

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER REGARDING IRAQ SITUATION

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the situation relating to Iraq has been rapidly evolving over the past few weeks. India has consistently stood for a peaceful resolution of the Iraq issue. The peace and prosperity of the Gulf is of vital interest to India given our long standing political, cultural and economic ties with the countries of the region. There are over 3.5 million Indians working in the Gulf, whose welfare is of great concern to us. Their remittances are an important source of foreign exchange for the country. Over 60 per cent of India's crude oil imports are sourced from the region. The Gulf countries have also emerged as important destinations for our exports.

India recognizes the validity of the unanimous decision of the UN Security Council in its Resolution 1441, which provides for the disarmament of Iraq and also reaffirms the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait and the neighbouring States. Resolution 1441 provides a stringent regime of inspections designed to meet the international community's desire that Weapons of Mass Destruction are eliminated from Iraq. We believe that Iraq must cooperate actively with the inspection process and comply fully with all relevant Security Council Resolutions. If the pace of this cooperation had been quicker, it may have enabled United Nations Monitoring Verification and Inspection Commission and the International Atomic Energy Agency to certify to the UN Security Council that Iraq was in full compliance of Resolution 1441.

The work of the inspectors is continuing in Iraq. The Security Council should decide on what further action needs to be taken. The international community must take a very careful look both at the objective of achieving Iraq's full compliance with UN resolutions and at the means to be adopted to reach this goal. This can best be achieved by a collective decision through the United Nations. If permitting more time and formulation of clearer criteria can facilitate a decision within the UN framework, we believe this option should be given a chance. We hope that the members of the Security Council will harmonise their positions to ensure that its final decision enhances the legitimacy and credibility of the United Nations. If unilateralism prevails, the U.N. would be deeply scarred, with disastrous consequences for the world order. The Government of India would strongly urge that no military action be taken, which does not have the collective concurrence of the international community.

India has voiced its concern on various occasions about the difficult humanitarian situation in Iraq. The Iraqi people have suffered severe shortages and hardships for over a decade. We have consistently stated that if Iraq complies fully with the provisions of relevant Security Council resolutions, then sanctions against that country should be lifted.

While we sincerely hope, in the interest of all humanity, that the matter can be resolved peacefully through the United Nations, my Government has drawn up contingency plans to deal with any eventuality. There are less than 50 Indian nationals in Iraq at present and they have all been advised to leave the country in the coming days. It is unlikely that there would be any large scale dislocation of the Indian communities in the neighbouring countries on a possible outbreak of hostilities. Nevertheless the Ministry of Civil Aviation has drawn up plans to evacuate Indians, if necessary. The Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas has taken steps to shore up our inventories of crude oil. While no major dislocation in crude oil imports is envisaged, India has adequate foreign exchange reserves to meet a higher crude oil import bill if prices continue to rise in the short run. Thank you.

श्री सभापति : माननीय सदस्यगण, अगर आप स्पष्टीकरण मांगना चाहें तो मैं अलाउ कर रहा हूँ ? श्री नटवर सिंह ?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH (Rajasthan) : Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to pose a few questions to the distinguished Prime Minister whom I thank for his statement on the profoundly important issue of the stand-off against Iraq. One would have thought that at the beginning of the New Millennium the mankind journey would progress through light and truth and uprightness and not through darkness. One thought that the day for deciding arguments and issues with a gun were a matter of the past and the arguments would be settled by debate and discussion. I would like to know from the Prime Minister: When you spoke to the President of the United States, did you ask, as friends of the United States -- because they have all welcomed the improvement in relations between India and the US and as friends you are entitled to ask them are you taking into consideration our deep anxiety and concern as we are understanding and appreciating your compulsions -- the American President whether he genuinely believes that Iraq poses a security threat to the United States? Are they responding to the crisis or have they created a crisis? Senator Bird, who has spent 50 years in the US Congress, said in the

Senate that the President of the United States has not been able to convince anybody except a few people around him that Iraq poses a security threat to the United States. Did you ask him and appeal to him that would he -- now that Iraq was cooperating -- give some more time to the UN Inspectors? If so, what was the response? If not, you should have asked him. Secondly, did you ask him -- now that the Security Council is meeting and efforts are being made to find a peaceful solution -- would he consider extending the time limit from the 17th to beyond 17th?

Now I come to the most important part of his statement. We welcome some parts of the statement. You have said that you like a peaceful solution and no military action. But the United States has declared it openly on the television -- the President has said so -- if the Security Council authorises us, fine; if they do not authorise us, we will go in. So, on the 17th of March, five days from today, the world will be faced with a situation when in a unilateral action along with the United Kingdom and Spain, America would walk into Iraq.

Military action is going to take place. At that time, will the Prime Minister of India condone war, condemn war or keep quiet? The entire country awaits your answer because there is profound feeling in the country and this House must reflect the uneasiness and express its national consciousness because this is not simply a matter of war or peace, there is a moral dimension and India has taken a stand on issues on moral grounds. Do you, Sir, subscribe to the doctrine of intervention? Do you subscribe to the doctrine of regime change? Do you subscribe to the doctrine of pre-emptive strike? If these doctrines are accepted, then who next, when next, and if, as President Clinton said in this very building that India and Pakistan should sit down, because Kashmir is a disputed territory, post-war Iraq, suppose there is a proposal to trifurcate Iraq, they will then say that let us sit down and talk about Kashmir, will you accept this? Your Foreign Minister was good enough to give us an assurance, when I asked him that you will not be a party in his arrangements.

You have also hinted in your statement about the future of the United Nations. Now, the League of Nations was killed by the U.K. and France, when they condoned the invasion of Manchuria by Japan in 1931, of Abyssinia by Italy in 1935 and by Hitler in the Rhineland in 1936. What will

1.00 p.m.

happen to the United Nations if the sole super-power wants to impose a new world order, do we accept that? I am not saying that you have a confrontation with United States, for that is not in our national interest, but, at the same time, do we become a party to the denigration of the U.N.; do we become a party to the total disregard for the international law; do we become a party to the sovereignty of nations being trampled? Sir, these are profound questions, which every Indian wants to have an answer from, and I would be grateful if you could please enlighten the House what your thinking on this matter is.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think my senior colleague, Shri Natwar Singh, has put everything very succinctly, so I do not have too much to ask, but I just want to pose a couple of additional points. Is it the belief of the Prime Minister that the impending assault on Iraq has anything to do with international terrorism, with the possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction and with America's love for democracy? Or is it that there is another agenda that the United States might have? That is the first clarification that I seek.

We do know, Sir, as far back as 1992, there was a document of which Mr. Paul Wolfowitz and Dick Cheney were a party, called the Pax Americana now, which in the year 2000, there was a project launched called the project of New American Century which is the blueprint, we do believe, Sir, that if unilateral action of this nature is allowed to be taken, pre-emptive action is allowed to be taken, it will give fillip to the project for the New American Century. What is the Government of India's response to that, Sir? That is the second clarification that I wish to ask.

And, the last but not the least, we have somebody far more dangerous than Saddam Husein, next to our border. Then, why is it, Sir, that the United States does not wish to deal with Pakistan and is forging ahead so quickly against Iraq? Thank you, Sir.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH (Madhya Pradesh): Hon. Chairman, Sir, the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister is a statement which has been made obviously to fight all the harsh questions that will flow out of the events that will take place in the weeks to come. Sir, I will not repeat what has already been said by Shri Natwar Singh and Shri Kapil Sibal. We are hearing voices inside the country; -- not voices; the newspapers are reporting them -- the kind of efforts that is being made to cajole India, -- I

don't want to use the word 'coerce' -- to accept what is being asked for. The American Ambassador has spoken to some one. Madam Condoleeza Rice has spoken to some one; and all the paraphernalia of the United States is busy in somehow bringing India into line. What is being offered is, -- that is also in the newspapers -- "Post-Iraq, you will have a role there". Reconstruction means, you will get some contracts, and they will profit in that reconstruction. I want to put only one question. Has this great nation come down to this level where aggressors want to tell us that you are welcome to the feast of vultures? And, is this Government so afraid -- this question is being raised in this country -- and we feel that they are not in a position to answer it?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal) : Sir, I will put two very brief questions. One is in regard to the difficulty, the tension, the crisis, that has come about in the Middle-East, so also the actions of the United States and the United Kingdom which are saying, "U.N. Security Council Resolution or not; come what may, we will go to Iraq." Now, I would like to know whether or not this action or the statement by these countries is in total contravention to the principles of Non-Alignment of which, we understand to this day, our country is still a member. Are we condemning this attitude of these two nations or not?

The second question relates to our course of action in the eventuality of the war, because nobody is discounting it. A very, very hectic lobbying is going on over telephones. I was in Europe two or three days back, and we are seeing the kind of crisis even in the ruling establishment of England. The ruling party there is almost on the verge of a split. So, in this kind of a situation, if there is a war, are we going to allow the United States and its allies to use our military facilities because post 11/9, we had gone overboard, unilaterally, to announce that all military facilities available with India would be made available for the so-called international coalition against terrorism? So, this time around, if there is a war, are we going to do that? It is very, very vital to know this. In Turkey, the earlier Government was allowing them to land in Turkey. The Turkish Parliament opposed that and passed a Resolution, and there will be a regime change in Turkey.

And, thirdly, are freedom and democracy something to be exported or imported as the Americans are saying? Do we subscribe to this theory that there will be a regime change? I would like to know whether we are prepared to -- at least very categorically, this whole notion of regime change

which is being articulated by the United States -- condemn this notion or not. That is my question.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN (Kerala) : Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Sir, for giving me this opportunity. Sir, I had been to Baghdad in the last week...(Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please come to the question.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN : ..As a part of the Left Party delegation to Iraq to declare solidarity with the people of Iraq and the Government of Iraq. Sir, we have visited so many hospitals, schools and so many places in Babylon and various places of Baghdad also. Sir, it is painful to note that because of the U.N. Sanctions, 1.7 million people have already died due to lack of medicines, medical equipments and food. This fatal position is prevailing in Iraq. I refer to para 4 of the statement regarding lifting of the sanctions. Sir, now Iraq is fully complying, not only they are active but they are pro-active in complying with the UN Resolution. Regarding disarmament, they are destroying missiles fully in compliance with the UN Resolution and under the directions and guidelines, as issued by the UN inspection teams. Therefore, I would like to seek clarifications from the hon. Prime Minister: Would the Government of India take a position that the sanction which is being imposed on the people of Iraq and their Government will be lifted? I would like to know whether such a step will be taken by the Government of India. The statement itself is very clear that a war, a unilateral action, or, a war on Iraq is imminent, which is being admitted in the statement also.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is enough.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN : Sir, just now, comrade Basu has said regarding the change of regime. I want to know whether India will approve the stand to have a change of regime , and mediate in the matter.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Maharashtra): Sir, with all my increasing disappointment and dissatisfaction with things, which the Government does, I must say that the statement made by the Prime Minister this morning compels respect and support. If at all it has some defects, the first defect is that it is too much near the fence. We should have got off the fence and became a little more explicit and clear. Secondly, it is not a well-reasoned statement, the conclusions happened to be right, but how they were arrived

at, and why they were arrived at, the process of reasoning is most unclear. Sir, so far as India is concerned, our founding fathers told posterity in this country; how to conduct its Foreign Policy and they introduced an express article 51 in the Indian Constitution. A feature, which does not exist in the Constitution of any other country. India is under a constitutional obligation to conduct its Foreign Policy in accordance with international law that is the dictate of article 51. Now, therefore, I would have expected that the statement of the hon. Prime Minister should have reasoned out, how it is consistent with and in complete harmony with current international law. Sir, I hope the Prime Minister will have more occasions, and the Foreign Ministry of our Government of India will have more occasions to tell the world that even Gandhiji recognised the distinction between a just war and an unjust war.

When the war takes place, if and when it takes place -- I hope it will not -- but if it does, the Prime Minister is under no obligation to answer the curiosity of my learned friends on the other side, 'tell us today whether you will condemn it or you will approve of it'. We will see exactly the circumstances under which it takes place, and then the Prime Minister may be under an obligation. Sir, I do wish to suggest that matters of diplomacy must not be conducted under the glare of publicity. There is something like secret diplomacy, and all questions can never be answered in public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri J. Chitharanjan.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, was this a clarification or a statement?

श्री सभापति : उन्होंने दे दिया है जो देना था।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु : आप बता देते तो अच्छा रहता। ...*(ब्यवधान)*...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: What deal you made?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't be so offensive. ...*(Interruptions)*... That is right.

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN (Kerala) : Sir, I do agree with most of the questions put by my colleagues. Sir, paragraph 2 of the statement states, "We believe that Iraq must cooperate actively with the inspection process and comply fully with all relevant Security Council Resolutions. If the pace of this cooperation had been quicker, it may have enabled UNMOVIC and IAEA to certify to the UN Security Council that Iraq was in full compliance of Resolution 1441".

Sir, along with that, I would like to state here what was stated by the Foreign Minister in the all-party meeting convened by the Prime Minister. Towards the end of the meeting, he said that Iraq is not blameless. Of course, United States is also not blameless. But the pressure exerted by the United States is a factor which has compelled Iraq to comply to the extent that they have. But, yet they are criticised. What exactly is the stand of the Government in this regard? Sir, here the question is, two Governments, especially the United States is declaring again and again that a war will have to be declared and Saddam should be ousted from power; and if the UN Security Council does not agree to this, then they will go on their own. That means, they are not prepared to abide by the international law; they are not even prepared to respect the United Nations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your clarification?

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN: In that situation, what exactly is the clear stand taken by our Government? That is one thing. Another thing is, two weeks ago, when our Defence Minister was asked by the Press whether the Government of India would provide facilities to America at our ports and airports, he replied, "No, they have not asked". What does it mean? Of course, they have not asked so far. But, suppose tomorrow they ask, what will be the stand of the Government of India? That should also be spelt out here.

श्री संजय निरुपम (महाराष्ट्र) : आदरणीय सभापति जी, आपने मुझे बोलने की अनुमति दी, इसके लिए धन्यवाद। मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी के बयान का समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। उन्होंने बेशक उम्मीद की है कि कोई इराक युद्ध नहीं होगा, नहीं होना चाहिए। हम सब की भी यही उम्मीद है लेकिन अमरीकी प्रशासन जिस तरीके से जोर-जबरदस्ती से बातें कर रहा है और जिस तरीके से कहा गया है कि 17 तारीख डेडलाइन है, जिस तरीके से संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की भूमिका के ऊपर प्रश्न-चिन्ह खड़ा किया जा रहा है, वह सचमुच चिंता पैदा करता है। विश्व युद्ध के दौरान जैसे संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ पूरी तरह से खत्म हो गया था, आज बिल्कुल वैसी ही स्थिति बन रही है। हो सकता है कि अगर यह युद्ध हुआ तो फिर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ का कोई अर्थ नहीं होगा। ऐसे में सरकार की तरफ से सिर्फ आशा ही नहीं बल्कि साफ-साफ शब्दों में कहा जाना चाहिए कि इस आक्रमण को हम स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे, नहीं मानेंगे। लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ मैं जरा कांग्रेस के साथियों को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि पूरी दुनिया इस समय इराक के संभावित युद्ध को लेकर दो हिस्सों में बंट गई है। पूरा यूरोपीय समुदाय दो हिस्सों में बंट गया है। कुछ देश ऐसे हैं जो समर्थन कर रहे हैं, विशेषकर टोनी ब्लेयर की सरकार और कुछ देश ऐसे हैं जैसे फ्रांस और जर्मनी, जो इसका खुलकर विरोध कर रहे हैं। सरकारों की अपनी भूमिका के साथ-साथ वहाँ के जो राजनीतिक दल हैं, वहाँ के जो सामाजिक संगठन हैं, वे भी खुलकर सड़को पर आ गए हैं। महोदय, 14-15 फरवरी के आसपास मैं यूरोप में था। सभापति महोदय, मैं बताना चाहूँगा कि उस दिन पूरे यूरोप में, हर देश में लोग सड़कों पर उतरे। पांच-पांच लाख,

दस-दस लाख लोग सड़कों पर उतरे। मुझे मालूम है ऐसी स्थिति में सरकार रैलियां आयोजित नहीं कर सकती। लेकिन क्या बाकी राजनीतिक पार्टी, बाकी राजनीतिक संगठन, इस तरीके से सरकार और भारत की भूमिका स्पष्ट करने के लिए, भारत का संदेश देने के लिए, सड़कों पर उतरने का कार्यक्रम बना सकते हैं ? प्रधानमंत्री जी अपील न करें, लेकिन प्रधानमंत्री जी के पास इस तरह की कोई इन्फोरमेशन, सूचना है, जानकारी है ?...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति : आप ध्यान मत दीजिए।

श्री संजय निरुपम : इसलिए मैंने सोचा कि थोड़ा ध्यान दिलाया जाए। वहां पर इंस्पेक्शन की जो बात चल रही है.....

श्री सभापति : अब आप क्लेरिफिकेशन कर लीजिए।

श्री संजय निरुपम : वैपन्स आफ मास डेस्ट्रक्शन के इंस्पेक्शन की जो बात हो रही है, वह इंस्पेक्शन चल रहा है। प्रधानमंत्री जी ने बताया है कि वह इंस्पेक्शन अभी भी चल रहा है। मैं माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या अमरीकी प्रशासन को यह कहा जा सकता है कि रिपोर्ट आने के बाद ही अमरीकी प्रशासन की कोई भूमिका बननी चाहिए?

प्रो. राम देव बंडारी (बिहार) : धन्यवाद महोदय। मैं अपने विचार दिनकर जी की एक पंक्ति के साथ प्रकट करना चाहूंगा :- "समर शेष है, नहीं पाप का भागी केवल व्याध। जो तटस्थ है, समय लिखेगा उसका भी अपराध।"

श्री सभापति : क्या आप प्रधानमंत्री जी से इसका जवाब कविता में ही सुनना चाहते हैं ?

प्रो. राम देव बंडारी : भारत की ही नहीं, आज यह दुनिया की सबसे बड़ी बर्निंग प्रोब्लम है। आज केवल भारत ही नहीं, पूरी दुनिया चिंतित है। सब भय के वातावरण में जी रहे हैं। अमरीका में विरोध हो रहा है, दुनिया के दूसरे देशों में विरोध हो रहा है। हम मध्यम मार्ग अपना रहे हैं। मैं नहीं जानता हूँ कि यह मध्यम मार्ग क्या है। स्पष्ट रूप से जो हमला करने जा रहा है, रोज अमरीका धमकी दे रहा है कि हम इराक पर हमला करने जा रहे हैं। आज युनाइटेड नेशन्स अप्रासंगिक हो रहा है उसकी प्रासंगिकता समाप्त हो रही है। जब दुनिया में झगड़े होते हैं, एक देश दूसरे देश से लड़ता है तो युनाइटेड नेशन्स में जाकर उसकी पंचायत होती है। मगर आज अमरीका युनाइटेड नेशन्स को भी अप्रासंगिक बनाने जा रहा है और इस वक्तव्य में इराक का तो कई जगहों पर नाम आया है मगर कहीं भी युनाइटेड स्टेट्स का नाम नहीं है।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी : किस चीज का भय है, हम लोग तो हैं ना।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति : ठीक है, इनको बोली दीजिए। बोलने दीजिए।

प्रो. राम देव बंडारी : हम युनाइटेड स्टेट्स का वक्तव्य में नाम भी नहीं ले सकते हैं। स्पष्ट रूप से हमारी जो पॉलिसी है, हमारा बहुत बड़ा देश है, हमारी बहुत बड़ी ताकत है और जब देश की प्रतिष्ठा का सवाल उठता है, मान-मर्यादा का सवाल उठता है तो पूरा देश आपके साथ रहता है। आप बहुत ताकतवर हैं, इस मुद्दे पर पूरा देश आपके साथ है। आप खुलकर,

मजबूती से, जो हमला करने वाला है उसके खिलाफ बोलिए। जिस पर हमला हो रहा है, उसकी हमें रक्षा करनी चाहिए।

श्री सभापति : मैं समझता हूँ जैसे अभी शांति से आपने बात सुनी है, उसी प्रकार से आप शांति बनाकर रखें।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सभापति जी, दुनिया एक गहरे संकट के दौर से गुजर रही है। शीतयुद्ध की समाप्ति के बाद अलग-अलग सैनिक शिविर समाप्त हो गए। लेकिन विश्व बहुध्रुवीय बनने में अभी समय लगेगा। मैंने अपने वक्तव्य में कहा है कि युनिलेटरलिज्म, एक तरफा कार्यवाही नहीं होगी। एकतरफा वाद नहीं चलेगा। युनिलेटरलिज्म चलाने का लोभ हो सकता है, महत्वाकांक्षा हो सकती है। लेकिन वह पूरी नहीं होगी और होनी भी नहीं चाहिए।

हम एक बहुराष्ट्रीय विश्व बनाना चाहते हैं। इसलिए किसी एक देश का कहना कि वह तय करेगा कि किस देश में कौन सी सरकार होनी चाहिए, किसकी सरकार होनी चाहिए, यह वर्तमान शताब्दी से मेल नहीं खाता। काल इसे स्वीकार नहीं करेगा इसलिए फैसले होने में देर हो रही है, उसका कारण यही है। जो फैसला करने वाले हैं वे और समय लें। तारीखें तय नहीं होनी चाहिए। अल्टीमेटम नहीं दिए जाने चाहिए। तारीखें बढ़ाई जा सकती हैं। इंसपेक्टरों की संख्या भी बढ़ाई जा सकती है। सुरक्षा परिषद् पूरी तरह से तस्थीर में रहनी चाहिए। जो भी कार्रवाई हो, वह सुरक्षा परिषद् के माध्यम से हो। उसके द्वारा निश्चित निर्णय के अनुसार हो। दूसरा और कोई रास्ता नहीं है। लेकिन किसी ने मुझसे पूछा कि अगर सुरक्षा परिषद् ने ही तय कर दिया कि इराक पर हमला किया जाए तो? मैंने कहा कि ऐसा नहीं होगा। ऐसा नहीं होगा। यह विश्व बदला हुआ है। सुरक्षा परिषद् के सदस्य भी नए ढंग से सोच रहे हैं। विश्व का जनमत अपने को असर्ट कर रहा है - इतनी बड़ी संख्या में लोगों का सड़कों पर आना, जो लोकतंत्रवादी देश हैं, उन्हें इससे प्रभावित होना पड़ेगा। इसलिए युद्ध कोई विकल्प नहीं है, युद्ध कोई मार्ग नहीं है। समस्या का समाधान शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से निकालना होगा, समझौता वार्ता द्वारा निकालना होगा और विश्व की पंचायत में निकालना होगा। इस संबंध में जब राष्ट्रपति बुश ने मुझे टेलीफोन किया था और मैंने उनसे जो कुछ कहा उसे उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ :

"Yes, Mr. President, I thank you for sharing your perspective on Iraq. As you know, there is great anxiety in India on the situation. Our people are deeply concerned about the consequences of military conflict. My Government is of the opinion that Iraq must get rid of its weapons of Mass Destruction, continue to support the efforts of the United Nations Security Council in this regard. We still hope that the goal can be achieved without resorting to military action. We sincerely hope, Mr. President, that all decisions on Iraq will be taken through the United Nations Security Council." उन्होंने उस समय जो कुछ कहा मैं उसे उद्धृत नहीं कर रहा हूँ लेकिन ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री के. नटवर सिंह : कर दीजिए।

श्री सभापति : ठहरिए, ठहरिए।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उनके शब्दों से यह ध्वनि नहीं निकली ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री के. नटवर सिंह : इतना गंभीर सवाल है । क्या कहा उन्होंने आपसे ? आपसे सहमत हैं कि नहीं ...(व्यवधान)...

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्री (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : बता रहे हैं ।

श्री सभापति : बोलने दीजिए, लेट हिम फिनिश ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सभापति जी, श्री नटवर सिंह कूटनीतिज्ञ रह चुके हैं ।

श्री सभापति : इसीलिए तो पूछ रहे हैं ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं पौलेण्ड एक संसदीय प्रतिनिधिमंडल में गया था तो वहां नटवर सिंह जी राजदूत थे ।

श्री के. नटवर सिंह : आप हिन्दुस्तानी बोले थे वहां ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : जी ।

श्री के. नटवर सिंह : आप बतौर हिन्दुस्तानी वहां बोले थे । सारा देश देख रहा है कि आप क्या जवाब देंगे । लोग सुनना चाहते हैं ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : देख नहीं रहा है, सुन रहा है ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति : आप डिस्टर्ब मत कीजिए ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : इस समय देश जो आशा रखता है, उसकी वह आशा पूरी होगी । इसके बारे में किसी के मन में संदेह नहीं होना चाहिए । आखिर अपने देश के बारे में इस तरह की भावना क्यों?

श्री के. नटवर सिंह : क्योंकि आप खामोश हैं ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : क्या सरकार परिवर्तित हो गयी तो देश का मानस भी बदल गया ।

श्री के. नटवर सिंह : वह तो आप पर निर्भर है ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : ऐसे अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्दों पर राय नहीं बदलती, यह आप जानते हैं । हम विदेश नीति के मामले में मोटे तौर पर एक साथ रहे हैं ।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु : आप के मुंह में घी शक्कर ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सारा जनमत इस के पीछे खड़ा है और मैं ने स्पष्ट किया कि कोई वहां सरकार बनाकर बिठा दी जाए, गुड़िया सरकार, इस को कोई स्वीकार नहीं करेगा । हथियारों के बल पर फैसले नहीं होंगे । अन्य दलों से सम्पर्क कर के उस दिन चर्चा कर के हम इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचे थे कि मोटे तौर पर देश में एक आम राय है और युद्ध और शांति के प्रश्न

पर देश बंटना नहीं चाहिए । हम आशा करते हैं कि अभी भी समझदारी वापिस आएगी, बुद्धिमत्ता से काम लिया जाएगा । युद्ध का रास्ता छोड़कर, समझौते की गली में आगे बढ़ने के लिए कोशिश की जाएगी ।

सभापति महोदय, हम ने अपने नागरिकों का प्रबंध किया है । वह प्रबंध आवश्यक है, पर स्थिति कोई घातक रूप भी ले सकती है । हम उम्मीद करते हैं कि नहीं लेगी और इसलिए हम अभी इन प्रश्नों का उत्तर नहीं दे पा रहे हैं कि अगर ऐसा हो गया, वैसा हो गया । जब जैसा होगा तब हम करेंगे । क्या करेंगे ? जो देश की प्रतिष्ठा के लिए उचित होगा और विश्व की शांति के लिए होगा । इस के बारे में किसी के मन में संदेह नहीं होना चाहिए ।

सभापति जी, आप ने मुझे समय दिया, मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned for lunch for one hour.

The House then adjourned for lunch at twenty-seven minutes past one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at thirty-one minutes past two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 2003-2004 (CONTD.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Nilotpall Basuji, you have to start now. Your party has been given 35 minutes.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Yes, Madam, I am the only speaker from my party.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You can speak for 15 minutes more.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : I might take one or two minutes more.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Okay.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Madam, Deputy Chairman, I was talking about the five priorities about which the hon. Finance Minister had elaborated in the very opening paragraph of his Budget Speech. I think, there is absolutely nothing in the actual Budget provisions to substantiate that these are the priorities. As I have already stated, the basic problem of the economy, today, is that there is no demand. And unless we can get over this demand compression, and empower the people, invest them with a certain amount of purchasing power, things will not look up. Unfortunately, we had certain possibilities in terms of what I was stating; liquidation of the huge food stocks that we have build over the last couple