवर्नमेंट ने राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के मामले को, राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा की नीति को विवादास्पद बना दिया है। इससे पहले किसी गवर्नमेंट ने इसको विवादास्पद नहीं बनाया था। यह सबसे दुखद बात है। जो एटोमिक एक्सप्लोजन हुए हैं उनका कोई विरोध नहीं कर रहा है। लेकिन जिस तरह से इसका प्रचार किया गया, जिस तरह से इसका प्रसार किया गया, उससे ऐसा लग रहा है कि जैसे बी०जे०पी० के हेडक्वार्टर्स से अटल जी गए हों, जेब में एटम बम ले गये हों और पोकरण में डाल दिया हो, ऐसा लग रहा है। आप गौरव दिवस मना रहे हैं। इसमें भारतीय जनता पार्टी के

अलावा और किसी पार्टी को शामिल करने की कोशिश नहीं की गई, सरकार में शामिल किसी पार्टी की भी उसमें शामिल करने की कोशिश नहीं की गई? माननीय रक्षा मंत्री जी यहां बैठे हुए हैं, क्या उनकी समता पार्टी को गौरव दिवस में शामिल किया गया है? बतायें कि कौन सी पार्टी, जो बी०जे०पी० के साथ सरकार में शामिल है, गौरव दिवस में शामिल थीं, पटाखे चलाने में शामिल थीं? मेरा कहने का मतलब यह है कि इस मामले को आपने राष्ट्रीय हित के बजाए दलीय हित के रूप में देखा है, जो कि बहुत खतरनाक है। यह सही है और इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती कि राष्ट्रीय हित किसी भी देश की विदेश नीति के निर्माण में सबसे इम्पॉर्टेंट फैक्टर होता है और जब राष्ट्रीय हित सर्वोपरि होता है तो जब राष्ट्रीय हित खतरे में होता है तो चाहे जो सिद्धांत हों, चाहे जो नीति हो, चाहे जो परंपराएँ हों, उन सब से हटकर भी देश के राष्ट्रीय हित के लिए अगर कोई कदम उठाने की जरूरत पड़ती है तो उसमें सरकार जो निर्णय लेती है और पूरा देश उसके साथ हुआ करता है। लेकिन राष्ट्रीय हित पीछे हो जाए और दलीय हित आगे हो जाए तो यह खतरनाक चीज होती है। इससे राष्ट्र का हित नहीं होता है बल्कि इससे राष्ट्र को नुकसान होता है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि एक तरफ तो आप बहुत लंबी लंबी बातें कहते हैं। कोई कहता है कि अब शक्ति संतुलन बदल गया है, पाकिस्तान बाज आए वरना...., कोई कहता है जैसे दंगल में किसी के साथ लड़ा जाता है कि कहां लड़ेंगे, किस जगह लड़ेंगे, तारीख तय कर लीजिए, वेन्यू तय कर लीजिए, कोई कुछ और बात कहता है, इससे काम नहीं चल सकता। अटल जी जब हिन्दुस्तान के विदेश मंत्री थे तो जिस दिन वह चीन में थे, उसी दिन चीन ने वियतनाम पर आक्रमण कर दिया। आप लोगों को याद होगा। Atalji was very much in Beijing. लेकिन मुझे याद है कि जब वे वहां थे तो उसी दिन चीन ने वियतनाम पर आक्रमण किया था। चीन ने इसी तरह से हिन्दुस्तान पर आक्रमण किया था। जो चीन का तरीका रहा है उसको देखते हुए बजाए, जो हम कह रहे हैं वह कहने के हमें अपनी तैयारी दूसरी तरीके से जारी रखनी चाहिए थी। अगर दुश्मन को यह मालूम पड़ जाए कि इनके तरकश में कितने तीर हैं तो बराबरी तो वह कर ही लेगा। क्या आवश्यकता थी जब माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी दुनिया को बताने जा रहे थे कि हमने एटामिक एक्सप्लोजन किए हैं, तो ऐसा बताने की क्या आवश्यकता थी कि उसमें एक फ्यूजन डिवाइस भी था, न्यूक्लियर फ्यूजन और जिस वक्त प्रधानमंत्री ने कहा कि फ्यूजन डिवाइस, और हाइड्रोजन बम से संबंधित फ्यूजन भी था तो उसी वक्त हम समझ गए

थे—इसका दुनिया में रीएक्शन बहुत तेज होगा। जब एक्सप्लोजन हो रहे हैं, और इतने साफिस्टिकेटेड डिवाइज से और इतने बढ़िया तरीके से किया जा रहा है तो यह बताने की क्या आवश्यकता थी कि जो एटामिक एक्सप्लोजन हुआ है उसमें हाइड्रोजन बम का भी एक्सप्लोजन किया जा रहा है क्योंकि दुनिया की वे ताकतें जिन्होंने एटामिक एक्सप्लोजन करने के बाद हाइड्रोजन बम बनाए हैं उसमें उन्होंने दस-दस साल लगा दिए हैं। चाहे अमेरिका हो और चाहे तत्कालीन सोवियत यूनियन हो, ये देश यह चीज पसंद नहीं कर सकते हैं कि आप एक साथ एटामिक बम और हाइड्रोजन बम का एक्सप्लोजन करें। This was strategically wrong, और जब आपने कर ही दिया, जब स्वयं यह कहते हैं कि हम बड़ी ताकत बन गए तो फिर स्पष्टीकरण देने की कौन सी जरूरत है? क्या ब्रिटेन ने कभी दुनिया को यह बताने की कोशिश की कि हम क्यों बम बना रहे हैं? क्या कभी फ्रांस ने यह बताया? कभी चीन ने यह बताया? अमेरिका और तत्कालीन सोवियत यूनियन या वर्तमान रूस को तो छोड़ दीजिये, चीन की तो यह स्थिति है कि एन०पी०टी० ट्रीटी पर उधर चर्चा हुई और हस्ताक्षर होने शुरू हुए तो उसके तुरंत बाद उसने हाइड्रोजन बम का एक्सप्लोजन कर दिया। जब साल्ट-वन पर, स्ट्रेटजिक आर्म्स लिमिटेशन ट्रीटी पर दोनों सुपर पावर्स ने हस्ताक्षर किये तो चीन ने उसके बाद न्यूक्लियर इंटरकांटीनेंटल बलास्टिक मिसाइल पर अंतरिक्ष में भेज दी। कभी किसी की बात कोई नहीं मानी चीन ने। कभी स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया और आप स्पष्टीकरण दे रहे हैं कि हम चीन और पाकिस्तान की वजह से बम बना रहे हैं। स्ट्रेटजी की दृष्टि से, डिप्लोमैटिक प्वाइंट आफ व्यू से भी यह गलत है। यह नहीं होना चाहिये। यह कभी किसी देश ने नहीं किया। एक तरफ सेंक्शंस की जब बात होती है तो यह कहते हैं कि इससे कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ने वाला है। कल जब प्रधानमंत्री जी जवाब देंगे तो यह बताने का कष्ट करेंगे कि 11 मई के बाद 4 दिन के अन्दर दुनिया की बड़ी बड़ी कम्पनीज़ को, किन किन कम्पनीज़ को क्या क्या सहूलियतें हिन्दुस्तान में दी गई? सारा देश यह जानना चाहता है कि लगभग 50 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर जमीन बिहार, मध्य प्रदेश, महाराष्ट्र और कुछ अन्य राज्यों में मल्टीनेशनल कम्पनीज़ को पट्टे पर माइनिंग के लिए दी गई। एटोमिक एक्सप्लोजन के चार दिन के अन्दर ऐसा क्यों किया गया? क्या यह जानते हुए कि यह मल्टी नेशनल कम्पनीज़ अपने-अपने देशों पर दबाव डालेगी कि सेंक्शंस नहीं लगाए। कहां गया आपका स्वदेशी का विचार और आपकी स्वदेशी की थ्योरी? जब आप माइनिंग के लिए विदेशी कम्पनियों को ज़मीन दे रहे हैं तो

सिक्कुरिटी के लिए क्या खतरा हो सकता है, क्या आपने कभी इस पर विचार किया है? हम लोग यह देखते हैं कि छोटी-छोटी माइनिंग के लिए, पत्थरों को तोड़ने के लिए, पहाड़ों को तोड़ने के लिए एक्सप्लोजन का प्रयोग किया जाता है। यहां पर भी एक्सप्लोसिव विदेशी कम्पनियां लाएंगी जिनका माइनिंग के लिए प्रयोग होगा। यह सोफिस्टीकेटेड एक्सप्लोसिव होंगे तो इसका आपको सिक्कुरिटी पर क्या प्रभाव होगा, क्या कभी आपने इस पर विचार किया है? मैं यह कह रहा था कि सारी बातें यह साबित करती हैं कि केवल पोलिटिकल माइलेज के लिए, राजनीतिक लाभ के लिए यह चीज की गई। टाइम बचाने के लिए मैं केवल एक ही उदाहरण देना चाहूंगा। 11 मई को एक्सप्लोजन हुआ। इसके ठीक एक माह पहले 13 से 19 अप्रैल के संडे मैग्जीन के अंक में एक जगह इस बात का उल्लेख है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर के एक बहुत निकट सहायोगी हैं, उत्तर प्रदेश में सीनियर मिनिस्टर हैं और इनकी पार्लियामेंटरी कॉन्स्टीट्यूमेंसी से संबंध रखते हैं, उनका स्टेटमेंट इस अंक में कोट किया है। उसमें उन्होंने कहा कि मैंने तो उनसे कह दिया कि आप एटम बम फोड़ दीजिये। यह अमरीका, चीन और पाकिस्तान चिल्लाते रह जायेंगे और जय ललिता और स्वामी के मुंह भी बंद हो जाएंगे। आगे उसमें वह लिखता है ... (व्यवधान) आप देख लीजिये, 13 से 19 अप्रैल का संडे मैग्जीन है, उनको मैं कोट कर रहा हूँ। (व्यवधान) इसके पहले क्या कभी किसी ने खंडन किया है? तो फिर क्यों कह रहे हैं इस बात को? इसके बाद उन्होंने यहां तक कहा कि मैंने कहा कि बम न हो तो कोई बड़ा पटाखा ही फोड़ दीजिये। कौन जानता है, कौन देखता है? उत्तर प्रदेश में उस समय इस बात को किसी ने सीरियसली नहीं लिया, उत्तर प्रदेश में जैसी स्थिति है उत्तर प्रदेश के मंत्रिमंडल से जैसे मंत्री हैं वह तो बम और बंदूक की रोज बात करते हैं। Nobody took it seriously. लेकिन जब यह हुआ तब लोगों ने समझा कि यह तो पहले से ही योजना थी और योजना यह नहीं थी कि कोई अंतरिक्ष पर हस्ताक्षर कर दिये... योजना यह थी कि किस तरह से—जो ये सर्वानुमति की बात करते हैं और अपनी पार्टियों के अंदर सर्वानुमति नहीं बना पा रहे हैं—उसको कैसे चेक किया जाए। मैडम, मेरा यह कहना है कि किसी बाहरी ताकत से देश को खतरा नहीं है। खतरा देश के अंदर रहने वाली उन ताकतों से है जो इस देश को तोड़ने की साजिश में लगी हुई हैं, जो इस देश में दंगा-फसाद कर कर, धर्म के नाम पर लोगों को उकसाकर, धार्मिक उन्माद पैदा करके, तनाव पैदा करके देश में विघटनकारी ताकतों को मजबूत करने की कोशिश कर रही हैं। खतरा

उससे है। देश को कोई बाहर से खतरा नहीं हो सकता है। न पहले से था। आज की जो स्थिति है उसमें छोटे से छोटे देश पर बड़े से बड़े देश अगर हमला भी कर देते हैं तो उसका कुछ बिगाड़ नहीं पाते हैं। ऐसी स्थिति हो गयी है आज के इस युग में, इस वैज्ञानिक युग में। तो यह खतरा नहीं है। लेकिन एक खतरा आपने पैदा कर दिया है। इस गवर्नमेंट ने पैदा कर दिया है मैडम और वह खतरा यह है कि इससे पहले की सारी सरकारों की कोशिश यह रही कि हिंदुस्तान स्वयं रणक्षेत्र न बने, अगर लड़ाई हो तो कहीं इधर-उधर। लेकिन अब खतरा यह हो गया है जब आपने प्वाइंट आउट कर दिया, स्पेसिफिकली बता दिया है कि ये हमारे दुश्मन हैं, ये हमारे दुश्मन हैं। तो दोनों दुश्मन हैं। एक तरफ एक दुश्मन और दूसरा दुश्मन दूसरी तरफ। एक दुश्मन उसमें बहुत ताकतवर भी है। यह कोई खोकार करे या न करे लेकिन यह एक तथ्य है।

जार्ज साहब बैठे हुए हैं। चीन की वर्किंग देखते हैं। हम लोगों को यह खतरा हो गया है कि आप लोगों के बयान के बाद जब चीन ने बयान दिया कि 90 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर हमारी जमीन हिंदुस्तान ने दबा ली है तो इसका अर्थ क्या है। इसका अर्थ यह है कि जबर्दस्ती कोई लड़ना चाहता है आपसे। सारी दुनिया जानती है कि आपके ऊपर आक्रमण किया था 62 में सारी दुनिया जानती है कि हिंदुस्तान की जमीन पर चीन कर कब्जा है। लेकिन चीन कह रहा है कि 90 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर जमीन हिंदुस्तान ने कब्जे में ली हुई है। इसका मतलब क्या है? कल वह यह भी कह सकता है कि फलों तारीख तक वह-वह जगह खाली कीजिए, अन्यथा। आप ही "अन्यथा" नहीं कह सकते हैं, वह भी कह सकता है और वर्किंग चीन की इस तरह की रही है कि अब यह खतरा हिंदुस्तान को पैदा हो गया है। इस तरह के किसी भी खतरे के लिए अगर कोई होता है तो पूरा देश यूनाइटेड होकर आपके साथ होगा। यह जो एक प्रचार कर रहे हैं कि "विरोध कर रहे हैं" या जो इस वक्त बी०जे०पी० के एक्सन्स का विरोध करे वह देशद्रोही और जो समर्थन करे वह देशभक्त, यह चीज नहीं होनी चाहिए। जो वास्तविकता है आप देखिएगा कि किस-किस देश से खतरा है। यह साइंटिस्ट्स आपको कह सकते हैं। आपकी थिंकिंग क्या है? जो हिंदुस्तान की न्यूक्लियर मिसाइल टेक्नालजी के जनक हैं डा० अब्दुल कलाम—एक साल पहले इलाहाबाद यूनिवर्सिटी ने जब उन्हें डॉक्टरेट की मानद उपाधि दी, मैडम, मैं आपका ध्यान चाहूंगा तो बी०जे०पी० के एक इलाहाबाद जिले के एम०एल०ए० जो हंडिया क्षेत्र से हैं, इलाहाबाद यूनिवर्सिटी स्टूडेंट यूनियन के प्रेजिडेंट भी कभी रहे, आज वहां मंत्री

हैं, उन्होंने अब्दुल कलाम के खिलाफ नारेबाजी की, पूरा विरोध किया, वाक आउट किया और कहा कि यूनिवर्सिटी इस मुसलमान को डी०एल्टि० उपाधि कैसे दे रही है ... (व्यवधान)

प्रो० राम बख्श सिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश): वे आपके साथी थे ... (व्यवधान)

श्री रामगोपाल यादव: श्रीमान जी, वह इनकी पार्टी से चुनाव लड़े थे, अभी अभी एक साल पहले ... (व्यवधान) यह इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि आप उसको पोलिटिकल ... (व्यवधान) बना रहे हैं। यह मैं इसलिए कहना चाहता हूँ कि कल दूसरे सदन में एक बात आपके एक बहुत बड़े, वरिष्ठ नेता ने भाषण देते हुए कही कि हिंदुस्तान के कुछ वैज्ञानिक हटना चाहते हैं, अवकाश लेना चाहते हैं। क्यों अवकाश लेना चाहते हैं? अगर इस तरह के वैज्ञानिकों के साथ इस तरह की अभद्रता होगी तो अवकाश लेने की कोशिश करेंगे, टैट वाज द रीजन बिहाइंड टैट। इसलिए मैं यह कह रहा हूँ वरना मैं कभी यह बात ... (व्यवधान) नहीं लाता। मैं नहीं लाना चाहता था इस तरह की बात। यह तथ्य है। मानसिकता इस तरह की है। इसी मानसिकता से इस देश को खतरा है और किसी मानसिकता से नहीं। यह मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसी देश से खतरा नहीं। देश के अंदर अगर आप जाति और धर्म के नाम पर सोचेंगे तो यह देश के इंटेरेस्ट में नहीं है। अभी आपने सुना वे कोर्ट तो कर रहे थे और आपने कहा कि विश्व हिंदू परिषद में नहीं है? मैं जानता हूँ विश्व हिंदू परिषद के वाइस प्रेसीडेंट बी०जे०पी० की टिकट पर लोक सभा में आए और पिछली लोक सभा में मैनबर थे। आप कहते हैं कि विश्व हिंदू परिषद से कोई बास्ता नहीं है। बी०एच०पी० के पदाधिकारी और बी०जे०पी० के एम०पी० लोक सभा के सदस्य, बनारस से कौन एम०पी० था, शिरीष चंद दीक्षित किस पार्टी के थे, विश्व हिंदू परिषद में किस पद पर थे? देश के अंदर स्थिति यह है कि 145 किसान ऑन रेकार्ड यह अभी है स्टेट गवर्नमेंट कुछ कहें, महाराष्ट्र में, आन्ध्र में और कर्णाटक में 145 किसान अभी तक आत्महत्या कर चुके हैं। उन्हीं का कर्ज बैंकों से मुआफ़ करवा दो औरों का तो छोड़िए, नेशनल कैलामिटीज़ हुआ, क्या हुआ, क्या नहीं हुआ। तमाम अस्तिचित्त जमीन पड़ी हुई है, उसके लिए कुछ करिए। राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के मामले में तो कोई किसी से पीछे नहीं है, पूरा देश एक है, कभी विरोध नहीं किया जा सकता है और न विरोध कोई कर रहा है। लेकिन अपने तौर-तरीके संभालिए। देश को अब वास्तव में खतरा हो गया है। इसलिए अब सब को साथ लेकर चलने की कोशिश कीजिए।

बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

रक्षा मंत्री (श्री जार्ज फर्नांडिस): उपसभापति जी, मुझे खुशी है कि एक बात पर हम लोग सहमत हैं कि हमारे वैज्ञानिकों ने लाजवाब काम किया है। डा० अब्दुल कलाम, डा० चिदम्बरम्, डा० काकोडकर और संधानम इन चार लोगों के नाम मैं लेना जरूरी समझता हूँ और यह बहस आज नहीं होती अगर इन लोगों ने इस प्रकार का अपनी बुद्धि का और अपनी कला का प्रदर्शन नहीं किया होता। एक प्रश्न है कि जिस प्रकार सब से अधिक विवाद आज चल रहा है और इस सदन में भी वही विवाद है कि अभी क्यों हुआ, पोखरण में अभी क्यों हुआ? हो सकता है कि यह पहले होना चाहिए था या पहले हो जाता जैसे कांग्रेस के ए०आई०सी०सी० के एक मंत्री हैं मेजर सुधीर सावंत, उन्होंने अभी 24 तारीख को यह कहा और यह छपा है कि 1995 में जब पी०वी० नरसिंह राव प्रधान मंत्री थे और साथ-साथ देश के रक्षा मंत्री भी थे, तो 1995 के अक्टूबर महीने में शायद उन्होंने महीना नहीं कहा हो, लेकिन 1995 में इस बात का फैसला आगे इसलिए नहीं बढ़ाया गया चूंकि यह महसूस किया गया कि सिर्फ अणु हथियार अपने हाथों में बनाए रखना ही काफी नहीं है, उसका इस्तेमाल करने के लिए जो वाहन, साधन चाहिए उसे भी बनाना जरूरी है। उनके शब्दों में he said, "In 1995, the Rao Government had not gone ahead with tests as it focussed on developing delivery systems like Su-30. जो वायुयान रूस से खरीदा है, Mirage-2000 and Agni missile. He said, "The Government paid attention to developing the delivery systems as the Non-Proliferation Treaty was indefinitely extended." हो सकता है कि इस पर उस समय की सरकार के मंत्री कुछ प्रकाश भी डाल सकते हों। मगर यह ए०आई०सी०सी० के सेक्रेटरी का बयान है। बहुत जिम्मेदार आदमी है। केवल सेना में ही नहीं रहा है और केवल लोक सभा में ही चुनकर नहीं आया है, बल्कि जब वह सेना में था तब मिलिट्री इंस्टीट्यूट में था और ऐसे सेंसेटिव इलाके में था, वही बता सकता है। लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ, नहीं बताऊंगा। फिर उप-सभापति जी, 1997 के अक्टूबर महीने में यह होने वाला ही था यानी टेस्ट होना तय था और इस के गवाह तत्कालीन रक्षा मंत्री श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव हैं। एक नहीं, अनेक बार उन के बयान हैं। बोमई साहब, आप तो उस समय उसी मंत्रिमंडल में मंत्री थे और मुलायम सिंह यादव ने सार्वजनिक तौर पर यह कहा, दूसरे सदन में कही हुई बात इस सदन में नहीं कही जा सकती, इसलिए मैं उसे नहीं कह रहा हूँ, क्योंकि कल उन्होंने जो बात कही वह तो लायब्रेरी में है, वह तो

अखबारों में छपी है, लेकिन मुलायम सिंह यादव जी ने जोकि रक्षा मंत्री थे, अनेक बार यह कहा कि 1997 के अक्टूबर महीने में विस्फोट करना तय था, लेकिन चुनाव का एलान हो गया, इसलिए नहीं हो पाया। गुजराल साहब का भी एक बयान बीबीसी टेलीविजन को दिए इंटरव्यू के बारे में अखबारों में छपकर आया है। अब मैं टेलीविजन नहीं देखता हूँ ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE:
But he contradicted it.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Yes, he contradicted it. I am only making a point. Let me complete my point. You will not find anything objectionable in that.

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस: उन्होंने बीबीसी टेलीविजन को कहा, यह अखबारों में छपकर आया है। मैंने यह बात कही है और यहाँ भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि न मैं रीडियो सुनता हूँ, न टेलीविजन देखता हूँ, इसलिए जो अखबारों में आया है उसी के आधार पर यह बात हम छेड़ सकते हैं।

प्रश्न यह है कि मुलायम सिंह यादव जी इस बात को बहुत मजबूती के साथ कहते हैं कि मैं कभी झूठ नहीं बोलता हूँ, मैं सच बोलता हूँ और जब मुलायम सिंह यादव कहते हैं कि अक्टूबर महीने में विस्फोट होना तय था तो क्या मुलायम सिंह यादव जी रक्षा मंत्री के नाते अनुबन्धन का प्रयोग पोखरण में करने वाले थे? अब जो भी प्रधान मंत्री थे, उन को खोजकर लाकर उन से पूछना होगा, पूछा जाएगा और पूछना चाहिए। मैं यहाँ पर विवाद करने के लिए यह बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि बार-बार यह प्रश्न आ रहा है और इतने प्रभुद्ध लोगों ने यह प्रश्न छेड़ा है जिन को ज्यादा मालूम है कि अभी क्यों। तो वह इसलिए कि जब टैस्ट करने का फैसला अनेक बार कर-कर के नहीं किया गया, टेस्ट नहीं किया गया तो इसलिए हमारी सरकार ने इसे कर दिया।

अब सवाल उठता है कि क्या यह जरूरी था? तो वह तर्क वहीं खत्म हो जाता है जब हम लोगों का 1995 और 97 में, मैं उस के पीछे नहीं जाऊँगा, इस प्रकार का सोच हुआ था, निर्णय हुए थे। फिर अलग-अलग कारणों के चलते वह निर्णय अमल में नहीं आए। तो उपसमाप्तिजी इस परिस्थिति में हम यह भी मान सकते हैं कि इस की जरूरत है यह लोगों ने महसूस किया था। तो जब जरूरत है, महसूस कर के यहाँ तक उस को पहुँचा दिया और कई कारणों के चलते हो सकता है वहाँ

तक पहुँच गए फिर हिम्मत नहीं हुई और सोच लिया कि भाई वापिस चलो पता नहीं क्या होगा, दुनियाभर के लोग क्या बोलेंगे, पता नहीं देश के भीतर कौन क्या कहेगा, क्या वाद-विवाद होंगे? अनेक कारण आए होंगे, अनेक विचारों से परेशान हुए होंगे ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: Madam, I am on a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bommai, what is your point of order?

श्री एस० आर० बोम्माई: मैडम, सोचा था, निर्णय कभी नहीं हुआ।

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस: खैर, मैं तो जो बात सार्वजनिक हो चुकी है, उसी को कह रहा हूँ बोम्माई साहब। मैं अपने मन की बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मैं कोई काल्पनिक बात नहीं रख रहा हूँ। जो बातें लिखित, मौखिक और स्पष्ट शब्दों में कही गयी हैं, केवल उन्हीं का यहाँ पर जिक्र कर रहा हूँ और मैं फिर कहता हूँ कि विवाद बढ़ाने के लिए नहीं। केवल यह तर्क देने के लिए कि जो निर्णय हम लोगों ने लिया, उस निर्णय के पीछे आज यह जो यहाँ पर कहा, आज क्यों, आज ही क्यों, यह सारे जो प्रश्न हैं, यह प्रश्न अभी कोई मतलब नहीं रखते, यह बताने के लिए मैं बड़े आग्रह के साथ सदन के सामने इसे रख रहा हूँ।

इतना कहने के बाद, मैडम, यहाँ एक और प्रश्न जबसे यह बहस शुरू हुई है, किसी न किसी रूप में लगभग हर वक्ता, सदस्य ने यहाँ पर छेड़ा है कि आज ऐसा तत्काल आपको कोनसा खतरा दिखाई दिया। हम नहीं मानते हैं कि खतरा सामने बिल्कुल ही जब आए कि भाई, युद्ध की तैयारी किसी ने की है या हम लोगों के ऊपर अभी आक्रमण करने की तैयारी किसी ने की है और तब हम लोग, कैसे अपने को बचाया जाए, उस पर सोचने के लिए कोई अपना दिमाग बनाए और फिर अपने कारखाने फिर से खोलें, यह काम इतना आसान नहीं है। एक सू-थर्टी, जिसको खरीदने का फैसला हुआ था और जिसके कुछ विमान हम लोग ला चुके हैं तो उस सू-थर्टी को बनाने में दस साल लगे, वह सू-थर्टी ड्राइंग-बोर्ड के ऊपर शुरू करके बनाने में। अभी उसकी पूरी डिलीवरी नहीं हो पा रही है। चूँकि यहाँ भी उसमें और सुधार पर, कहां क्या कमजोरी है, आदि आदि पर चर्चा हो रही है। केवल ड्राइंग बोर्ड से लेकर आपके हवाई अड्डे तक पहुँचाने में दस साल लगे। आवडी टैंक बन रहा है। वह टैंक बनाने के लिए, ड्राइंग बोर्ड पर उसे डाले बीस साल हो गए। इसलिए यह जो प्रश्न बार बार छेड़ा जा रहा है और ऐसे लोगों की ओर से, जिनको

ज्यादा इसका मालूम है, कि यह अभी क्यों, कौनसा आपको खतरा दिखाई दिया, कहां कौन दुश्मन आ गया। तो यहां घर मेहमान आ गया और बाजू की दुकान पर जाकर कहें कि चलो, उसको क्या खिलाएं, पिलाएं। तो यह बात तो नहीं होती, न? अचानक मेहमान आ गया, चलो जल्दी जाकर कुछ ले आओ, खिलाओ, पिलाओ, बैठाओ। यह बात तो अच्छी नहीं है, न? देश की सुरक्षा की जब बात होती है तो सोच आज की नहीं होती, कल परसों की भी नहीं होती, सोच होती है कई सालों की। चूंकि जो तैयारियां करनी हैं, दूसरे की जो तैयारी है तो हमारी अपनी रक्षा के लिए भी तैयारी होनी है और वह भी उसके लिए काल बांधकर तय करनी होगी। इसलिए, उपसभापति जी, यह जो तर्क दिया गया है, हम समझते हैं कि यह तर्क हम लोगों को नहीं देना चाहिए।

मैडम, डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी ने बहुत ही बढ़िया यहां पर भाषण दिया। उन्होंने कहा कि मैंने दूसरे सदन में यह रिपोर्ट्स रखीं। रिपोर्ट्स का मैंने जिक्र किया, मैंने उसमें से कुछ कहा नहीं, डाक्टर साहब। मैंने उसमें क्या लिखा है, वह नहीं कहा और मैं नहीं कहूंगा ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री प्रणब मुखर्जी: नहीं कहना चाहिए।

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस: नहीं कहना चाहिए, न? धैर्य यू। मगर यह छपा है। यह रिपोर्ट सार्वजनिक है, सीक्रेट रिपोर्ट नहीं है।

श्री वसीम अहमद: तो फिर कह दीजिए।

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस: नहीं, हम नहीं कहेंगे। रक्षा मंत्री के कहने पर, सुना है कि उसका कुछ अलग असर हो जाता है। चूंकि अभी बोम्बई साहब ने यहां पर कहा कि जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस ने चीन को ऐनेमी नंबर वन करके कहा है। तो बोम्बई साहब मैंने यह ख्याब में भी नहीं कहा।

श्री एस० आर० बोम्बई: पेपर में छपा है।

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस: वही तो मुसीबत है। ... (व्यवधान) ... वही तो मुसीबत है। आप एक ही अखबार को पढ़ते होंगे। चूंकि एक ही अखबार में यह छपा और बाद में सब लोगों ने उसी को कहना शुरू किया। हम ऐनेमी नंबर वन करके चीन को कैसे कहेंगे? ... (व्यवधान) ... मैंने अपनी बात कही थी, जब मुझसे एक टेलीविजन इंटरव्यू में यह प्रश्न पूछा गया था—

"Do you consider China as an enemy?" I said, "No."

"You don't think China is an enemy No. 1?" I said, "No."

However, let me put it this way: "I do consider that China is a potential threat."

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: What is potential threat?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You don't understand the difference between a threat and an enemy! ... (interruptions) ... I am sorry, then I should not ... (interruptions) ... There is no difference between an enemy and a threat, and an enemy is an enemy. ... (interruptions) ...

SHRI KHAGEN DAS: How can a friend threaten? ... (interruptions) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just one minute, please.

श्री वसीम अहमद: मैडम, सिर्फ ऐनेमी इनको नजर आया, इससे पहले किसी सरकार को नजर नहीं आया? ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, I want to seek one clarification, if you allow me. (interruptions) ... Unless you sit down, how can I speak?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Yes, I will sit down.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Is it fair on the part of a Minister to describe a State with which we have friendly relations as a potential threat or even use these words? If he says "yes", I will agree.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Madam, just one minute.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If we are going to have a question and answer session, it would be difficult.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, I would like Mr. George to differentiate between threat and enemy. Threat comes only from enemies. Friends to do not hold out any threat. Therefore, Madam, I would like to know... ... (interruptions) ...

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I don't yield.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Madam, let him clarify.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish.

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस: उपसभापति जी, मुझे अपनी बात कहने की इजाजत दीजिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish. (Interruptions)...

श्री वसीम अहमद: मैडम, मैं सिर्फ एक बात कहना चाहूंगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish please. आपका नाम मेरी लिस्ट में है, आप बैठ जाइए।

श्री वसीम अहमद: मैडम, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कोई श्रेट है कंट्री के लिए तो गवर्नमेंट को खुल कर बताना चाहिए था कि यह श्रेट है, उसके बाद फिर चाहे जो करते। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस: यह सब इन रिपोर्ट्स में है, इनको पढ़ लीजिए।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: इसमें बहुत सारी चीजें हैं, हमने पढ़ा है उसको। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री वसीम अहमद: तो बताइए न। ... (व्यवधान) ... बिल्कुल, हाउस में बताइए कि क्या श्रेट है? ... (व्यवधान) ... बताइए। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस: इन रिपोर्ट्स को पढ़ लीजिएगा। ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: What does he think of himself? (Interruptions)...

श्री वसीम अहमद: मैडम, क्योंकि कंट्री के लिए श्रेट है तो यह आपको बताना चाहिए हाउस के अंदर कि क्या श्रेट है? ... (व्यवधान) ... कंट्री के लिए श्रेट है और यह पब्लिक डायक्यूमेंट है, इसलिए आपको बताना चाहिए। ... (व्यवधान) ... कंट्री के लिए श्रेट है तो आपको बताना चाहिए सदन के अंदर। ... (व्यवधान) ... क्या बात कर रहे हैं आप? ... (व्यवधान) ... कंट्री के लिए श्रेट है तो फिर बताइए न कि क्या श्रेट है? ... (व्यवधान) ... क्या श्रेट है बताइए? ... (व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. (Interruptions) ... Let him finish, please. (Interruptions)...

श्री वसीम अहमद: कंट्री के लिए क्या श्रेट है आपको बताना चाहिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभापति: वसीम साहब, आप बैठिए, आपने पूछ लिया। ... (व्यवधान) ... Now you have asked. Let him answer. (Interruptions)...

श्री वसीम अहमद: क्या श्रेट है बताइए? ... (व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister answer. (Interruptions)...

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल (राजस्थान): चाइना ने आक्रमण किया था इस देश के ऊपर ... (व्यवधान) ... चाइना ने आक्रमण किया था इस देश पर और हमारी 90 हजार किलोमीटर ज़मीन ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री वसीम अहमद: आप बताइए क्या श्रेट है? ... (व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. (Interruptions) ... Please sit down. (Interruptions)...

वसीम साहब, आपने पूछ लिया है, आप बैठ जाइए। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री वसीम अहमद: बीईंग ए मैम्बर मुझे यह हक हासिल है कि मैं पूछूँ कि क्या श्रेट है?

उपसभापति: आपने पूछ लिया, अब उनको जवाब देने दीजिए।

श्री वसीम अहमद: उनको बताना चाहिए कि क्या श्रेट है, यह आम बात नहीं है। ... (व्यवधान) ... क्या बात कर रहे हैं आप? ... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभापति: बैठिए, बैठिए। ... (व्यवधान) ... आप बैठ जाइए। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल: उसने आक्रमण किया था। ... (व्यवधान) ... उसने दोस्त बनकर आक्रमण किया था। ... (व्यवधान) ... कृष्णा मेनन् को जाना पड़ा था। ... (व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please cool down. (Interruptions) ... Agarwalji, please sit down. (Interruptions) ... I am very sorry even the Defence Minister has some defence behind him. I think he can take care of himself. (Interruptions) ... Let the Defence Minister defend the country and himself, if he doesn't need you. (Interruptions) ... Let him speak. (Interruptions)...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Madam, what is this? (Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him defend himself and his views. Why are you bothering him? (*Interruptions*)... All right. Let him answer. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Madam, let him read out. (*Interruptions*)... इसमें बहुत कुछ है पढ़ लीजिएगा।

What is going on in this country for the last two days? (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him answer. (*Interruptions*)...

श्री वसीम अहमद: एक मिनट, मैडम, मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ।

उपसभापति: आप बोलिये, अब आपको अपनी बात बोलने दीजिए न।

श्री वसीम अहमद: हम शेट के डिस्कशन में नहीं जाना चाहते, लेकिन उन्हें सिम्बॉलिकली यह बताना चाहिए कि किस किस का शेट है? ... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभापति: अच्छा बैठिए, आपको आप जवाब तो देने दीजिए न। ... (व्यवधान) ... Let him answer. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI BRAHMAKUMAR BHATT: Madam, he has stated that China had made a helipad in Arunachal Pradesh. (*Interruptions*)... I would like to know whether he has collected the information from the Army. (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now he will clarify. He is still speaking in the House. He will clarify all your points and concerns about the threat perception. He is standing to tell you that only. (*Interruptions*)...

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडिस: महोदय, यहाँ पर एक तर्क दिया गया डा० मनमोहन सिंह की ओर से कि स्टैंडिंग कमेटी ऑफ पार्लियामेंट, मिनिस्ट्री ऑफ डिफेंस की जो अनेक रिपोर्ट्स हैं, जिनका हमने उल्लेख किया, उनके कहने के मुताबिक उनका कोई महत्व नहीं है। वे बोले कि सरकार को अपना शेट परसेप्शन कहना चाहिए। महोदय, हम यह मानते हैं कि सरकार से श्रेष्ठ संसद है और जब संसद की कमेटियाँ और विशेषकर रक्षा विभाग की स्टैंडिंग कमेटी एक साल में अनेक रिपोर्ट्स तैयार करती है, जिनमें देश के सामने क्या चुनौतियाँ हैं, उन चुनौतियों का सामना करने के लिए हमें क्या करना

चाहिए, कहाँ-कहाँ से वे चुनौतियाँ हैं, जब वे कमेटियाँ इन बातों को देश के सामने, केवल संसद के सामने नहीं बल्कि देश के सामने रखती हैं, चूंकि वे सार्वजनिक दस्तावेज हैं, तो फिर सरकार उस पर दखल नहीं करेगी? आपकी बोली से तो मुझे ऐसा लगा कि आपने उसकी दखल नहीं ली लेकिन अगर सरकार उसमें दखल नहीं लेगी तो फिर वह बहुत बड़ा गलत काम होगा।

मैं यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि आपकी सरकार ने दखल नहीं ली। नहीं ली होती तो जिस मोड़ पर आकर हम लोग पहुँचे हैं, उस मोड़ पर नहीं पहुँच पाते। दखल तो ली, कुछ काम अपने ढंग से किए, संसद के भीतर इस पर कुछ बातें हुई। इसमें एक रिपोर्ट उस कमेटी की है जिसके अध्यक्ष इंद्रजीत गुप्ता थे और उस रिपोर्ट में जो भी बातें लिखी हैं, वे बातें, वे निष्कर्ष श्री इंद्रजीत गुप्ता की सदारत में गठित स्टैंडिंग कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के प्राथम्य से सामने आए हैं। इसमें किसी दल की बात नहीं है ... (व्यवधान)

श्री वसीम अहमद: इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि जो पिछली सरकारें थीं, अगर उनके सामने शेट था तो उन्होंने उसे सीरियसली नहीं लिया ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति: वह बता रहे हैं न। ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: We are ignorant people. Please read it out for us.

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडिस: अब एक स्थान पर इंद्रजीत गुप्ता इसके अध्यक्ष हैं तो दूसरे स्थान पर शरद टिघ उसके अध्यक्ष हैं। इसलिए इसमें किसी एक दल का, किसी एक विचारधारा का निष्कर्ष नहीं है जिसके आधार पर यह चीज तय हुई हो। यह बात नहीं है। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: Madam, I am on a point of order.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, I am on a point of order? (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One person at a time. Mr. Fernandes.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: Madam, I am very grateful to the hon. Defence Minister because he is taking cognizance of the report of a Parliamentary Standing Committee. We all know that reports of the Parliamentary Standing Committees are of recommendatory

On Recent

nature. For the first time the hon. Defence Minister is taking cognizance of the report. It is an open document. It has been placed on the Table of the House. Is it appropriate for the Defence Minister of the country to sever relations with a friendly country merely based on the report of a Parliamentary Standing Committee and not take into cognizance the threat perception given by the military intelligence? All the time the hon. Defence Minister is quoting two books. But he is not reading even one sentence. I feel that he is misleading the House and he is misleading the country because the debate is being televised. I would request the hon. Defence Minister to read out the relevant portion. It is not appropriate for him to cast aspersions on certain Members or the Chairman of the Committee who have given the report. I don't think it will suffice for the Defence Minister to say that since the Parliamentary Committee says so, therefore, I am saying so. At no stage was the policy of the defence of the country approved by the Parliament alone.

DR. MANMOHA SINGH: I would like to put one question to the hon. Defence Minister. If he was so sure about the outcome of the reports of the Parliamentary Standing Committee, why did the National Agenda promise the first ever strategic defence review?

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I want to raise a point of order....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him answer the two queries.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Let him clear my point also simultaneously. Madam, the hon. Defence Minister is sensationalising the issue. He is referring to a report and the Chairman is an hon. Member of the other House. Without creating any sensationalism, let him read out the relevant portion in support of his argument. If he does not read it out, then there is an element of suspicion that the hon. Minister is misleading us. Therefore, in order to clear his own position and that of the Government which he belongs to, it is better that he reads it out.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Three queries have been raised.

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडीज: उपसभापति महोदया, नेता विपक्ष की ओर से जो प्रश्न आए हैं कि जब यह सब चीजें हैं तो फिर किस के लिए स्ट्रेटिजिक डिफेंस रिव्यू का हम लोगों ने अपनी सरकार के उस न्यूनतम कार्यक्रम में उसका उल्लेख किया था। स्ट्रेटिजिक डिफेंस रिव्यू होगा। हम लोगों का यह फैसला था कि नेशनल सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल बनेगी और उसके द्वारा देश का स्ट्रेटिजिक डिफेंस रिव्यू किया जाएगा। तो उससे कोई भाग नहीं है, वह होगा। तो उसमें और इस बहस में कोई अन्तर्विरोध नहीं है। अब एक बात डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी ने यहां पर कही थी कि इन सब मुद्दों पर एक राष्ट्रीय, एक राय, कंसेंसस था। मगर आपने यह भी कहा अपने कंसेंसस वाली बात पर तीन मुद्दों को रखते हुए, उसका एक मुद्दा यह था कि न्यूक्लियर ऑप्शन को खुला रखना। फिर आपने यह कहा कि उसमें से एक और मुद्दा था जो केवल पांच राष्ट्रों के हार्थों में यह जो मॉनोपोली है—यह शब्द आपका है, यह जो मॉनोपोली है यह हमें स्वीकार नहीं थी और यह स्वीकार न होने के चलते सी०टी०बी०टी०, एन०पी०टी० की तरफ हम लोग नहीं गए और अब जब मॉनोपोली के विरोध में हम लोग हैं और यह जो राष्ट्रीय सहमति वाली नीति...(व्यवधान)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him first answer Mr. Manmohan Singh...(Interruptions)

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: The House cannot be misled. We want to know from the Minister what the extract is...(Interruptions)

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Madam, you allowed the hon. Members to put their questions. The Minister is expected to reply specifically to those questions...(Interruptions)

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: He should not read from books. ...(Interruptions) He should not feel shy of quoting the relevant portion...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Mr. Minister, you were replying to the Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Manmohan Singh. There were two other pointed questions. One was asked by Mr. John Fernandes. He asked whether

you were taking cognizance of the Parliamentary Committee's Report or whether you were referring to your own review committee or whether any military intelligence is involved in it. The other question was put by Mr. Gurudas Dasgupta. You are referring to a report of a Committee. It is a Joint Committee. Would you like to mention which is the relevant portion so that the Members may get a clear view of what is the threat perception? I think that they want to be very clear about that.

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडीज: उपसभापति महोदया, जहां तक रिपोर्ट की बात है, वह सारी रिपोर्ट सदस्यों के हाथों में है... (व्यवधान)

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: The hon. Minister is misleading the House. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. (Interruptions) Just one minute. (Interruptions) It is a very serious debate. It is not a game or something that somebody should say something from here and somebody should say something from there. It is a very serious question. It is a nuclear policy. It is a defence policy. It is about the security of the country and if Members of the country are concerned about it and they are prepared to share the perception, they are prepared to share the consequences; I don't think anybody should get angry either on this side or on that side. It should be a clear cut debate and the Members should be satisfied because they are answerable to their constituencies and you are answerable to the House and to the nation. Everybody is concerned about it, including me. So I would like you to please explain, and that is it. Let us not interrupt from any side. I would request everybody to listen to the debate in seriousness. If you have any query, you can put. The Minister is here to answer. He has volunteered to come here. He is not a Member of this House. I am sure he will answer all the questions you have put.

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडीज: उपसभापति जी, जहां तक रिपोर्ट का मामला है तो मैंने शुरू में ही एक बात कही कि मैं रिपोर्ट को नहीं पढ़ रहा हूँ, न मैं पढ़ूँगा। यह रिपोर्ट सार्वजनिक दस्तावेज़ है, यह सरकारी दस्तावेज़ है, यह संसद का दस्तावेज़ है। यह दस्तावेज़ हर सदस्य के हाथ में है। श्रेष्ठ परसेप्शन की बात कहां से आती है। यह जो प्रश्न छेड़ा गया है, इस श्रेष्ठ परसेप्शन के अनेक आधार हैं, यह रिपोर्ट उसमें भी है, यह मैंने कहा है। तो यह रिपोर्ट... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE (Tamil Nadu): Madam, I am on a point of order.

SHRI WASIM AHMAD: Madam, I am on a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wasim, you have made your contribution. Let him also say what he wants to say.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: When the hon. Minister for Defence was explaining the concept of threat to the national defence, he gave an impression to the House that there are voluminous reports by leaders, especially who are present in the Opposition and they have mentioned it in the Parliamentary Committee Report as if it is very vital to go through a nuclear test. That is the impression that he has given. He specially mentioned the name of Indrajit Gupta and also the other Leaders in the Opposition. Now we want to know which was the actual report and what was the exact portion of the report that necessitated this nuclear test. I think we are very well within our rights. Otherwise, the Minister should withdraw those words.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, is there any difficulty in reading out that portion from the Report? (Interruptions)

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडीज: जी हां, मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम इस रिपोर्ट को आपके हाथ में दे सकते हैं, आपके कमरे में बैठ कर इसको पढ़ाया जा सकता है लेकिन... (व्यवधान)...

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Please tell us the page number.

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडीज: इस रिपोर्ट को बनाने वाले इस सदन के भी सदस्य हैं। सरकार की जो रिपोर्ट है... (व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him speak. (Interruptions) Let him complete.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: The Minister should have no difficulty. These are public documents. (Interruptions)

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: The House has a right to know about what is there in the Report. If the Minister does not read it then I charge the Minister of misleading the House. I am charging the hon. Minister of misleading the House. He is misleading the House. I am challenging him. The Defence Minister is misleading the House. (Interruptions)

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): This is the House of the Elders. (Interruptions)

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: He is accused of fabrication. (Interruptions)

श्री वसीम अहमद: मैडम, मैं रीयली सीरियस हूँ। मैं यह बात इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know you are serious. Who said you are not? (Interruptions) I have to call Mr. Chitharanjan. Mr. Wasim, don't monopolise. Let Mr. Chitharanjan also make his point. I would only like to say that these reports were placed on the Table of both the Houses. There is no need to keep it in the Chairman's Chamber, my Chamber or in the library. In the Library, these are already there. Perhaps a part of it must have been published in the newspapers.

Now, if the Members are so agitated, what is the harm in reading those few lines? ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, this is for the Minister to decide. He is the defence Minister ... (Interruptions)

श्री वसीम अहमद: यह बता क्यों नहीं रहे हैं ?
..... (व्यवधान)...

श्री ईश दत्त यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): यह शरमा रहे हैं।..... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: It is not fair to pressurise the Defence Minister to read ... (Interruptions)... Madam, it is not fair to the Defence Minister. (Interruptions) There are certain things that are secret... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is nothing secret. (Interruptions) One second, please, (Interruptions) Please sit down. (Interruptions) That is not the question. (Interruptions) Just a minute. I am quite experienced.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, I have never questioned you wisdom (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. (Interruptions) I will tell you one thing (Interruptions) If it was anything of a secret nature, if it was an Intelligence report or if it was some other agency's report I would have never asked the Minister and I would have left it to his discretion.

But this is the property of the House and this is a part of the report of a Parliamentary Committee, which is open to the public. What is the harm? Let the Members know. There is no secret about it. There is no danger to anything. The country is going to be safe, even if you read it.

... (Interruptions)...

You see, we are having a serious discussion. We don't want to have division on such issues. We should be united as far as the country is concerned and its defence is concerned. What is the difficulty?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, can I draw the attention of this House? According to CNN, CNBC and BBC, Pakistan has conducted two nuclear blasts at 3 p.m. The Defence Minister is here. I think the Government should make a statement. Since we are already sitting for a longer period of time today,

we would like to know what the real position is. *(Interruptions)*

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडिस: उपसभापति महोदया, इसकी जानकारी जैसे आपके हाथों में पहुंची है वैसे ही मेरे हाथों में भी इसकी जानकारी अभी पहुंची है। तो इस पर सरकार का जो भी निवेदन है, वह आ जाएगा।

एक माननीय सदस्य: क्या दो घंटे लग जाएंगे?

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडिस: जो हां दो घंटे तो लग ही जाएंगे।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, we have come back to the same thing now. Now that the matter has become more serious after this announcement *...(Interruptions)* Let us not make it an issue. Mr. Minister, you can mark the pages and if you like you can lay these on the Table of the House and I will ask the Members to look at them. But please go ahead and let us finish it because we don't have much time left. There are many other names. *(Interruptions)* We have taken a decision to sit beyond 5 o'clock.

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडिस: उपसभापति महोदया, तो मैं उस बात पर था कि जब आपको आपत्ति मोनोपल पर है तो इसका अर्थ क्या होता है? इसका अर्थ तो यही होता है कि केवल पांच ही लोगों के हाथों में क्यों? पांच लोगों के हाथ में है तो एक और के हाथ में क्यों नहीं जाए? *...(व्यवधान)...*

श्री वसीम अहमद: मैडम, यह क्या बात हुई? *...(व्यवधान)...* रिपोर्ट के बारे में क्या हुआ? *...(व्यवधान)...*

श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी: मैडम, यह बड़ा सीरियस मैटर है। *...(व्यवधान)...*

श्री वसीम अहमद: मैडम, यह गलत है। *...(व्यवधान)...* और मिनिस्टर साहब बोल ही नहीं रहे हैं? *...(व्यवधान)...*

He cannot go ahead like this. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: What is his problem? *...(Interruptions)...*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. I am trying to solve it. *...(Interruptions)...*

श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी: मैडम, *...(व्यवधान)...* वह मिनिस्टर की बात पर विश्वास *...(व्यवधान)...*

Madam, they are blaming me. *...(Interruptions)...*

श्री वसीम अहमद: मैडम, आपने हाउस की फीलिंग्स को देखते हुए मिनिस्टर साहब को डाइरेक्शंस दी हैं। *...(व्यवधान)...* आपने डाइरेक्शंस दी हैं मिनिस्टर साहब को *...(व्यवधान)...*

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल: उन्होंने यह कहा है *...(व्यवधान)...*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know it. Please. The Chamber is also very hot. *...(Interruptions)...* अपनी जगह पर बैठ जाइये। *...(व्यवधान)...*

Mr. Fernandes, I know it. *...(Interruptions)...*

श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी: *...(व्यवधान)...* रिपोर्ट का मकसद पूरा हो सकता है *...(व्यवधान)...*

श्री वसीम अहमद: मैडम, आपने डाइरेक्शंस दी हैं *...(व्यवधान)...*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Members are agitated about that report. At least, give the reason why you don't want to give. Then I will satisfy them. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: They are unnecessarily creating a lot of dispute over it. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Madam, you have given a direction. Madam, it is your direction.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Gurudasji, don't try to do that to me. I am quite used to that.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: I also know it.

श्री वसीम अहमद: मैडम, डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब इसे सीरियसली नहीं ले रहे हैं। *...(व्यवधान)...*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a serious thing. Let us take it in the same spirit; I asked the Defence Minister also to take the Member's concern seriously. Let not the House be divided on Defence. I don't want anybody to speak. Please, just listen to him.

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडीज: उपसभापति महोदया, आपका आदेश है तो मैं पढ़ देता हूँ। मिनिस्ट्री ऑफ डिफेन्स, गवर्नमेंट ऑफ इंडिया एनुअल रिपोर्ट 1994-95 ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Madam, he is reading from the Annual Report and not from the Joint Parliamentary Report. Madam, he has referred to the Joint Parliamentary Report. ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I will also come to...

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI: We are asking for the joint Parliamentary Report. ... (Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, Please, one second. ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Yes, Yes I read the name of Shri Indrajit Gupta also.

THE GURUDAS DASGUPTA: He read Indrajit Gupta also. ... (Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him clearly read it so that it can be registered. If everybody speaks, then whatever he speaks cannot be either reported or recorded. Let him read and quote from wherever he wants to. He will clarify from which report he is reading. He is telling whether he is reading from the Joint Parliamentary Report or other reports. He is not hiding anything. He has got the report before him. Which is this report?

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडीज: उपसभापति महोदया, यह रिपोर्ट है मिनिस्ट्री ऑफ डिफेन्स, गवर्नमेंट ऑफ इंडिया एनुअल रिपोर्ट, 1994-95. मैंने दोनों रिपोर्ट्स का उल्लेख यहां पर किया था और जब यह रिपोर्ट बनी थी तब 5 मार्च, 1993 से लेकर रक्षा मंत्री पी.वी. नरसिंह राव थे।

पृष्ठ नम्बर 1.16 पेज श्री—

"Some relevant factors also deserve mention. Beijing is engaged in building strategic road links from its border towns to rail-heads and sea ports of Myanmar. It is helping to develop these ports. China has also been rapid

in modernising its armed forces and equipping them with sophisticated aircraft, air defence weapons and enhancing its blue water capabilities. China also continues to carry out nuclear tests.

Pakistan's unrelenting material and other forms of support to Kashmiri terrorists and separatist elements have highlighted the security needs in India's western plank. Pakistan's low-cost proxy war through sustained propaganda offensive as well as its attempt to internationalise the Kashmir issue by focusing on alleged human rights violations is a function of its domestic political instability and ulterior political/territorial objectives vis-a-vis India.

"....Pakistan continues to maintain close ties with China. The latter is a major source of weapons, particularly combat aircraft, missiles and tanks. The sale to Pakistan of M-11 Missiles and allied technology by China is causing concern. Lately, Pakistan's efforts to..." ... (Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This report is also a part of the property of the House. ... (Interruptions)... You can read it. No problem. I wanted to make it clear. ... (Interruptions)... We know it. ... (Interruptions)... Let the Press know it that the House is not insisting on his laying certain secret documents. That is the reason I am making it clear. It will not be clear in this noise. That is why I might clarify it. ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: ".... revelation by Nawaj Sharief, former Prime Minister of Pakistan, that Pakistan possesses a nuclear bomb, and it has been proved now, has added a new dimension to security in the region. Equally distressing has been his other disclosure implicating Pakistani army and the ISI in funding covert military operations against India through narcotics trade...." ... (Interruptions)...

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल: मैडम, ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति: अच्छा, अभी आप बैठिए।
...(व्यवधान)...

श्री वसीप अहमद: मैडम, ...(व्यवधान)

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल: आग लगने के बाद कुंआ खोद जाएगा। ...(व्यवधान)

श्री वसीप अहमद: आप बैठ जाइये।
...(व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him speak. ...(Interruptions)... You were all agitated. ...(Interruptions)... The Minister is complying with your queries. ...(Interruptions)... He is reading out from a Parliamentary report. ...(Interruptions)...

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Madam, I would like to say something. ...(Interruptions)... Madam, the hon. Minister is quoting from a report which was published in 1995. ...(Interruptions)... Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, Mr. Manmohan Singh and Azadbhai were Ministers at that time. Nothing happened during those years. Suddenly a threat perception has come. ...(Interruptions)...

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडिज: यह मिनिस्ट्री ऑफ डिफेन्स की जो पार्लियामेन्टरी स्टैंडिंग कमेटी है उसकी रिपोर्ट है। This report is for 1995-96. I am quoting para 4.15 on page 16 of this report. "China has developed as a major nuclear and missile power. China also continues to be a major source of weapons including missiles and allied technology for Pakistan, a very hostile neighbour causing disquiet to India. Despite warming relations with China, China is and is likely to remain the primary security threat to India in the medium and long terms. ...(Interruptions)... Its enhancement of missile capabilities and its immense help to Pakistan in the missile programme are a serious security concern to India...."

"The Committee feels that India has no option but to continue to develop and upgrade its missile capabilities and deterrent and not for aggression on national security consideration" ...(Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. ...(Interruptions)... Please, sit down. ...(Interruptions)... Mr. Agarwal, Please, sit down ...(Interruptions)... Mr. Agarwal, You are not in the Opposition any more. You are among the Ruling Party. So, please restrain yourself. ...(Interruptions)...

अग्रवाल जी, आप बैठिए ...(व्यवधान)... कुछ समय लगता एडजस्ट होने में ...(व्यवधान)... जरा बैठिए तो ...(व्यवधान)... You do not have to react for everything ...(Interruptions)... Please, just one minute ...(Interruptions)... the Minister has read out from a Report. Let him go ahead with his speech ...(Interruptions)... He read out from a Report submitted to the House. I think, the entire House knows as to who were the Members in that Committee. ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka): Madam, the hon. Defence Minister has read out from the Report of 1994-95 or from 1995-96. That is the property of the House. I think, the B.J.P. was also in the House. Yes, it was. It did not demand then that the threat perception is so serious and you go ahead. What were they doing then? They also pacified. They said that that is an information to the country. And that is what is happening in the neighbouring countries. We wanted to know as to what has happened this year. During 1995-96, they were in the Opposition. They did not demand, "Come on, you go ahead." ...(Interruptions)... "It is necessary. We have to up-date ourselves." Nothing. We have said that we have to up-date our capabilities. We should be alert ...(Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, let the Defence Minister say ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Madam, we wanted to know that. We wanted to know as to what their earlier stand was as to what their earlier stand was. ...(Interruptions)... We wanted to know what happened after the B.J.P. took over the Government. ...(Interruptions)...

उपसभापति: डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब, जो भी आपको बोलना है, बोलिए।

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डेज: उपसभापति जी, इनको शिकायत है कि यह 1994-95 की रिपोर्ट है। जो ताजी रिपोर्ट है, 1996-97 की उसके पेज नं० 2, पैराग्राफ 1.4 में है कि:

“As in the case of India's nuclear capability, it has also had occasionally to withstand international pressure brought to bear on its missile programme. The indigenous development of missile capability by India is in response to the evolving security environment in its region. China has supplied M-11 missiles to Pakistan and is aiding it with the technology and manpower as well in the development of its indigenous missile programme. There are also credible reports about China countinuing to assist Pakistan in its clandestine nuclear weapon programme. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, Order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डेज: यह रिपोर्ट उस समय तैयार हुई जब मुलायम सिंह यादव देश के रक्षा मंत्री थे।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him agree to allow you ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: Madam, I am on a point of order. Madam, these Reports are public documents. They are concerned with two or three years earlier. After that, the relations between China and Pakistan have improved.

After that there is no threat ...*(Interruptions)*... defence Department ...*(Interruptions)*... This Government had taken note of the Report and had already taken an action. He admits it. Because of the action there is a development. Then, during these three years, as quoted by the Leader of the Opposition, our relations have improved. The President of China came and made certain declarations. Foreign Ministers of Pakistan and *Hindustan* have exchanged visits. Things have improved ...*(Interruptions)*... I want to know

...*(Interruptions)*... The House wants to know ...*(Interruptions)*... What was the immediate provocation that within 90 days ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now, please conclude, Mr. Defence Minister ...*(Interruptions)*... concluding means he is replying to these points. Then, he has to conclude ...*(Interruptions)*... Please ...*(Interruptions)*... I know that they have ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Madam, I want to make one simple ...*(Interruptions)*... I am not disturbing him. I am a new Member. I want to know, when a Minister is speaking, whether you have a right to ask him a question in between every time ...*(Interruptions)*... Please, I am asking the Deputy Chairman ...*(Interruptions)*... I want to get myself enlightened. I was also a Member of the State Legislative Assembly for a good number of years. I would like to know ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is asking me. Please ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: If a Minister is making a speech a Member can speak only if he obliges. If there is a point of order, he has to give in ...*(Interruptions)*... But, I have seen many Congress friends and many Communist friends interrupting time and again. Now, we are seeing that a senior leader from Janata Dal is not only interrupting, but also questioning him. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please ...*(Interruptions)*... If you enlighten me, I am ready to go by that ...*(Interruptions)*... I am wondering whether it is the Question Hour or it is debate in which the Minister is being asked ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One minute, Mr. Venkaiah Naidu. Mr. Wasim has asked me a question ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: We have just heard the news that Pakistan has conducted two nuclear tests. I thought that after hearing this news the House will become serious in discussing this issue. But, unfortunately we are not going by any rules or procedure or by any other thing *...(Interruptions)...*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will tell you. I am sure in your Assembly there had never been such an occasion when a country's security and nuclear policy had been discussed. So, do not compare your State Assembly with the national Parliament *...(Interruptions)...* Just one minute *...(Interruptions)...* One minute please *...(Interruptions)...* There is nothing to be happy about. We are discussing a serious matter. members are concerned about it. Everybody is concerned. If there is a war, these Members are not going to be saved, nor are you going to be saved. All of us will have to face that. If there are sanctions, all of us will have to suffer, not one person. We cannot say that the Prime Minister did it, so let the Prime Minister suffer. We all will have to suffer. So, if the Members of this august body, who had also been in the Government, Mr. Bommai had been a senior Member in the Cabinet, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee had been a Foreign Minister and a Finance Minister, ask questions, what is the danger? Why should anybody mind it?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Madam, we have already heard Mr. Pranab Mukherjee and Dr. Manmohan Singh. They have made valuable suggestions. Even Communist Party Members have also made their points. Even then, every two-three minutes they are making a running commentary.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It only shows that the concern is much deeper than vicer *...(Interruptions)...* Now please *...(Interruptions)...* Now, it is enough *...(Interruptions)...* Enough is enough *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI SATISH PRADHAN: Does it mean we are not concerned with it?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are also concerned *...(Interruptions)...* Yes, yes *...(Interruptions)...* if you also want to speak *...(Interruptions)...* Let him finish *...(Interruptions)...*

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस: तो खैर मुझे एक ह बात की परेशानी है उपसभापति जी और वह यह है कि ग्रेट परसेप्शन के बारे में अलग अलग राय हो सकती है और अलग अलग राय यहां पर है, यह बहुत स्पष्ट है। लेकिन जो बातें हमने पढ़ीं उसके बाद भी अगर ऐसा लगता हो कि इस पर कोई सोच की जरूरत नहीं है तो फिर हमें बहुत परेशानी हो रही है क्योंकि हमारा इस बारे में जो परसेप्शन है वह कुछ भिन्न है और हम यह नहीं चाहेंगे कि यह देश फिर एक बार कुछ ऐसे अनुभवों में जाए जिसमें इसके पहले गया है। इसी संदर्भ में इस बात को छेड़ रहा हूं कि जब मोनोपोली का विरोध होता रहा लगातार तो हम यह मानते हैं कि जब मोनोपोली का विरोध है। तो वह विरोध केवल शब्दिक विरोध नहीं बल्कि किसी समय वह विरोध कुछ ऐसे भी कदम उठाना चाहेगा कि वह मोनोपोली खत्म हो जाए। अगर हिंदुस्तान ने एक राष्ट्रीय नीति बनायी अणुशक्ति के इस्तेमाल के बारे में और इस्तेमाल इस मामले में नहीं कि शांतिमय कार्यों के लिए हो बल्कि समर आदि के लिए - उसकी अगर एक संयुक्त नीति बनाकर सी०टी०बी०टी० और एन०पी०टी० पर हस्ताक्षर करने से भी हम लोगों ने इन्कार किया और "वी आर कीपिंग अवर आफ़ांस ओपेन" करके कहा तो इसमें आफ़ांस क्या होते हैं? हमारी समझ से इसमें केवल दो आफ़ांस हो सकते हैं। एक वह कि आप अणुशक्ति की ओर जाएंगे, विस्फोट करेंगे, टेस्ट करेंगे-उस दिशा में आप जाएंगे या तो आप नहीं जाएंगे। चूंकि पांच राष्ट्रों की मोनोपोली की जब हम लोग निन्दा करते हैं तो निन्दा इस बात की करते हैं कि तुम अपने हाथों में अणु हथियार लेकर बैठे हो और तुम हमें कह रहे हो कि तुम खबरदार, तुम हाथ मत लगाओ, तुम खबरदार। अब नीति यह थी कि हमें यह मंजूर नहीं है। जब मंजूर नहीं है और ये सारी जो अभी मैंने कुछ दो रिपोर्ट्स पढ़ीं इसके अलावा परसेप्शन का जब सवाल आता है तो फिर परसेप्शन हर समूह या हर व्यक्ति अपने-अपने ढंग से सोचता है। हिंदुस्तान में ऐसे भी लोग हैं और मैं भी उन लोगों में था-सी०टी०बी०टी० की बहस लोकसभा में जब हुई थी जुलाई 1996 में तब तक मैं भी उस राय का था कि किसी प्रकार से अणुशक्ति में हम लोगों को नहीं उतरना चाहिए। हम हिंदुस्तान में और हिंदुस्तान के बाहर अणुशक्ति के विरोध में प्रदर्शन किए हुए व्यक्ति हैं, भाषण दिए हुए व्यक्ति हैं और हमारे

अपने ढंग से विश्व में इन चीजों का खात्मा हो इसके लिए प्रयास किए हुए हैं। बहुत कम हम लोगों की ताकत होगी लेकिन इस ताकत से भी प्रयास किए हुए लोगों में हैं। लेकिन 1996 के जुलाई महीने में जब यह बात स्पष्ट हो गयी—कि ऐसी सीन्टीफीकींग पर आपको हस्ताक्षर करने ही चाहिए—यह जब दबाव आने वाली बात हो गयी और उसके नतीजे जब सभी लोगों ने समझ लिए तो हमारी संसद में एक सामूहिक राय इस मुद्दे पर बनी थी कि इस पर हस्ताक्षर हम लोगों को नहीं करने चाहिए और हमारे जो आपास हैं, उन आपास के पीछे डा० मनमोहन सिंह ने जो कहा वह बड़ी बात थी कि किसी भी सूत्र में यह मोनोपोली हम लोगों को मंजूर नहीं है तो हम लोगों ने उस आपास को एक्सप्रेसइज कर लिया इस समझ से कि क्या खतरे हैं और कौन-सी स्थिति में हम लोग अपने को पा सकते हैं। कई लोगों को यह पसंद नहीं होगा। हम उनकी राय को इज्जत करते हैं। हम यह नहीं कहते कि उनकी राय गलत है। उनसे हमारा कोई विवाद नहीं। इन बातों पर उपसभापतिजी, लेकिन भारत सरकार ने अगर यह फैसला लिया तो यह हमारा जो श्रेष्ठ परसेप्शन के बारे में सोचा था उसके आधार पर यह कर दिया।

अब इस पर जो खर्च होना है, एक मुद्दा यहाँ पर यह छेड़ा गया। डा० मनमोहन सिंह ने इस पर तो बहुत ही मजबूती से कहा कि देश में कितनी गरीबी है, कितने लोग गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे हैं। आपने 35 प्रतिशत कहा। मेरी राय में वह लगभग 55 प्रतिशत है। यह मेरी अपनी राय नहीं है। यह आपके सामने हमने इस पर एक बार विवाद छेड़ा था। नेशनल काउंसिल ऑफ एप्लाइड इन्फार्मेटिक्स की एक जो रिपोर्ट है वह बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों के लिए उन्होंने बनायी थी कि बाजार हिन्दुस्तान में उनका क्यों नहीं बन रहा है। इसके लिए उन्होंने पूछताछ करते हुए बनायी थी और उनकी जो रिपोर्ट है उसके मुताबिक 58 प्रतिशत हिन्दुस्तानी गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे हैं। तो खैर। अब सवाल खर्च का आता है तो क्या देश की सुरक्षा के मामले में अंत में यह बात पैसे के लिए आ जाएगी कि खर्च कितना है? खर्च तो करना ही पड़ेगा। अगर देश के सामने बड़ी चुनौतियाँ हैं तो फिर पैसे की बात और खर्च की बात तो नहीं होगी। और खर्च की जब हम लोग बात करते हैं तो जो जवान सीमा पर खड़े हैं और हर दिन मर रहे हैं, उधर कश्मीर में मार खा रहे हैं, मर रहे हैं, उधर पूर्वांचल में मर रहे हैं। कोई दिन नहीं जाता है जबकि हमारे जवान नहीं मारे जाते हैं। देश की सुरक्षा के मामले में और यह तो एक-आध सीमा, एक-आध प्रदेश, पठारचल में, दो-तीन प्रदेश हैं, तो जब इन चीजों के लिए आज हम लोग हर

प्रकार की कुर्बानी दे रहे हैं, जान की कुर्बानी दे रहे हैं, फिर अगर देश के सामने बड़ी चुनौती दिखाई देती है तो उस चुनौती का सामना करने के लिए कि कितना पैसा खर्च होगा, क्या इसी पर बहस चलायेंगे? हम यह नहीं मानते हैं कि पैसे का यहाँ पर दरअसल में कोई प्रश्न है। मैं इसको नहीं मानता हूँ और पैसा चूँकि शर्कों पर जा रहा है इसलिए देश का विकास नहीं हुआ, यह तर्क भी मैं नहीं मानता हूँ। नौवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना का जो एप्रोच पेपर बना था, जिसे प्लानिंग कमिशन ने बनाया था, आपने भी उसको देखा है और मैंने भी उसको देखा है। उसमें उपसभापति जी, पिछली पंचवर्षीय योजना में, आठवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में देश में कुल विकास का जो काम हुआ था, उसकी जो रूप-रेखा रखी थी, उस रूप रेखा के मुताबिक पंचवर्षीय योजना के तीन साल पूरा होने पर, चौथा साल चलते हुए, क्योंकि रिपोर्ट तब बनी थी जब पाँचवाँ साल अभी पूरा होना था, रिपोर्ट में यह लिखा था, नंबर 9 का पन्ना है और उसमें लिखी हुई बात है कि देश में योजना शुरू होने के पहले, आठवीं योजना शुरू होते हुए अगर 100 रुपये औसतन राष्ट्रीय आय थी तो राष्ट्र में उसकी बढ़ोतरी 20 प्रतिशत हो गई। उत्तर प्रदेश में बढ़ोतरी हो गई एक प्रतिशत और बिहार में घाटा हो गया 20 प्रतिशत, यानी 100 पर देश था, देश गया 120 पर, उत्तर प्रदेश 101 पर और बिहार 80 पर गया, तो क्या बिहार में अणु बम बना रहे हैं? क्या पैसा उस पर जा रहा था? क्या उत्तर प्रदेश में कोई अणु बम पर पैसा जा रहा था? छत्तीसगढ़ में गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे लोग जो भुखमरी से मर रहे हैं, उड़ीसा में जो लोग मर रहे हैं, वह क्या कोई अणु बम उन प्रदेशों में बना रहे थे कि वह इसलिए हो रहा है? इसलिए मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता हूँ कि यह जो पैसे का तर्क इसमें लाया जा रहा है इस तर्क में कोई विशेष अर्थ है। मगर वह अर्थ की बात को अलग रख कर भी मैं फिर इस बात को दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि हम राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के मामले में कभी भी पैसे नाम की चीज़ से सामने नहीं लाना चाहिए। उसके लिए जो भी कुर्बानी देने की जरूरत पड़े उसमें हमें जाना चाहिए।... (व्यवधान) अभी मुझे जरूर खल करने दीजिए, उपसभापति जी, आप बाद में सब को बोलने दीजिए।... (व्यवधान)

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH (Gujarat): Madam, I would just like to point out to the hon. Defence Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish first. Your name is there. I will allow you to speak. But let him finish first.

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: He is referring to the Plan. (Interruptions) These are sentences which I have written.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Everytime you cannot interrupt him. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Alagh, I will allow you to speak later. Let him complete first. (Interruptions)

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: Madam, he is misquoting, the Planning Commission views on Bihar and U.P. (Interruption) Your own Economic Survey placed today in the other House says... (Interruptions) The Defence Minister is saying something else. It is not fair. (Interruptions) He is completely misquoting.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not misquoting the Plan. I am referring to the Approach Paper to the Ninth Five-Year Plan which was laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha.

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: It also says... That Bihar and U.P. need a special plan.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not disputing what it also says. I am only referring to the fact that there have been disparities in the growth. This is all I am saying. I am only saying what the disparities in growth are. It has nothing to do with the bomb. This is all I am trying to say. (Interruptions)

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: The Prime Minister has said that we do not want to enter into an arms race. But you are talking about an arms race.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not talking about an arms race. When have I talked about an arms race?

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: Just two minutes ago. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, you please address the Chair. (Interruptions)

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: You said that we should have tactical weapons for our defence forces. Yes you say that you are not taking about an arms race.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not talking about an arms race.

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: You did, only two minutes ago. You quoted a statement, saying that we have to go in for tactical weapons for our troops. This was the sense of your statement. (Interruptions) He has forgotten that. Madam, barely two minutes ago, he said it. Therefore, we should get a proper clarification. I do not understand what is going on. (Interruptions) There are different voices. The Hon'ble Prime Minister says one thing. The Finance Ministers Economics Survey says another thing. The Defence Minister says some other thing. (Interruptions)

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस: उपसभापति जी, हम लोगों के मित्र प्रणब मुखर्जी ने दो दिन पहले एक बड़िया लेख लिखा था।

और यह लेख उन का "हिन्दू" में था। उनके भाषण के वक्त मैं तो यहाँ पर नहीं था, लेकिन जो थोड़े-बहुत मैंने उस के नोट्स बैग में देखे हैं उसमें और जो उन का लेख है, उस में मुझे लगा कि कुछ थोड़ा-बहुत अंतर है। मैं इस को इसलिए ले रहा हूँ क्योंकि डा० अलख ने अभी जो बात छेड़ी कि हथियार बनाने और हथियार की होड़ में हम लोगों को लगना है, तो हम उस बात से सहमत नहीं हैं। आप के लेख टाइल है:—

The title is "Should India Sign CTBT?" और अभी जो पोखरन में विस्फोट हो गया, उस पर उन का कहना है कि —

"These tests are the logical conclusions of the process which began at Pokhran 24 years ago when Indira Gandhi had the first nuclear explosion done in 1974. The scientific and technological competence of Indian scientists and engineers reflect the vision of Jawaharlal Nehru who laid the foundation for these developments. This was carefully nursed and development by successive Congress Prime Ministers."

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: This morning also I said the same thing.

SHRI GEORGE PERNANDES: I am a slightly different point.

वह यह कि अणु बम हम ने सन् 74 के बाद क्यों नहीं बनाया? इस का जो तर्क आप ने दिया है, यही बहुत सही तर्क है। मैं उसका हवाला दे रहा हूँ। आप का यह जो तर्क है हम लोगों ने नहीं बनाया, शक्ति बनाए रखी, लेकिन उस के इस्तेमाल की किसी भी दिशा में हम नहीं गए क्योंकि हम लोग यह चाहते थे, आप के शब्दों में —

“The question is whether India should sign CTBT and NPT. India's refusal to sign the Treaties was based on its principled stand articulated over the years. India's aversion to nuclear weapons was expressed by Mahatma Gandhi. He said it was the most diabolical use of science. We were, therefore, appalled that instead of stepping back from the road to nuclear ruin, the nuclear-weapon States sped faster and faster down it. As they accelerated, India tried unsuccessfully to apply the brakes”.

यानी हम लोगों में शक्ति थी, सन् 74 में हम लोगों ने उस को हासिल किया था और हम उस शक्ति का इस्तेमाल करना चाहते थे। यह जो आप ने 5 मोनोपोलिटिक्स की बात की जो हम उन्हें उस रास्ते से हटाने की कोशिश में लगे थे, लेकिन आप ही मानते हैं कि बात कुछ बनी नहीं और हम यह मानकर चलते हैं कि दिशा हम लोगों को वही पकड़नी चाहिए। सन् 1974 में इसे बिना बनाए केवल हमारी ताकत का प्रदर्शन कर के जब यह नहीं चल पाया, जब इन 5 लोगों पर आप का दबाव जम नहीं पाया, जिस के चलते वह अपने अणु हथियारों को समाप्त करते, विश्व में अणु हथियारों का जो भी खतरा है, उस खतरे से दुनिया को बचाने का काम करते, जब वह नहीं हुआ, तो हम यह मानते हैं कि आज के दिन भारत ने यह जो प्रयोग किया है, इस प्रयोग का इस्तेमाल कोई हथियारों की होड़ के लिए नहीं बल्कि प्रयास इसलिए किया कि दुनिया में अणु हथियारों का खात्मा हो। इस में कामयाबी मिलेगी, नहीं मिलेगी, यह आज के दिन कोई नहीं कह सकता है क्योंकि जिस रूप से वह मोनोपोलिटिक्स लोग पेश आए हैं, जिस में रूस और फ्रांस ने जो एक भूमिका

ली है, वह भिन्न है, अंग्रेजों की थोड़ी-बहुत और भिन्न है, लेकिन अमेरिका का जो रुख है, उस रुख को देखते हुए सेक्सशंस के बाद अन्य प्रकार से भारत को कहां-कहां आज रोका जा सकता है, इस दिशा में आगे बढ़ने से रोका जा सकता है, इस के लिए जो उनका सारा प्रयास है, हमें उस चीज को देखते हुए यह विश्वास नहीं हो रहा है कि उन को सही रास्ते पर लाना आसान है। मगर हम यह मानते हैं कि हमें वह दिशा पकड़नी चाहिए।

अब रहा सवाल, महात्मा गांधी का देश — वह बात तो सही है मगर जब कश्मीर पर सन् 47 में पहला आक्रमण हुआ था और गांधी जी जीवित थे तो उन्होंने सेना भेजने के लिए कहा था। यह नहीं कहा था कि सेना नहीं भेजो और गांधी जी के दो वाक्य हम लोगों को कभी नहीं भूलने चाहिए।

एक वाक्य उनका यह था —

“I would prefer the violence of the brave to the non-violence of the coward.”

यह गांधी जी का वाक्य था। मुझे नहीं लगता है कि केवल व्यक्तियों को लेकर, व्यक्ति व्यक्ति के रिश्ते में

violence of the brave to the non-violence of the coward करके अपनी सोच को कहीं सीमित रखा था। उन्होंने कुल मिलाकर राष्ट्रों के बीच में भी जो रिश्ते हैं, उन सब चीजों को ध्यान में रखकर इस बात को कहा था, ऐसा करके मैं मानता हूँ।

उनका एक और वाक्य है, जिसको कभी नहीं भूलना होगा, कि —

“I shall risk violence a thousand times rather than risk the emasculation of the whole race.”

हम यह मानते हैं कि आज के दिन हम लोगों का लिया हुआ फैसला हथियारों की होड़ के लिए नहीं बल्कि दुनिया में हम लोग इस शक्ति के आधार पर एक प्रयास कर सकते हैं कि इन सब परिस्थितियों से हम लोग बाहर निकल आए, उसमें से हम लोग बाहर निकल कर आ सकें और विश्व को भी निश्चलकर ला सकें।

महोदया, अन्त में दो तीन बातें कहकर मैं अपनी बात को समाप्त करूंगा। पहली बात, यह जो समर्थन, विरोध, विवाद सब बातें हैं। कल यह बात कही गई थी कि कटेंगना में अभी जो नोन-एलाइन मूवमेंट का सम्मेलन हुआ, उस सम्मेलन में तीसरी दुनिया के जितने राष्ट्र पहुंचे थे, शायद लगभग डेढ़ सौ राष्ट्र वहां पहुंचे थे,

उन्में अधिकतर गरीब राष्ट्र हैं, जो ज्यादातर हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ नेतृत्व के लिए देखते रहे हैं, उन राष्ट्र में कुछ इने-गुने अपवाद छोड़कर बाकी सभी ने हिन्दुस्तान के इस प्रयोग का स्वागत किया, विरोध नहीं किया, स्वागत किया। फ्रांस अणुशक्ति रखने वाला देश है, रूस ने अपनी परेशानी व्यक्त की, लेकिन विरोध नहीं किया, फ्रांस ने कुछ बातें कहीं, क्यों कहीं, हम समझ सकते हैं आपकी परेशानी। रूस के कम्युनिस्ट के नेतृत्व ने कहा कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के इस फैसले का स्वागत करते हैं। रूस के संसद के अध्यक्ष ने कहा कि हम इसका समर्थन करते हैं। तो इसलिए जो आपने यहां पर एक बात कही कि कौन दुनिया के लोग हम लोगों का इस मामले में समर्थन करते हैं, इसके बारे में ज्यादा नहीं सोचना चाहिए। चूंकि अपने मकसद से कुछ कर सकते हों, लेकिन तीसरी दुनिया के लोगों ने जब कटेगना में यह बात कही कि हम समर्थन करते हैं आपको, हम स्वागत करते हैं आपके इस फैसले का, तो वह हम लोगों की ओर कुछ विश्वास कुछ आशा, कुछ उम्मीद से देख रहे हैं। यह विश्वास, आशा, उम्मीद इस बात को लेकर है कि जो आपकी पांच की मोनोपोली रही है उस मोनोपोली से वह भी परेशान हैं। उनकी वह मोनोपोली सारी दुनिया को कहां ले जा सकती है, वह भी जानते हैं। इसलिए भारत से उनकी अपेक्षा है क्योंकि यह राष्ट्र अणुशक्ति का किसी गलत काम के लिए इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा, कोई विघटन के कार्य के लिए उसका इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा, किसी को ध्वस्त करने के लिए उसका इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा बल्कि उसका इस्तेमाल सबकी भलाई के लिए, सारे विश्व की भलाई के लिए करेगा। इसलिए मैं मानता हूं कि कटेगना में जुड़े हुए लोगों ने हम लोगों के इस फैसले का स्वागत किया। तो जो परेशानी मनमोहन सिंह जी ने इस मामले में रखी है, मैं मानता हूं कि उसमें दम है, फिर भी बात इतनी परेशानी वाली नहीं है जितना कि आपने यहां पर वर्णित किया है।

महोदया, अब एक और प्रश्न है और वह प्रश्न यह है कि क्या अणु बम से हिन्दुस्तान एक बहुत मजबूत राष्ट्र के तौर पर उभर कर आया, बड़ा पावरफुल हो गया, वगैरह वगैरह। हम यह बात नहीं कह सकते हैं कि अणु बम हमारे हाथ में आ गया तो हिन्दुस्तान कल से एक महा-राष्ट्र हो गया। हम इस बात को नहीं मानते हैं। चूंकि शस्त्र तो अंत में, लड़ाई का शस्त्र हाथ की मुट्ठी है। बांहों में ताकत होनी चाहिए, मुट्ठी अगर काम की बननी है तो। हिन्दुस्तान में वह बांह मजबूत करने की बहुत जरूरत है। हम लोगों की जो आर्थिक स्थिति है, उसमें सुधार नहीं होता तो फिर अणु बम अपने पास रखकर या फिर कोई शस्त्र अपने पास रखकर हम लोग

कोई बहुत बड़ा काम कर पाएंगे या दुनिया में अपनी एक कोई छाप छोड़ पाएंगे, ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है। हम इस बात में किसी से भी विवाद में उतर ही नहीं सकते कि ऐसे कोई बात बन सकती है।

मं० ६.००

हमें देश के आर्थिक विकास के लिए, देश में आज जो भी विघटन, विभाजन, द्वंद की बातें हैं, इन सारी बातों को बाजू रखकर इस राष्ट्र को मजबूत बनाने की दिशा में कदम उठाना होगा और हम यह आशा करते हैं, उपसभापति जी, कि इस दिशा में देश आगे बढ़ेगा।

इसी से जुड़ी हुई एक और बात है और वह यह है कि क्या सुरक्षा का मामला केवल सरकारी दफ्तरों तक ही सीमित रहे? सेना के लोगों को ही सारी जानकारी रहे, कहां से क्या खतरा है? कभी साल में एक बार रिपोर्ट में ऐसा लिखा जाए, मगर उस पर बहस न हो? कभी उसकी जानकारी लोगों तक न पहुंच पाए? अब लोगों को भी इसमें शिरकत करने की जरूरत है ताकि लोग समझें कि चुनौतियां कहां से हैं, कहां-कहां से खतरनाक स्थिति निर्मित हो सकती है, खतरे कहां से हैं। इन सबकी चर्चा हम लोगों को देश में नहीं करनी चाहिए? उपसभापति जी, हमने अगर यह बहस छोड़ी है तो कई लोगों ने कहा कि यह मेरा पर्सनल एजेंडा था और उसको लेकर मैंने यह बहस छोड़ी। यह बहस कोई अमरीका के पत्र वगैरह को लेकर नहीं छोड़ी गई है। अमरीका का पत्र, अगर मैं नहीं होता और मुलायम सिंह होते तो उनके हाथों में जाता, इसलिए इस बारे में आपको बिल्कुल चिंता नहीं करनी चाहिए बोम्बई साहब। मुलायम सिंह थे, उनकी जगह पर मैं बैठ गया तो इसलिए पत्र मेरे हाथ में आ गया वरना वह आपके ही हाथ में चला गया होता। इसलिए इस बारे में आपको परेशान नहीं होना चाहिए। राष्ट्र-राष्ट्र के बीच में जो बातें होती हैं, उसमें इन चीजों को लाना कि कौन उस पद पर बैठा है तो उसको खरीदने को कोशिश हो रही है, ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। हमको खरीदने वाला अभी पैदा नहीं हुआ है, वह बाद में देख लेंगे। इसलिए उसके बारे में कोई चिंता हम लोगों को नहीं करनी चाहिए।

श्री सोमण्या आर० बोम्बई: मैंने वह बात नहीं कही है, मैंने खरीदने की बात नहीं कही। मैंने वह बात नहीं कही।

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस: मतलब तो वही हो गया न कि उन लोगों ने जब कुछ हो गया, तब उनको बुला लिया। उनके दिमाग में बात है, शायद इन्को वे लोग

अभी अपनी तरफ खींचेगे। ऐसा ही है न आपके दिमाग में? मतलब तो वही हो गया, खरीदना। तो उसकी चिंता बिल्कुल मत करिएगा, उसके पैदा होने में अभी बहुत समय है। तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि हम चाहते थे कि राष्ट्र में इसके बारे में बहस हो और मुझे खुशी है कि एक मायने में वह बहस आज चल रही है।

उपसभापति जी, मैं अपनी बात को समाप्त करना चाहूंगा और समाप्त करते हुए मैं एक तर्क, अपनी तरफ से नहीं, बल्कि 1968 में जब एन० पी० टी० पर हस्ताक्षर करने का वक्त आया था, तब श्रीमती गांधी ने संसद में एक बात कही थी, उन्होंने अपने भाषण के दौरान 5 अप्रैल, 1968 को जब एन० पी० टी० पर डिबेट हुई थी, तब एक बात कही थी, उन्होंने कहा था कि:—
“We shall be guided entirely by our self-enlightenment.

उन्होंने सिक्युरिटी कन्सर्स भी नहीं कहा था, न प्रोस्पेक्टिव की बात हुई थी। माफ करिएगा।

“We shall be guided entirely by our self-enlightenment and the considerations of national security.” और मैं आपसे इतना ही कहूंगा कि हम लोगों ने जो भी निर्णय लिए हैं “We have also been guided entirely by our self-enlightenment and the considerations of national security.”

तो इसमें हम जैसे कई लोगों ने विरोध किया था कि अणु का विरोध होना चाहिए,

[श्री सभापति पीठासीन हुए]

किसी प्रकार का कोई सौदा, कोई बातचीत वाला मामला नहीं होना चाहिए, हम आशा करते हैं कि इस बार कोई विरोध नहीं करेगा, हम लोगों ने जो निर्णय लिया है। वाद-विवाद जरूर चले लेकिन राष्ट्र के सामने जो चुनौतियां हैं, उनको ध्यान में रखकर सारा राष्ट्र इस कार्य में एक साथ मिलकर आगे बढ़ेगा, यही आशा व्यक्त करते हुए, सभापति जी, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, ...
(Interruptions)....

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI : Mr. Chairman, Sir, one clarification. Sir, I in my speech referred to the statement of the honourable Defence Minister and consequently he received an invitation from the Defence Minister of America.

He has commented on it. But there is a lurking doubt in my mind, it may be true or may not be true. That lurking doubt is America has played a trick to divide the Asian countries. Today, Pakistan has exploded the bomb. That is what they wanted. That is our perception. They wanted to have a nuclear race in Asia.

They wanted a place to fight China; they wanted differences between China and India and India and Pakistan and we entered the trap. This has been proved by today's action of Pakistan. This was what we feared. This Government has taken the country towards an arms race and what is the answer for it?

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Is it a second speech?

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, I think we had decided earlier that we would finish the debate today. I would submit this fact before you for your kind consideration that after the nuclear explosion by Pakistan, the situation has changed. This discussion cannot be only on the situation, as it is. We should have a deeper thought and a balanced approach. The Government also will think. The ruling party and the Opposition, each one of us has to think. So, I think there is no use going on with the debate as such. If you think, we can continue tomorrow. As a mature nation, as a sober nation, as a determined nation, we have to take a decision, and then we should do it in a different climate. We should consider whether we should continue the discussion in the same pattern. Now, I would request the hon. House, if you think it proper, then we may defer it and take it up tomorrow. (Interruptions)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, I agree with your perception. I want to have one clarification. I would like to know from the hon. Defence Minister whether the Prime Minister is going to make any statement or whether the Government is going to respond to today's development.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let me tell you. I have heard your whole thing.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Let me complete. What I wanted is that if there is any chance that the Government may make a statement today, we would like to give them some time to that they can make a statement till then, we can carry on the business of the House. But if the Government decides that they are not going to make any statement today, then we can conclude and can start the discussion in a different context. My point is absolutely technical.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will tell you. I was listening to the debate in the Lok Sabha. They also decided just now to defer the debate which was to continue for one more hour tomorrow also and the Prime Minister himself said that are awaiting information. The details are awaited. The Government will also consider it. We will also get the news tonight. We may have to continue the debate day after tomorrow also—doesn't

matter may be Monday, because the situation has totally changed and our responses cannot be as earlier. So, as a House of Elders and as Members of Parliament as **very determined** people of India, we should take up a very serious debate and discussion. So, I think tomorrow, after the Question Hour, we can take it up. We will know that the situation is. By that time, the Government also would have got the information. I think they will inform the Leaders of the Opposition about what the situation is and then we can discuss it tomorrow as to what we have to do about it.

Now, I adjourn the House till 11.00 AM Tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at eight minutes past six of the clock, till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 29th May, 1998.