

ont>

14.24 hrs.

Title: Further discussion on Demands for Grants under the control of Ministry of External Affairs in respect of the Budget (General) for the year 2003-2004 (Cut motions moved and negatived). (Not concluded)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand No.30 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.

Hon. Members present in the House whose cut motions to the Demand for Grant have been circulated may, if they desire to move their cut motions, send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the cut motions they would like to move. Only those cut motions will be treated as moved.

Motion moved:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the Fourth column of the Order paper be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 2004, in respect of the heads of Demands entered in the Second column thereof against Demand No.30 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs. "

Now, the debate will start. Shri R.L. Bhatia to initiate the discussion.

श्री राजो सिंह (बेगूसराय) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राज्य मंत्री आगे बैठे हैं लेकिन बाकी मंत्री कहां हैं? (व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : संबंधित मंत्री बैठे हुये हैं।

श्री राजो सिंह : इसमें विदेश मंत्री के साथ के बाकी विभागीय मंत्री बैठे हुये हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : विदेश मंत्री बैठे हुये हैं।

श्री राजो सिंह : वह तो ठीक है लेकिन बाकी मिनिस्टर जो बैठे हुये हैं, उनके विभाग की ग्रांट्स गिलोटिन में चली जायेगी जिनका इस मंत्रालय से कोई कनसर्न नहीं है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : लेकिन बिहार से तो मंत्रीगण बैठे हुये हैं।

SHRI R.L. BHATIA (AMRITSAR): Hon. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the basic objectives of the foreign policy of a country are to safeguard the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country. The second objective is to create an external atmosphere beneficial to the country, which is helpful to us in maintaining our development as well as the national institutions. This policy was formulated a long time ago by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and administration after administration has been following that policy because that policy was a policy of peace and good relationship with all the countries, especially with our neighbours. In the pursuit of that policy, India has been pursuing an independent policy of good relationship with all its neighbours – Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Bangladesh, Nepal and Bhutan. Of course, the relationship with Pakistan is on a different footing.

In this regard, it is very important that we develop our relations with our northern neighbour, which is a big country, and that is China. I would like to say that China is not a country but it is a civilisation and India is also a civilisation. Both the countries have a very good past record of relationship. A long time ago, in the time of war, India sent a medical mission under Dr. Kotnis and later when China became free, India tried to see that China also became a member of the United Nations. All these efforts brought the two countries quite close. After attaining Independence, Chou-en-Lai and Pandit Nehru had good meetings and our relationships were established. In 1954, the agreement of *Panchsheel* was adopted and the relations went on very well. Some time in 1962, on account of differences on border, a conflict did arise and thereafter, up to 1988, there was not much interaction between the two countries.

The credit goes to Shri Rajiv Gandhi who initiated the talks and a breakthrough was achieved in the relationship between India and China and ever since our relationship has been growing. Three agreements were made during the visit of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Thereafter, Li Peng, the Prime Minister of China, came to India in 1991. In 1993, Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao went to China and a very important agreement was signed for maintaining peace and tranquillity at the border and setting up of a working group. I had the opportunity of accompanying Shri Narasimha Rao and signing this agreement on behalf of India. Thereafter, in 1996, President Jiang came to India and the relationship was developed further.

But in 1998, Shri George Fernandes made a statement that China is enemy number one. Well, that upset our relations. We were surprised, as there was nothing tangible that happened at the border or in the relations between the two countries that Shri George Fernandes had to make that kind of a statement in the Press as well as in the

political circles of India. It was a big surprise to us.

Shrimati Sonia Gandhi in a meeting in Panchmarhi in 1999, where we discussed the problems of the Congress Party, future programme and all that, raised this point about the damage done by the statement of Shri George Fernandes and how it can be offset. So, it was decided to send a Congress Party delegation to China so that at party to party level, we may explain to them the friendship between the two countries. Shrimati Sonia Gandhi sent a three-Member delegation. Shri Natwar Singh was the Leader, Shri Eduardo Faleiro was a member and I was also a member of that delegation. When we met the leadership of China, they were very happy that the Congress Party had sent three former Foreign Ministers to explain this position. Later, the hon. President, Shri K.R. Narayanan, went there - he had quite a clout there; he was there for a long time. It was a very good meeting. Later, Shri Jaswant Singh, our former hon. Minister of External Affairs also went there and relations have become almost normal.

Now Shri George Fernandes has also gone there. It is very good. Earlier, he made a statement that China is enemy number one. Now, he has gone there as a friend. I hope he will contribute to the friendship between the two countries and Chinese will certainly be happy to have a statement from him.

Now our hon. Prime Minister is also likely to go to China soon. I would like that we must have some kind of a package with China with regard to border. It is because we set up a JWG. A number of meetings -- 12 or 13 meetings -- have already taken place. It is such a slow progress and I do not know how many years it will take to settle this point. This is the only point between the two countries where we have a difference and it should be resolved. In order to keep a bigger pace, I would like that either we suggest or let Chinese suggest to us and you take into consideration some kind of a package by which this dispute is over so that there is a greater cooperation between the two countries. I would like to mention here that all these years, from 1988 onwards, there has been no incident on the border between the two countries. There has been good cooperation and China also changed their stance on Kashmir. Formerly they were helping Pakistan, but now they clearly say that it is for India and Pakistan to settle their differences.

Sir, one more point I would like to say that in 1993 when our agreement with France for the supply of heavy water to Tarapore was over, France refused to honour the agreement and extend the agreement. They clearly mentioned that it was because of pressure from America that they could not do it because they told us not to give heavy water to India. Then, we requested China and China gave us heavy water. So, this is the kind of the cooperation that we had in all these years and the relations have been increasing. I think it is a great opportunity that the hon. Prime Minister of India is going there after ten years. So, it should be a historical meeting. It must be a fruitful meeting and something should come out of it.

We should be ready with our proposal. The Chinese may agree or may not agree; that is their business. Some time back, the hon. Speaker led a Delegation to China, and I was a member of that Delegation. We had very good discussions with President Jiang, Mr. Jin Tao, Mr. Li Peng and other leaders. What we found was that they have been quite engaged in the economic build-up of their country, and they want a peaceful border, especially with India. It appeared to us, I might be wrong, that they have been very keen to have a permanent settlement with us. That is all the more reason that when the world is changing, when a new international order is taking place in the world and in view of the kind of tendency that is developing, that is, the unipolar world, there is a need that India and China should further cooperate. For that, I would like that more and more 'Confidence Building Measures' should be taken.

One thing confronted us in many meetings; I went there three or four times. Whenever I went there, one pertinent question put by the journalists or the intellectuals there was that when we have accepted Tibet as a part of China, as an autonomous region of China, then why were the Tibetans conducting their activities here in this country? They feel that if India is a friend, a friendly country, then anti-China activities should not be there. The Lama is here in this country as a revered leader and because he is a religious leader, we respect him. But we cannot allow him to have political activities in this country. This part of it may kindly be looked into because this issue was raised by some people over there.

Similarly, other measures should be taken by which our friendship can grow. Luckily, with all your efforts, the trade has increased from US \$ 1 billion to US \$ 5 billion and, very soon, I think, we will be able to reach US \$ 10 billion. Their Prime Minister, when he came here, wanted that the trade between India and China should grow. Our Prime Minister has set up a 'Group of Eminent Persons of India' and, similarly, a 'Group of Eminent Persons of China' has been made there. It was done at the time of Shri Narayanan. When the President went there, he suggested that the Government Ministers or the officers could not meet so often and, therefore, there should be non-Governmental interaction between the two countries. I thank the Prime Minister that he has made me the Chairman of the Group of Eminent Persons of India. We had three meetings with the Chinese. We are discussing common issues, like trade, culture and other things, and especially the issue of environment. All the rivers flow from China to India. If there can be any collaboration between India and China to tame those rivers, it will be beneficial to us. In this regard also,

when our Prime Minister goes there, he should raise this subject because in this way, there will be a permanent relationship between the two countries. Since common interests are involved, our friendship will grow.

The other point, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would like to make is about Pakistan. During Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's time, India had a great strategy of non-alignment in foreign affairs, and we had democracy and secularism in the domestic affairs, and planning and self-reliance in the economic affairs. This policy worked very well in India, but today, unfortunately, the NDA Government does not have such an integral approach to the problems of India.

Regarding Pakistan, we must say that the conflict between India and Pakistan is based on the ideology and identity of Pakistan. The central point among the relations between India and Pakistan is the two-nation theory. While British were leaving this country they divided this country on this basis. Ever since, we are fighting with each other. There have been three wars and we have not been able to solve the problem. Many efforts have been made by Government of India, especially by our Prime Ministers, but no fruitful results have come so far. Pakistan always does things which are against India as such.

What we find is that whenever there is a civil Government in Pakistan, there has always been effort on both sides to come together. However, the Army always intervened and as a result of that, the relationship does not grow. Every time we started talks there was always a happening. Earlier we had talks with Benazir Bhutto and there was a change of Government over there. Later on we had talks with Shahnawaz and again there was a change of Government. It is the vested interest of Army in Pakistan that relations between India and Pakistan do not get better. The moment there is peace, the Army would lose its relevance in Pakistan. Therefore, it is a very big factor. That India and Pakistan are not coming together is because of the Army in Pakistan.

Prime Minister Vajpayee made an effort and took initiative to go to Lahore in a bus and tried to have talks with the Pakistani leadership. There were lots of hopes on both sides of the border that since Shri Vajpayee had gone to Lahore, there would be some positive outcome. What we found was that the Kargil war was started. It was started because the Army did not like it. I am told that the present President of Pakistan, who was at that time the Commander-in-Chief of Pakistan Army, refused to salute to Shri Vajpayee saying that he came from the enemy country. That was what was reported in Pakistani Press. Now we cannot expect friendship from the same person.

Again, maybe under international pressure or pressure from inside the country, it was decided once again to invite Gen. Musharraf to Agra for talks. All of us know what happened at Agra. He brought a big contingent with him, addressed the international Press here and forcefully spoke his point of view. We did not want that he should meet the Hurriyat people and yet he met them. He was able to do whatever he wanted to do. I do not know if we were not fully prepared or what happened. One can say that he went back victorious, as reported all over at that time. India lost face because we invited him for talks and yet we could not get anything. We could not reach any agreement at Agra. He was able to forcefully put across his point of view. Some people say that India had always won wars with Pakistan but always lost in talks. When we talked, it is they who took the advantage and we were not able to take the advantage.

The Prime Minister has once again offered for talks with Pakistan while he was in Srinagar. All along, it has been our policy that we will not have dialogue with Pakistan until cross-border terrorism is stopped. The Prime Minister made this statement a number of times. The Foreign Minister made it and the Defence Minister made it. The Deputy Prime Minister made the statement categorically that there will be no further talks till they stop cross border terrorism. But, all said and done, the Prime Minister's offer has baffled the people in India.

Sir, two attempts were already made with a fair mind by the hon. Prime Minister. But there was no response, and it was a failure. Now, again the hon. Prime Minister has said it, more so at a time when the Foreign Minister had made a statement.

I congratulate the Foreign Minister for his bold statement when he said that India cannot remain silent simply out of fear of incurring the displeasure of others. I know what he means and I think, all of us know he pointed to whom. Then, Shri George Fernandes also made a very categorical statement in this regard.

Sir, normally, I am not happy with his statement. But this is the first time that I am appreciating his statement because what he had said was that 'more than enough, Pakistan is a fit case to launch a strike.' I think, that is the realistic situation. That is what the position in India is. That is what India feels. There cannot be two yardsticks, one for Iraq and another for Pakistan. Americans are fighting in Iraq. They have done the aggression there. But so far as India is concerned, they always advise us: "No, no. Do not fight; always have a dialogue and resolve your problem."

So, I am glad that the hon. Minister has made a very good statement. I appreciate it.

Sir, after the attack on our Parliament, the hon. Prime Minister made a very bold statement on the floor of this House. He had said: "Enough is enough." He said: "अब आर-पार की लड़ाई होगी।"

We were happy with his statement. Pakistan is always creating problems for us. We thought that this Government was determined to do something. But I am sorry to say that nothing happened. We sent the Army there and after nine months we withdrew them. I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what were the circumstances that they sent the Army. What were their compulsions, and what were their compulsions when they withdrew them? I would like to know all this from them.

Sir, the hon. Prime Minister says: "अब आर-पार की लड़ाई होगी" हम पार तो गये नहीं, आर भी नहीं रहे, हमें तो आपने मझघार में फेंक दिया। We are nowhere. We have lost faith. People are laughing at us. India has only made good statements, long statements, and tall statements, but in action, we do not do anything. So, I would like to say to our hon. Minister that when we are dealing with such a sensitive issue like Pakistan, we should be very cautious in our statements. So, in this connection, I would like to ask the hon. Minister as to what our policy is towards Pakistan. What is our national policy? All these years, we are having a haphazard way of talking to them and meeting them and involving others. But we must have a definite policy towards Pakistan which I would like the hon. Minister to announce.

Secondly, what is the strategy of the Government to achieve their goal? What are their tools? How will they do it? What is the strategy and the magnitude by which they would relieve us from the permanent problem of animosity with Pakistan? I hope the young energetic Minister will certainly guide us in this connection.

Sir, for nine months our Army was there in Pakistan and we Punjabis suffered the most because whenever there is war, we are the people in Punjab who suffer the most. Shri Vinod Khanna is sitting here and he knows what devastations took place to our areas. The farmers could not cut their crop; they could not sow even. So, during the Army movement and all that, all the trade is stopped, factories are closed. For nine months, before the Indian troops were withdrawn, Punjab suffered the most. They had already suffered in three wars. Now again, they suffered.

General Malik had made a very nice comment. He had said that Pakistan won the war without fighting it. He had said it very appropriately. The Government had sent the Army, called it back and got nothing out of it. So, what was the compulsion to send the Army on the border and what was the compulsion to call them back?

We Indians feel that all this indicates one problem. We feel that you are not directing your policies. There is somebody else, far away, who is influencing your policies. You should go and have a talk but you are saying that you will not talk unless Pakistan stops cross-border terrorism. Yet, you asked them to come to Agra. The general impression is, it is the United States of America which is interfering in our foreign policy. I would request the External Affairs Minister to act as a sovereign State, as an independent State and do not look to them for the answers. They will not give you the answer. They have one stand for Iraq and another stand for Pakistan. India is of no value for them except for apartheid, but they have every value for Pakistan because it is an ally.

I am sorry to say that when President Clinton came to India, he had said that America is a natural ally of India. May I ask you Mr. Minister, has your natural ally so far accepted your position in Kashmir? Does he accept that Kashmir is an integral part of India? Your natural ally says that Kashmir is a disputed territory.

After the attack on Parliament, when the Government had sent the forces on the border, it was presumed that they had advised you not to do it and that they would do something when they would be free from Iraq. So, do not expect anything from them. They have their own national interests. We should watch our national interests.

India has joined the international coalition. It is a support to them. But have they supported us? Has any country come forward to support us on Kashmir? Therefore, I would request you to depend on your own. You should have your independent Foreign Policy. You should have your policy to deal with Pakistan. Do not depend on the United States of America. They will never come to help you because they have their own interests with Pakistan.

I would now like to mention about the new International order. We know, after the Cold War was over, 40 years' bipolar world was no longer there. The only other superpower, that is the USSR had disintegrated. The Non-aligned Movement had weakened. No other country in the world but one possesses the qualifications of being the only superpower which is all powerful, which is a new power, a military power, economic power and science and technological power. It has set up its own agenda.

If you see the reports of the Pentagon, If you see the reports of various committees where discussions took place, it appears that America has its own national agenda and that agenda is admonished. You have seen how they are playing their role in the world. You may see their position on Iraq. The other Security Council members did not approve it, the world opinion was against it yet they carried out their agenda over there. They may say a number of things, like, 'he was a tyrant, people were unhappy and they have gone to liberate them as also to establish democracy', but this is wrong. Everybody knows that they had gone there for oil. About 15 to 20 per cent of the oil is located in Iraq and the American companies could not lay their hands on it.

That was the main reason. The other thing possible is that they always supported Israel and Iraq was the only

country which was a threat to Israel. So, they wanted to remove that threat. The third thing is that they wanted to teach a lesson to the other countries. America will do whatever it wants and nobody can stop them. When this situation has arisen, they are calling other countries rogue States, but in spite of our giving so much information about Pakistan that it is a terrorist country and that they are involved in cross-border terrorism, they are not prepared to call it a terrorist State, even though the bases are there. Therefore, the situation in the world is fast changing. It has become a unipolar world. It is very dangerous. It will create imbalances and further problems in the world. Now, India is a big country. We had a great past. India has played a very important role in the past as a leader of the Non-Aligned countries. More than 100 countries got freedom with our help and, of course, with the help of other member countries. India has a big name. We have a moral aspect of our foreign policy also. Wherever there has been some problem in the world, India has raised its voice. When the Britishers invaded Suez Canal, India was the first to raise its voice. In the case of Vietnam also India played a very important role in raising the voice for those people. So, where is that India now? I look to you as to what you have done to this country.

Last year I went to Gulf countries and I met Mr. Hosni Mubarak, the President of Egypt. He asked me where is Bharat of Nehru and Gandhi? What has happened to you? Why do you not lead the world? The world needs you. Mr. Minister, what answer should I have given to him? Should I have said that the present Government is not interested in Non-Aligned Movement?

Now, there are different statements by different people in your Party. Your Advisor, Shri Brajesh Mishra said in an international conference that Non-Aligned Movement is a shibboleth, while the Prime Minister goes in a meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement and he praises it. Similarly, there are different statements from different Ministers. As I have just told you, you said something about Pakistan, Shri George Fernandes said something about it, and the Prime Minister said something else about it. So, we are confused about your policy. There is a total confusion. You have no vision and policy. That is how India's position has been downgraded. During Nehru's time, we carved out a space in the world policy. We were honoured and respected. Today, that place has shrunk. It is all because of the fact that your Party and your Government has no vision and no strategy in the foreign affairs. This is how India's position has weakened today. We have become vulnerable. Now it is others who are playing a role in this region.

America wanted to have oil of CIS States. They bled Afghanistan for a long time. They created Hqmatyar but he failed. Then they created Taliban. It was all for oil in CIS States. It is because region of Tajikistan, Kazakstan, and Azerbaijan is a land-locked area. They want a pipeline through Afghanistan to Pakistan. That is why, for almost 10 years, Afghanistan had to face the music....(Interruptions). Please let me complete. You will have your chance. I am not yielding. So, around 15 to 20 per cent oil is in CIS States and the same percentage of oil is in Iraq. They want American monopoly there. That is how they created an imbalance in this world. Therefore, Mr. Minister, you could see how the things are changing in the world, how a new international order based on might is right is being created. What is your reaction? We would like to know what is India's reaction to this new development. I would like that you must answer all these questions which are in our mind and for which India is being downgraded.

CUT MOTIONS

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (CHANDIGARH) : I beg to move :

15.00 hrs.

श्री प्रकाश मणि त्रिपाठी (देवरिया) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं विदेश मंत्रालय की अनुदान की मांग के समर्थन में खड़ा हूँ। अपने आप में अनुदान बहुत मामूली तौर से बढ़े हैं और मेरे ख्याल से पूरी संसद इसको पास करने के लिए अपनी सहमति प्रदान करेगी। यह मौका लिया जाता है कि विदेश मंत्रालय के कामों का लेखाजोखा भी किया जाए लेकिन विदेश नीति के बारे में एक चीज समझना बहुत जरूरी है कि वह साल-साल में बदलती नहीं है। न तो सरकार के बदलने से विदेश नीति बदलती है और अभी रघुनंदन लाल जी विदेश मंत्रालय के बहुत वरिष्ठ जानकार भी हैं, उन्होंने जो बात की तो हमारे दिमाग में यह आया कि उनका यह विचार है कि बीसवीं सदी में जो विदेश नीति रही है, वही हमारी सरकार इक्कीसवीं सदी में चलाए। बार-बार पीछे जाने की बात आ रही है। यह विदेश नीति भारत की एक लगातार प्रक्रिया है। यह कोई एकाएक नहीं होती है लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ इसका नाता अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रगति के साथ है और इसलिए जैसे कि हर बुजुर्ग लोग अपने जमाने की बात करते हैं कि हमारे जमाने में ऐसा हुआ था, ऐसा हुआ था और वह बहुत अच्छी चीज है। हम सब लोग सपना देखते हैं। मैं भी बुजुर्ग हो रहा हूँ लेकिन हमको आगे बढ़ना है। यह इक्कीसवीं सदी है और बहुत सी चीजें बदल गई हैं। उस बदलाव को हमारी विदेश नीति अपनी नीति में अगर समाहित नहीं करती है तो हम पीछे छूट जाएंगे। बहुत से बदलाव हुए हैं लेकिन कुछ चीजें बताना जरूरी है और पहली चीज बताना चाहता हूँ कि भारत आज एक परमाणु शक्ति है।

हम लोग अमेरिकन्स के पिटू माने जा रहे हैं। 1974 से हमारे पास परमाणु विस्फोट करने की ताकत, शक्ति और जानकारी थी। 1974 से जब तक यह सरकार गवर्नमेंट में आई है, किसी की हिम्मत नहीं पड़ी कि परमाणु शक्ति का विस्फोट करें और उसकी घोषणा करें कि भारत एक परमाणु शक्ति है। विस्फोट तो हमने 1974 में किया था और सारी दुनिया में आडम्बर बनाकर हमने यह बताने की कोशिश की कि हमने परमाणु बम नहीं फोड़ा है। हमने शांतिपूर्ण उद्देश्य के लिए काम किया है। पहली दफा यह घोषणा की गई कि भारत एक परमाणु शक्ति है। वह बनाना अपने आप में इतना जरूरी नहीं था जितना यह हिम्मत करना कि घोषणा की जाए और दुनिया यह जाने, दुनिया के बड़े राष्ट्र यह जानें। **â€** (व्यवधान)

15.04 hrs. (Shri P.H. Pandian in the Chair)

अब आप लोग आराम से सुनिए। बहुत आराम से हमने रघुनंदन लाल जी को सुना क्योंकि सपनों से काम नहीं होगा, यथार्थ पर आना पड़ेगा। दूसरी बात यह है कि अब दुनिया में द्विपक्षीय पार्टियां नहीं हैं। एक सुपर पावर आ गयी है। उसको आप मानें या उसके बारे में परेशान हों लेकिन इस यथार्थ को भी जानना पड़ेगा कि एक सुपर पावर है और इसीलिए हमारी विदेश नीति को अपने में इस तरह से मोड़ना पड़ेगा कि हम उस सुपर पावर को जहां पर जरूरत है और इसके बारे में मैं उदाहरण

दूंगा।

जहां पर जरूरत है वहां पर रोक लगाई जाए, जहां पर जरूरत है वहां पर उसके खिलाफ बात की जाए और जहां पर जरूरत नहीं है उसके खिलाफ बात न की जाए। ये तीनों चीजें बहुत जरूरी हैं। तीसरी बात जो हमें बहुत ध्यान में रखनी पड़ेगी कि पिछले एक दशक में अंतर्राष्ट्रीयकरण आर्थिक नीतियों का हुआ है, व्यापार का है। अब इतना ज्यादा नहीं है कि हर मुल्क दूसरे मुल्क पर चढ़ाई करके उस पर कब्जा कर लेगा। लेकिन आर्थिक तरीके से उस पर दबाव डालना चाहेगा। इसलिए अपनी विदेश नीति में हम धीरे-धीरे परिपक्व हो रहे हैं और हमारी सरकार के जमाने में यह परिपक्वता आई है। आप लोगों ने डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. पर दस्तखत किए, लेकिन उसका कैसे सम्भाला जाए, उसके नुकसान से कैसे उबरा जाए, यह काम हमारी सरकार ने किया। इस बात को समझना चाहिए कि अगर कोई सुपर पावर है, हमारा देश भी कल सुपर पावर हो जाएगा, तो कल उसका एक एजेंडा होगा, वह एजेंडा दूसरों पर थोपने की कोशिश करेगा। यह यथार्थ है। अगर यथार्थ को नहीं मानेंगे तो हम उसका जवाब नहीं निकाल सकते। अमेरिका आज सुपर पावर हुआ है, चाहे जिस तरीके से भी हुआ है। लेकिन जब कोई सुपर पावर होगा तो यथार्थ है कि उसका एजेंडा होगा और वह उसको दूसरे पर लागू करने की बात करेगा। इसके बारे में बार-बार चर्चा करने से कुछ नहीं होगा। उसको अपनी नीति में समाहित करके उसका जवाब हम निकाल सकते हैं। Foreign policy and international relations are a vast subject and I am rather surprised to see रघुनंदन जी ने ज्यादातर इंडो-चाइना जो बना है, उसके अध्यक्ष के मुताबिक बात की है। लेकिन यह बहुत वास्तविक है। हम नहीं समझते कि सबको इस वास्तविक के बारे में पूरा मालूम हो। लेकिन मैं अपने विदेश मंत्रालय को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे अपने बगल के देश हों, चाहे साउथ एशिया के देश हों, चाहे ईस्ट एशिया के देश हों, चाहे सेंट्रल एशिया के देश हों, गल्फ हो, चाहे अफ्रीका हो, चाहे कैरेबियन कंट्रीज हों, चाहे अमेरिका हो या नार्थ अमेरिकन देश हों, चाहे कनाडा हो, ब्रिटेन हो या यूरोपीयन कंट्रीज हों या इंटरनेशनल आर्गनाइजेशंस हों, हमारा विदेश मंत्रालय बहुत संतुलित तरीके से और बहुत परिपक्व तरीके से इन सबका काम बहुत स्थिरता से कर रहा है। केवल स्थिरता से नहीं कर रहा है, वह रिएक्ट करके नहीं कर रहा है, वह अपने एजेंडे के मुताबिक कर रहा है। इसका मैं उदाहरण दूंगा।

एक चीज मैं इसके पहले जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेश नीति क्या है, मेरे ख्याल से विदेश नीति का आकलन केवल एक मापदंड पर करना चाहिए। वह मापदंड यह है कि that it must be pragmatic and it must do good to our country. Principles, policies, पहले क्या हुआ, बाद में क्या होना है, इसको छोड़ कर विदेश नीति इसी पर निर्धारित होनी चाहिए, न किसी बड़े नेता पर निर्धारित होनी चाहिए और न किसी के पर्सनल ख्याल पर निर्धारित होनी चाहिए। क्योंकि पर्सनल ख्याल पर निर्धारित होकर हम 1962 में पहले गड्डे में गिरे हैं। जब गड्डे में गिरे तो लड़ाई शुरू होने के 15 मिनट पहले तक हिंदी-चीनी भाई-भाई का राग अलापा जा रहा था। मैं तब फौज में था और हमने यह देखा था। इसलिए बहुत ठंडे दिमाग से विदेश नीति चलानी चाहिए, वह प्रैगमेटिक होनी चाहिए, जो हमारे देश के लिए अच्छा है, केवल उस पर करनी चाहिए। लोकल इवेंट्स हर देश पर प्रभावित रहते हैं।

They always have an impact on our country. Mexico is very important for America. Cuba is very important for America. Similarly, Pakistan and China are very important for us. But I certainly do not expect a country like India, with the status of India, to become only Pakistan centric or China centric. We have to be on a different footing with Pakistan which is totally India centric. हमको अपना फुटिंग अलग रखना है नहीं तो हम उसी रंग में रंग जाएंगे। बार-बार उसी की बात करते रहेंगे तो हमारा जो दृष्टिकोण है वह संकीर्ण और कम हो जाएगा। इस बात को हमें ध्यान में रखना है। मैं अपने विदेश मंत्रालय और खासतौर से माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि वह इस बात का बहुत ख्याल करते हैं। अगर हम पाकिस्तान सेंट्रिक हो गये, तो केवल हम रिएक्ट करेंगे और किसी काम में कोई भी रिएक्शन आज तक हमने नहीं किया है। चाहे पोखरन (2) किया, हमने अपने मन से अपना निर्णय लेकर किया है, किसी की बात नहीं सुनी है। यही देश है जहां पर न केवल परमाणु बम पर बल्कि आम मिसाइल टैस्टिंग रोक दी जाती थी अगर अमरीका का दबाव पड़ता था। एक केस हुआ है जबकि हमने अपनी सीमाओं पर हथियार लगाने पर रोक लगा दी क्योंकि अमरीका को पता चल गया। लेकिन यही वह अब देश है जिसने परमाणु बम अपनी मर्जी से किया। हम कभी रिएक्ट करके नहीं करते हैं। चाहे अटल जी बस में बैठकर लाहौर गये तो किसी के कहने पर नहीं गये। अपने दिमाग से गये। चाहे कश्मीर में इलैक्शन किये गये या कश्मीर में अभी उनका प्रवास हुआ। शुरू में तो लोग अचम्भित हो गये, क्योंकि लोग नहीं सोचते हैं जैसाकि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री सोचते हैं। सब लोग गरम थे, गुस्सा थे। जाकर उन्होंने जो बातें कही और आज जो उन्होंने अपना स्टेटमेंट दिया है, मेरे ख्याल में इस संसद या पूरे देश में कोई ऐसा आदमी नहीं है जो यह कहे कि यह किसी के दबाव में हुआ है या स्वयं सोचकर नहीं किया गया है। यह करना बहुत बड़े आदमी का काम है। सब लोग इसे नहीं समझ पायेंगे।

अभी माननीय रघुनंदन लाल जी ने कहा कि आप लोग क्या कर रहे हैं? मुशर्रफ साहब आगरा में आये and I think he went back victoriously. हमें हंसी आ गयी क्योंकि ऐसे ज्ञानी और विदेश मंत्रालय में रहने वाले और हमारे पुराने मित्र जिनका मैं बहुत सम्मान करता हूँ। यह बार-बार कहा जाता है कि वे वापस गये तो एक विजयी राष्ट्रपति की तरह गये। हमारा यह कहना है कि वे बंदूक की दोनों नालों से फायर करते आये थे और अपनी दुम दबाकर वापस गये हैं। उनको जवाब देने के लिए कुछ नहीं था। यह पहली दफे हुआ है कि एक पाकिस्तानी प्रेसीडेंट को बेरंग वापस कर दिया गया है। मैं आपके शासन का 1972 का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ जब हमने 92 हजार पाकिस्तानी सैनिक बंदी बनाकर रखा था और पाकिस्तान को आधा तोड़कर उसको आजाद करा दिया था। सब पत्ते हमारे हाथ में थे। उस समय पाकिस्तानी प्रेसीडेंट जुल्फिकार भुट्टो यहां पर आये और क्या बात या वार्ता हुई और क्या चीज हमने पाई। आज कश्मीर के बारे में आप शोरगुल मचा रहे हो। क्या 92 हजार सैनिक यहां पर रखकर, पाकिस्तान को आधा तोड़कर कश्मीर का मसला हल नहीं करवा सकते थे, क्या यह नहीं कह सकते थे कि इस पर दस्तखत कीजिए, तब हम इन्हें वापस भेजेंगे। शिमला समझौता हमने किया, बाइलैटरल एग्रीमेंट हमने किया। बाइलैटरल का क्या मतलब है? बाइलैटरल का मतलब है दो आदमियों के बीच में संधि। दूसरा आदमी छिटककर अलग हो जाता है और कहता है कि मैं इसको नहीं मानता हूँ। हम लोग बाध्य होकर उसको मान रहे हैं क्योंकि आप लोगों ने दस्तखत किया। हम लोग परिपक्व हैं जो उस गलत काम को भी मान रहे हैं और अपने कंधों पर ढो रहे हैं। लेकिन यह नहीं है कि 92 हजार लोगों को बंदी बनाकर भी आप नहीं नहीं कर सकते। क्या चीज ले गये मुशर्रफ, कौन सी चीज लेकर गये जो आप लोग बार-बार कहते हैं कि मुशर्रफ जीत कर गये। सबसे बड़ी चीज हमारी उपलब्धि है कि हमने कहा नहीं, जो चीज हमें पसंद नहीं है तो हम नहीं मानेंगे, आप जाइये वापस और पूंछ दबाकर वे वापस गये।

इराक की बात कही गई। इस पर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने 19 फरवरी को वक्तव्य दिया, जो मेरे सामने है। बहुत संतुलित वक्तव्य था। हर चीज उसमें समाहित थी। हमको जो करना चाहिए था, वह उसमें समाहित था। उसके बावजूद भी एक तरह का माहौल बनाया गया और संसद में गतिरोध पैदा किया गया। बाद में फिर रिजोल्यूशन सदन में पास हुआ और सर्वसम्मति से हुआ। हम सब लोग उसमें शामिल थे। यहां एक प्रभाव बनाकर गतिरोध पैदा किया गया और रिजोल्यूशन को लाने के लिए बाध्य किया गया। मैं आप लोगों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उस रिजोल्यूशन के क्या मायने थे? मैं चाहूंगा कि प्रतिपक्ष इसकी जिम्मेदारी ले और मैं यह मानने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि हम सब लोग उसमें शामिल थे। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने 19 फरवरी को जो कहा था, वह मध्य-मार्ग था। उस समय मध्य-मार्ग ही सबसे अच्छा मार्ग था। आप लोग भावुकता में आकर बार-बार अपनी बात कहते रहे, लेकिन क्या उससे बमबारी कम हो गई? क्या उससे इराक के साथ लड़ाई नहीं हुई? क्या उससे आपने इराकियों का कुछ फायदा किया? क्या आप लोगों ने नहीं देखा कि इराकियों ने ताली बजाकर अमेरिकन सैनिकों का स्वागत किया। वह मध्य-मार्ग था। बहुत लोग कह रहे हैं कि हम लोगों ने बड़ा अच्छा गोल अपने में ही कर लिया। लेकिन विवेक का इस्तेमाल, प्रैगमैटिज्म बहुत जरूरी चीज है। भावुकता बहुत अच्छी चीज है, लेकिन हम कुछ नहीं कर पाए। रिजोल्यूशन पास करने का इतिहास बहुत पहले से था। 1962 में स्व.पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी के नेतृत्व में भी यहां एक रिजोल्यूशन पास हुआ था कि हम एक इंच भी जमीन जो चीनियों ने ली है, जब तक उसको वापिस नहीं लेंगे, तब तक सोयेंगे नहीं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, रिजोल्यूशन पास करने में देखना चाहिए कि क्या हमारी क्षमता है और हमारा क्या फायदा है। हम खास तौर से बड़ी असमंजस की स्थिति में थे, जब वामपंथी दल इतने जोर से चिल्ला रहे थे कि अमरीका ने अटैक कर दिया और बहुत गलती हो गई है या फलाना हो गया है। 1962 में जब भारत पर अटैक हुआ था, तो यही वामपंथी दल था, जिसने चाइनीज का समर्थन किया था। अपने देश पर जब अटैक हुआ था, उसका वामपंथी दलों ने समर्थन किया था। (व्यवधान)

SHRI AJOY CHAKRABORTY (BASIRHAT): No, it is not correct. ...(*Interruptions*) It is not a fact. You are distorting the fact. ...(*Interruptions*)

श्री प्रकाश मणि त्रिपाठी : आपको रिकार्ड दिखा देंगे। \hat{a} € (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Ajoy Chakraborty, without getting my permission, you are getting up. Then, what for the Chair is?

श्री प्रकाश मणि त्रिपाठी : बहुत अचम्भे की बात है और हंसी आती है, जब कोई देश एक देश पर अटैक करता है, तो हम भावुक हो जाते हैं। श्री सोमनाथ चटर्जी जी को हम लोग तीस मिनट तक सुनते रहे कि यह हुआ और वह हुआ। 1991 में भी तो इराक पर अटैक हुआ था, उस वक्त कौन सा रिजोल्यूशन पास हुआ था? इराक ने कोई पहली दफा कुवैत पर अटैक नहीं किया था। ऐसी कौन सी बात हो गई कि मध्य-मार्ग से हमको हटाने की कोशिश की गई। ऐसी कोई बात नहीं थी। मैं पहले ही कह चुका हूँ, हम सब इसके हिस्सा हैं, हम यह मानते हैं। मैं किसी की आलोचना नहीं कर रहा है, लेकिन मैं यह जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रैगमैटिज्म, विवेक और अपने देश का भला किसमें है, इसका खास तौर से ड्राइविंग प्रिंसिपल होना चाहिए।

इंडो-यूएस रिलेशन्स की बहुत बात हो रही है। यह कहा जा रहा है कि हम अमेरिका के खिलाफ कुछ नहीं कह पा रहे हैं। जब अमेरिका के खिलाफ टैरिज्म होता है तो वह एक पहल करता है और जब हमारे खिलाफ टैरिज्म होता है तो वह दूसरी पहल करता है। यह बात सही है। हर देश अपनी पॉलिसी अपने लिए बनाता है। यह यथार्थ है, सच्चाई है और इसे लेकर चलना चाहिए। इसमें दुखी होने की कोई बात नहीं है। सब यही करते हैं और करना चाहिए। हमें भी अपने देश के लिए यही करना चाहिए लेकिन यह बात भी सही है कि अमेरिका का कुछ स्ट्रैटेजिक इंटरस्ट पाकिस्तान में है और विदेश मामलों में We must understand one thing that we should not go by what people say. We should go by what people are capable of doing, what countries are capable of doing. It is a fact that America has strategic interest in Pakistan and it is looking after its interest.

But even all this, I have to compliment our Ministry of External Affairs. We just had the case of the Ambassador of America putting in his resignation and going home. There was a lot of controversy that he was not towing the State Department's line, that he was more pro-India. There was this controversy. It must go to the credit of our Ministry of External Affairs that anybody who comes to India, they are able to convince him, whether it is President Clinton or anybody, of our stand in the matter with a very forceful presentation of our point of view. Even for a person, who has resigned with the post of Ambassadorship and has differences from his own Government, at least that is what it is said and that is what I come to know, has this to say and this was reported in *The Indian Express* of 22nd of April on page 9:

"Consistently troubled bilateral past is behind us and it is time to map the glittering future of Indo-US relations. As I have said, during my stay in India, the fight against international terrorism will not be won until terrorism against India ends permanently. There can be no other legitimate stance by the US, no American compromise whatever on the elemental, geopolitical and moral truth. The US and India and all civilised nations must have zero tolerance for terrorism."

If this is not the language of USA, where would you get an authentic language of USA and where would you get a more forceful enunciation of the language of our own Ministry of External Affairs? It is the ditto of what they have said. Therefore, I do feel that there has been a very substantial influence of our policy, of our stand with the American public, with the American administration and if they are not totally tilting towards us, it is because of their own compulsions, because of their own strategic requirements.

We take this factor into account and go forward from there. Every country is not going to agree with us. There is no such thing that they will agree with us; they will look after their own interests. But if we go forward from this basis, then I think we are on the right lines, and I think, by and large today our Ministry has been able to achieve a great deal.

With regard to China, a mention has been made. I must congratulate Shri Raghunandan Lal Bhatia for becoming the Chairman of this Committee, and I am sure a lot of goodwill will come out of our understanding on this. But, it is a fact that whenever the President of China or any other dignitary of China visited India, our leaders of the past had one single *mantra* and that was to say: "Tibet is yours, Tibet is yours, Tibet is yours". Whether they want to hear it or not, for these things start getting repeated as soon as the visit of the Chinese dignitary took place to India - I think most of us remember this point - without any reciprocal statement from the Chinese about Kashmir. We were never able to get that. Shri Raghunandan Lal Bhatia did express his fears. It is because our hon. Defence Minister Shri George Fernandes had once said that China is our biggest enemy. He was hoping that that statement does not work against India. It will not. It is not as if we are going to get the friendship of China by praising them morning and evening. It is a friendship from strength. Yes, he said it. This was his view. Yet, today, in China - he has gone there - he has been given excellent reception, and a lot of free and frank talks are going on. It is not only if I got invited to China by praising their President, their Prime Minister, and the Chinese people all the time which is a habit for last 40 years let me tell you, and we have suffered a great deal on that account. Then, they are nowhere. But, if a man who has set his mind, and his view, and then he has gone there, he is being treated, and he is being talked of, then his friendship will strengthen. That is the friendship with strength, not 20 days before any visit of the Chinese, this *mantra* is: "Tibet is yours, Tibet is yours, Tibet is yours". Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru said this, not today. Everybody

has said it and it is on record. This point, I think, ought to be taken note of. I entirely agree with you, Sir, that we must have a proper package. We must go forward from there and there is no rancour on this account; what is gone is gone. Personally, as an ex-Army man, I hope that China has nothing to lose; we have lost a lot. If we are prepared to go on, then we may be able to get something back from them.

With regard to Kashmir, the level of terrorism has increased and is going to increase further. Where we used to hear two persons killed, we are hearing twenty persons killed. The level is going to increase. This is a fact of life. It is not only that the level has increased, that our defenceless civilians are getting killed, but the terrorists are also getting killed more and more. Therefore, what is our policy? Is it to go to war with the Pakistan? Is that the answer?

I would humbly submit that in the last two years, we have been able to win the hearts and minds of the Kashmiris as never before. This is the challenge. They had an election in which hordes of people voted defying the terrorists. The percentage was more than some of the so-called peaceful States. Hordes of people have voted. It is an election which is universally recognised as free, fair and transparent. It is an election which the Kashmiris recognised that for the first time their voice has been heard and recorded in the voting machine. It is for the first time that during the Prime Minister's visit they flocked in thousands and thousands and with one voice they have praised the efforts of the Prime Minister to bring peace into the Valley and now with today's Statement, development into the Valley.

We have seen a lot of terrorism and insurgency and everybody started talking that we must win the mind and heart of the people. I think, we have succeeded. If we have succeeded in that, that is the main battle that we have won. It is visible. Today it can be seen. If we have not won the heart and mind of the people of Kashmir, we are well on our way to win it if this kind of a thing goes. Everybody would get the answer when we have won the heart and mind of the people of Kashmir.

Before I finish, I just want to mention one point that we have a very large population of Non-Resident Indians. And again, the Ministry is to be complimented. They were neglected a lot. They were a tremendous source of income. That was where it was stopped. It is for the first time we have had a conclave where we have called them, we have made them feel, and those who were there must agree with me that in some ways their feeling for India was so strong that it was overwhelming. This is something that our brotherhood will only increase in this manner, and I think, we have to compliment the Ministry for this initiative which they have taken.

There are many other points that could be gone into. As I pointed out, it is a vast subject, it is multi-dimensional, it looks after the world 24 hours a day, from morning to night, and it has varied problems. But one point must be made and must be accepted that the Ministry of External Affairs is taking into account the changing world scenario and responding in a pragmatic manner keeping the good of the country in mind.

There have been shifts. We are in the 21st century. I do feel that these shifts are in keeping with our role in the world affairs in the 21st century. And 21st century India is not like 20th century India. There is nothing but a bright future for India.

श्री रामजीलाल सुमन (फिरोजाबाद) : सभापति जी, बर्षा 2003-2004 के लिए विदेश मंत्रालय के नियंत्रणाधीन अनुदानों की मांगों पर हम लोग विचार कर रहे हैं। काफी अच्छी शुरुआत भाटिया जा ने की। मुझे विस्तार में नहीं जाना है। विदेश नीति एक तरह से दर्पण की तरह होती है और यह हमारी प्रगति का मार्ग भी प्रशस्त करती है। दुनिया के साथ हमारे क्या रिश्ते हैं, इससे हमारे आर्थिक विकास में मदद मिलती है। इसलिए बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर हम लोग चर्चा कर रहे हैं। मैं इतना जरूर कहना चाहूंगा यशवंत सिन्हा जी से कि दुनिया की राजनीति में हिन्दुस्तान का जो रुतबा और जलवा था, उसमें कहां कमी आई है, इस पर हमें जरूर विचार करना चाहिए। कूटनीति के मोर्चे पर हम कहां असफल रहे हैं, इस ओर ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। जो हमारे परंपरागत मित्र थे, उनसे भी हम अच्छे रिश्ते नहीं रख पाए, इस पर भी विचार करना चाहिए। हम निर्गुट आंदोलन के तहत लगभग 150 देशों के नेता हुआ करते थे और आज वह निर्गुट आंदोलन भी दम तोड़ रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस ओर भी ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। हमारी विदेश नीति का व्यावहारिक पक्ष यह होना चाहिए कि शत्रु को भय हो **â€**(व्यवधान)सभापति महोदय, विदेश राज्य मंत्री दिग्विजय सिंह जी हँस रहे हैं, पहले इनका हँसना बंद कराइए। मैं इनकी मदद कर रहा हूँ और ये हँस रहे हैं। **â€**(व्यवधान)

विदेश मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री दिग्विजय सिंह) : आप कहिये, हम खुश हैं। **â€**(व्यवधान)

श्री रामजीलाल सुमन : यशवंत जी, आप इनके पाप में क्यों भागीदार बन रहे हैं? **â€**(व्यवधान)

विदेश मंत्री (श्री यशवंत सिन्हा) : इनके पुराने मित्र इतना अच्छा बोल रहे हैं, इस पर इनको खुशी हो रही है। **â€**(व्यवधान)

संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री तथा पर्यटन और संस्कृति मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्रीमती भावनाबेन देवराजमाई चीखलीया) : सुमन जी, हँसने पर कोई पाबंदी नहीं है और यह कोई असंसदीय भी नहीं है।

श्री रामजीलाल सुमन : हमारी विदेश नीति का व्यावहारिक पक्ष यह होना चाहिए कि शत्रु को भय हो, मित्रों के साथ हमारी आत्मीयता हो और कमज़ोर देशों को हम सहायता देने का काम कर सकें। सभापति जी, स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद जो गुटनिरपेक्ष नीति हमारे देश में चली जवाहरलाल जी के ज़माने से, अभी तक हम उसी का अनुसरण कर रहे हैं। लेकिन एक वक्त था जब हम खुश्चेव, आइज़ेन आवरे और नाज़िर के दोस्त हुआ करते थे। आज हम कहां खड़े हैं, इस पर विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र के संस्थापक सदस्यों में से एक रहे हैं लेकिन लगातार प्रयत्नों के बाद भी हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र सुरक्षा परिषद् के स्थायी सदस्य नहीं बन पाए। हम सात बार सुरक्षा परिषद् के अस्थायी सदस्य रहे, लेकिन 1996 में हम लोग जापान से चुनाव हार गए। पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ हमने दुनिया में क्या वातावरण बनाया

है, क्या माहौल बनाया है, कितने देशों को मित्र बनाया है? हमारी जो परेशानी है, उसके साथ कितने देशों की सहानुभूति पैदा हुई है, पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ कितने लोग हमारे पक्ष में खड़े हुए हैं, इसका अंदाज़ा इसी से लगाया जा सकता है कि 1996 में हम तो सुरक्षा परिषद की अस्थायी सदस्यता का चुनाव हार गए, लेकिन आने वाले दो वॉर्क के लिए पाकिस्तान सुरक्षा परिषद का अस्थायी सदस्य निर्वाचित हो गया।

महोदय, इसका साफ मतलब यह है और इसने यह सिद्ध कर दिया है कि दुनिया में जो हमारे दोस्त बनने चाहिए थे, जो हमारे मित्र बनने चाहिए थे, उन्हें हम दोस्त और मित्र नहीं बना पाए। मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि निकट के छोटे-छोटे पड़ोसी देशों के साथ भी हमारे संबंध अच्छे नहीं हैं। यह अत्यधिक चिन्ता का विषय है। न सिर्फ पाकिस्तान बल्कि जो आतंकवादी हैं, उन्हें हमारे छोटे-छोटे पड़ोसी देश प्रश्रय देने का काम करते हैं, उन्हें संरक्षण देने का काम करते हैं। न सिर्फ पाकिस्तान बल्कि श्रीलंका, बंगलादेश, नेपाल और मियानमार जैसे छोटे-छोटे देश भी आतंकवादियों को पनाह देने का काम कर रहे हैं। इन देशों में आतंकवादी आकर शरण लेते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान को उनसे अपने मधुर सम्बन्ध बनाने का काम करना चाहिए, लेकिन हम अपने पड़ोसी देशों से अब तक अच्छे सम्बन्ध नहीं बना पाए हैं।

सभापति महोदय, कुल मिलाकर जो मनोवैज्ञानिक प्रभाव बना हुआ है, वह यह है कि हम कहीं न कहीं अमरीका के प्रभाव में आ जाते हैं, चाहे वह कश्मीर का मामला हो, चाहे आतंकवाद का मामला हो, चाहे अफगानिस्तान या फिर इराक का मामला हो। ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि हमारी विदेश नीति को कहीं न कहीं से अमरीका प्रभावित करता है, वह चाहे कारगिल युद्ध का सवाल हो, चाहे सीमापार से आतंकवाद को समाप्त करने का सवाल हो। कारगिल के समय अमरीका ने हस्तक्षेप किया, इसे सभी जानते हैं और जब पाकिस्तान को खदेड़ने का वक्त था, तब अमरीका के हस्तक्षेप के कारण हमारी सेनाएं थोड़ी पीछे हटीं।

महोदय, आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि अमरीका को छोड़कर दुनिया के और तमाम देशों से हमारे रिश्ते अगर ठीक हो सकते हैं, तो उस दिशा में हमें प्रयास करने चाहिए। यही कारण है कि लड़ाई होने के बावजूद, चाहे प्रधान मंत्री घोणा करें या विदेश मंत्री श्री यशवन्त सिन्हा जी अखबारों में बहुत अच्छी-अच्छी बातें कहें, लेकिन आतंकवाद को समाप्त करने के सवाल पर, जो मनोवैज्ञानिक प्रभाव पाकिस्तान पर पड़ना चाहिए, वह आज तक नहीं पड़ा है और पाकिस्तान अपनी हरकतों से बाज नहीं आ रहा है।

महोदय, मैं आपसे बड़ी विनम्रता से निवेदन करता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के जम्मू-कश्मीर यात्रा से आने के बाद, उन्होंने जो बयान दिया और इस क्षेत्र के लिए उन्होंने जो दौलत दी और कहा कि यहां रेलें चलेंगी, हवाई जहाज उड़ेंगे, लेकिन अखबारों ने जिस समाचार को प्रमुखता से छापा, वह यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाना चाहता है। उस पर पाकिस्तान ने तत्काल प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त की कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान चाहता है कि पाकिस्तान से बातचीत हो, तो वह शर्त नहीं हो सकती है। वह चाहता है कि बातचीत हो, लेकिन कोई शर्त न हो। आप तो रोजाना यह भाण देते हैं कि पाकिस्तान सीमापार से आतंकवाद को जब तक समाप्त नहीं करेगा तब तक हम बातचीत नहीं करेंगे।

महोदय, मैं एक राजनीतिक कार्यकर्ता होने के नाते यह मानता हूँ कि बातचीत के जरिए सभी समस्याओं के हल निकाले जा सकते हैं। हम बातचीत के पक्षधर हैं, लेकिन उसके लिए कौनसा माहौल चाहिए, उसके लिए कौनसी परिस्थितियां चाहिए, क्या वह माहौल और वे परिस्थितियां और हालात हमने पैदा किए ? मैं एक बात विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान आज जो हरकत कर रहा है, उससे वह बाज आएगा, ऐसा सोचना व्यर्थ है। इसलिए हमें पाकिस्तान के संबंध में जो भी कार्रवाई करनी है, वह अपने बलबूते पर ही करनी है। तभी हमें आगे बढ़ना चाहिए।

महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया के अन्य देश, खासकर यूरोपीय देश अपनी क्षमता और शक्ति का आज भरपूर प्रयोग कर रहे हैं। हम एक अरब की आबादी वाले देश हैं और इससे पैदा हुई हमारी बाजार की शक्ति आज विश्व के लिए आर्काण का केन्द्र है। हम चाहें, तो विदेश नीति की मार्फत इस बाजार का प्रयोग अपने हितों के लिए कर सकते हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरफ सार्थक प्रयास होने चाहिए।

सभापति महोदय, जैसा मैंने अभी निवेदन किया कि कारगिल युद्ध के समय क्लिंटन ने हस्तक्षेप किया। 1999 में हमारे विमान का अपहरण कंधार में हुआ, उस समय अमेरिका ने हस्तक्षेप किया और हम पर यह शर्त लगाई कि हम आयात से प्रतिबंध हटा लें और हमने 2002 में प्रतिबंध हटा दिए, लेकिन अमेरिका के आयात पर प्रतिबंध 2005 तक लगे हुए हैं।

मैं आपके मार्फत विदेश मंत्री जी, से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि आतंकवाद के सवाल पर जो कुछ करना है वह अपने बलबूते पर करिए। किसी से अपेक्षा मत करिए। पाकिस्तान से भुगतना है तो अपने बलबूते पर करिए, पड़ोसी देशों से अच्छे संबंध बनाने की आवश्यकता है, न सिर्फ अमेरिका, बल्कि दुनिया में अन्य देश भी हमारे दोस्त हो सकते हैं। इस दिशा में भी सार्थक पहल करनी चाहिए, यही मुझे निवेदन करना था।

SHRIMATI KRISHNA BOSE (JADAVPUR): Mr. Chairman Sir, the foreign policy of any country is always based on national interests. The nation comes first and India is no exception to that. But since our Independence to this day, India has always had a moral command over the international community for different historical reasons. We were also very lucky that in our foreign policy matters we were able to have a consensus. We have different opposition combines at different times, but all the opposition had been very cooperative. We always put forward a unified view from our side. This was very important. Therefore, India has always been a leader and never a follower in the matter of international policies. We have always set our own agenda. We have been fiercely independent in our foreign policy, which cannot be said about many other countries including some of our neighbouring countries that have always towed the lines of some or other big power at different times.

When we lived in a bipolar world, as we all know, we were leaders of the Non-aligned Movement. Then, the world order changed. We found ourselves in a unipolar world. I think, India was taking the right stand when India initiated a dialogue with the only super power of the world. I remember our interlocutor for several past years had been the then Foreign Minister of India who steadily but slowly tried to build up a relationship between the two democracies of the world.

Now it is true that we must change our policies whenever the geopolitical situation changes. But, at the same time, we must keep in mind that we must not let down our traditional allies. We have to keep in mind that our traditional allies had been Russia and the Arab World. We must not forget them. We have to keep that in mind.

When the Iraq crisis was thrust upon us, again, I think, we took the right path. Some of my previous speakers have just mentioned the middle path that our hon. Prime Minister had first stated.

Well, what did we do? We did say all the right things at the U.N. and at all other international forums we said that we believe in a multi-lateral approach to all international crises and we do not believe in a unilateral military action. That we could not stop the unilateral military action is a different matter altogether. But we did say what we believed in. In this, we had on our side, the two European powers known as Old Europe, but as a matter of fact the two countries are coming up again as big powers – Germany and France. Germany and France were with us, not to speak of Russia and we must see to it, as we are also a growing big power, Germany and France are emerging as big powers and we must keep up this alliance with them.

Apart from Germany, France and Russia we had world opinion with us which was a great plus point for India. You saw how people marched in all world capitals in favour of the people of Iraq and we were with them. What should we do now in the post-Iraq crisis? I think, in the post-Iraq crisis we must see to it that the U.N. is restored to its previous prestigious position. It is true that the position of U.N. had been undermined like anything in this. But you know that days when you could occupy a nation and have an occupation force in another country are gone and the days when you could become a colonial power and you could have your colonies are gone. The days of imperialism are gone.

Therefore, we must see to it that there is an international forum which will be the power behind which we can stand, as at present U.N. is the only one. We must see to it that the in the reconstruction of Iraq as also the forming of the new governance in that country, U.N. has a role to play. That should be what India should pay attention to now.

We are always accused, our foreign policy is accused of being Pakistan-centric. I do not want to sound like that. But it is true that while we have neighbours all around, we have always a festering problem with one neighbour. But there also, I think, on the whole India's role has been vindicated. Most of the world powers have condemned the cross-border terrorism that we had been talking about including, of course, the U.S.A. They had been telling Pakistan that they must stop this cross-border terrorism. What should be our policy vis-à-vis Pakistan? Only this morning our hon. Prime Minister had stated that and we need not go into that again. That has been our policy.

We have always put forward a friendly gesture to them. I must say, you all remember and I need not repeat, the bus journey. But we had Kargil. But even then we called them again to Agra. That also failed. We are having all the time this cross-border terrorism. But even so, only a day before, our hon. Prime Minister had again reiterated that we are ready for dialogue at any time because again this is a world when some of us are nuclear powers and we cannot, in an irresponsible manner, talk about war. Dialogue is the only thing that can solve our problems. The door to dialogue must be kept open. But, at the same time, as the hon. Prime Minister said this morning, well, we cannot have one hand stretched only; the other hand also has to come forward to us. So, vis-à-vis Pakistan also, we are following the same policy.

Sir, this is more or less an over-view. I am not going into issues relating to China because speakers preceding me, from both sides, have gone into them in detail. Anyway, this is more or less regarding our policy matter.

We are discussing here the Budget, the Demands for Grants. I happen to be the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on External Affairs. We have laid on the Table a Report on the Demands for Grants. This morning, our Prime Minister said that these Reports can be discussed, and you can have a discussion on that. I would like to ask my colleagues to go through it and to see what we have recommended. We have made recommendations. We have made certain criticisms as well. I am really proud to say that we have a very good team of officers in the Ministry of External Affairs. I am sure that they will take note of the criticisms that we have put into our Report and will try to correct those things.

For example, there is the question of unspent balances. We have seen that the amount that had been released in the Budget, much of which could not have been spent, it had been surrendered or it had been saved and the officers of the Ministry of External Affairs were very frank. They said that this had become an endemic thing and they had to do it more often. The other thing we have criticised is about our missions abroad where we rent big places and pay a huge amount on these. Our policy, we have said, should be to acquire or to construct our own accommodation and not to go in for such huge rents. They have also given us a list of 14 places, I think, where we are paying huge rents, but only at three places, we have been able to go in for some construction. These are some of the criticisms we have made in the Report. I do not want to waste your time on that. You can read it and come to your own conclusion. Also, we have made recommendations. I know that these recommendations will be taken seriously.

You all know this. Since this morning, we had so much of talk on the Standing Committees, I am saying this that our Standing Committees are not that powerful. For example, Foreign Affairs Committee in US Senate is very powerful, but we are not as powerful as that. We are, what we call, of a persuasive nature. We can only try to persuade the Government. It is an all-party Committee. Whatever we have said, we have said together. I am sure and I know that whatever we say is always taken very seriously. If they cannot do something, they come back to us and tell why they cannot do it and if they can do it, they will do it.

Sir, I stand here in favour of the Demand for Grants that the Minister of External Affairs has placed. I do hope that India will remain a leader in the field of international relations.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Mr. Chairman, Sir, today morning, the hon. Prime Minister has made a statement. This is reiteration of what has been stated at Srinagar a few days back. It was an unconditional offer for dialogue with Pakistan. We welcome it. Some people may call it a roll back from what has been stated by the hon. Minister for External Affairs. I am not going into the issue of 'rightly or wrongly'. Even after Friday's unconditional offer, a few hours afterwards, it was a different voice. The problem is here. The problem is of multi-toned, multi-tuned multi-voices of Government of India, this NDA Government. One Minister is saying something one day and another day, the same Minister is saying a different thing. The Minister is saying one thing and the Prime Minister, on another day or even on the same day, is giving a different signal.

16.00 hrs.

I am just starting from what has been left by my esteemed colleague Shrimati Krishna Bose. We have adopted a unanimous Resolution on Iraq. Some people may criticise it. There should be, and there are always some people who would criticise it, and there are millions of others also who appreciate it because the sovereign Parliament will not take its decision looking at who will say what. We have a great tradition and this is a great achievement of the sovereign Parliament, and the Indian Parliament had adopted a unanimous Resolution firstly condemning the unilateral action, and secondly stating that the Iraq's future will be decided by the Iraqi people only. If any one has any role to play in the matter of reconstruction, rehabilitation, etc. then it is to be done through the United Nations.

Also according to our glorious tradition, we have immediately extended our hand of cooperation responding to the call of the United Nations with humanitarian help both in terms of \$ 20 million in cash and 50,000 metric tonnes of food products under the World Food Programme. But, my question to this Government is this. Has there been any active follow-up of the Resolution? What is that follow-up? I find that one representative of Government of India has gone for a three-nation visit after the Resolution of the Arab countries -- 8 countries meeting together -- and made a concrete demand. What was that demand? The demand was that Iraqi people only will determine the Iraq's future, and the occupation forces should leave as early as possible without any further delay. Reconstruction, and all these things will be done under the supervision; under the guidance of the United Nations only.

I was just looking at the 1999-election manifesto of BJP, and I am coming to the NDA part later on. What do they say in that? They have stated a very interesting thing in the election manifesto. What do they say? They have stated that in the recent past they had noticed 'bending of the Government'; and 'bending of this country' before pressures. This is obviously a reference to the 1991-1996 Government because the Interim Government that had come up between 1996 and 1997 had hardly anything to spill out. Maybe, a Government during the 1991 Gulf war had done such things. 'In the recent past' is a reference to the 1991-1996 Government. Is it not a fact that if there was bending under pressure, here it is crawling even before any pressure?

Look at the Afghan situation. On the issue of international terrorism, the United States had taken certain steps and on our own we said that we are ready to give this and we are ready to give that, etc. They do not care for us. It is making such a large country of 110 crore people with such glorious tradition of anti-imperialist struggle, and making us irrelevant; and making us crawl even before we are told to crawl. They are criticising -- in the election manifesto - - the previous Government about 'bending before the pressures' that are mounting.

What does the 'National Agenda for Governance' of the NDA, which was their election manifesto in 1999, say? It says that 'they are committed to demonstrate India's capability to secure for India a place, role and position in the global arena commensurate with its size and importance'. What is the reality? Are we relevant? Is anyone caring for us? Even after we made the offer that we are ready to fight against terrorism or whatever you call it, no one cares for us.

Day after day, when killings took place in large numbers, very sweet words were said about the export of terrorism from Pakistan or the terrorist activities that are taking place in Jammu and Kashmir. They said, "Yes, we are taking note of it. We have made a list of the terrorists' organisations". Then, they patted them. The sanctions have been lifted, and then loan waiver is taking place. Why are we failing to understand that Pakistan is their natural ally in their geo-political scheme of future programmes? This is the reality, but still, we are hesitating.

What has happened to Mr. Robert Blackwill? I am not supposed to comment on what may be his perception or why he has resigned and going back to take up an academic assignment and all these things. I am not going into all that. He has made an elaborate list of his own achievements.

16.07 hrs. (Shrimati Margaret Alva *in the Chair*)

He says that during his tenure as the American Envoy here, more than 100 visits of American dignitaries and

representatives of the American administration have taken place; and joint military exercises have taken place. They are the same people who are saying, "Why are you equating the Iraqi situation with the Pakistani situation?" They are rather threatening us. The Minister, in his generosity, may say 'ignore all these things'. It was a threat. I do not want to endorse his compulsion because by implication, it was an acceptance of the position taken by America. This can never be done. Rather, what the Prime Minister said later on and the position taken by him is more welcome. I am not saying that this has been done under the American pressure. We know that Mr. Armitage is coming; G-8 meeting is going to take place where Pakistan would have taken the advantage and, ultimately, we could have been in an embarrassing position.

Even during the Iraq War, Mr. Colin Powell had already stated, "Our next agenda is India. We have not forgotten it. We will look into this issue immediately after this." This was taken up. This is a new era of 'Bush-ism' or whatever you call it. You can equate 'Bush-ism' with 'fascism'.

It is not that only Iraq is being bombarded and innocent people are being killed, but even the vocabulary and principles of yesteryears are also being bombarded. International agencies like the United Nations are being made irrelevant. They charged the United Nations by saying that it has failed in its duty why because the United Nations did not agree to the pressures being mounted by the United States to toe its line. This is the positive part of the situation that even in these days of dangerous unilateralism, they could not mobilise even nine countries in their support to have a resolution, which could authorise them to go to the war. In this new situation, there are new dangers.

In this new situation, there are new challenges. At the same time, there are new opportunities too. We have to meet the new challenges appropriately and properly by making use of the new opportunities, which we are not doing now. These are the days when a new language is being used. "Pre-emptive Action." What does it mean? It means – "Might is right; I have a right to occupy; I have a right to invade." What is the charge? The charge is, "You possess the weapons of mass destruction". Did anybody prove that? No. It is all bogus. Even Hans Blix, the Chief Weapons Inspector of UN said that this invasion was planned long before the Inspectors started their work. They said that nothing could be found. "Axis of Evil". Earlier three countries were named in this axis of evil. Now, suddenly, Syria is included as the fourth country. Indications are that India would be added as the fourth country in this axis.

In such a situation, we have to re-orient our foreign policy in such a manner that we can make our stand purposeful, meaningful, and relevant in the world arena. My charge against this Government is that such an important country like India has made itself irrelevant by subjugating to the pressures of American imperialism. This is my charge.

New vocabulary is being coined. "Regime Change". Who has authorised the regime change? Yes, the Prime Minister had repeatedly said that no country has a right to change a Government except the people of that country, whatever may be the view of the country, whatever may be the view of the Government, whatever may be its programme. A new diplomatic language is emerging. "Material Breach". What does it mean? It does not mean anything but, "Whenever I think there is breach, I will call it material breach. It is all my interpretation. I will say that they have not complied with the UN resolutions."

They said, "He is a dictator." How many dictators do you want to be shown to you Mr. Bush? We all know how many dictators of Africa and Latin America are sitting in the lap of the President of America, being encouraged by America, being patronised by America. Is there democracy in Pakistan? Is there democracy in – I would not like to take names here – many other countries? There are a host of such countries. What has America done in the Middle-East? What has it done in respect of Palestinian interest? America encouraged Iraq in its war with Iran. It is said that America supplied chemical and biological weapons to Iraq. In fact there is a joke on this which goes like this. When asked as to how America is so sure of Iraq possessing chemical and biological weapons, America says, "We have got the receipts for those weapons because it is we who have supplied them."

Very dangerous things are taking place. Twelve long years of sanctions have subjected the people of Iraq to untold misery. Lakhs of people including children have lost their lives. Immense damage was caused to the property. Not only that, great archaeological assets have been looted in a planned manner. Such a thing never happened in the world. There is Hague Convention to which America is a party. America is not a party to Kyoto Protocol. They are not agreeable to many international criminal laws. For them, their might is right. In such a situation we have to very coolly think over our foreign policy.

We had a great heritage of foreign policy based on national consensus. As our Resolution on Iraq was unanimous, on all the major issues of foreign policy initiatives we had a national consensus. If any distortion had taken place, it was all started by the BJP-led Government.

MADAM CHAIRMAN : Shri Rupchand Pal, please conclude now.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Yes, Madam, within two to three minutes, I am concluding.

As a result of that, we have become irrelevant. The Government needs to ponder over it. Not only that, we should extend our hands of friendship. It does not mean sacrificing the national interests. Flexibility and calmness, the two taken together, will build up a purposeful, meaningful and relevant Foreign Policy. Our Foreign Policy is an extension of the domestic policy.

If your secular democracy suffers inside, there will be some misunderstanding in the Muslim countries. If the Christian pressing continues, there will be a rethinking in the Christian countries.

Madam, in the NAM, we are failing to give the leadership. We had stated in the NAM that the Indian Government would give the leadership; it is committed to making the voice of India as the voice of the Developing world. But India did not do it. Do we do it in our economic diplomacy? In the WTO, in the Agriculture Agenda, in the TRIPs and on many other issues, we can make common cause. Even with Pakistan we could make a common cause on certain occasions.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now. There is one more speaker from your party. Now, there is no time left for him.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Today, the debate will continue. The hon. Minister will be leaving for Tanzania tomorrow. He will be here today.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Now, please do not waste time. Kindly conclude.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I am just concluding.

Madam, Chairperson, in the economic diplomacy also, we have a lot of things to do. Before the talk takes place with Pakistan, we should be well-prepared. We should not be as prepared as we were during the Agra Summit.

The hon. Prime Minister is going to China. China has been our traditional friend. It is a healthy development that our hon. Defence Minister has been there, and now the hon. Prime Minister is also going there. So, in such a situation, I fully appreciate the sentiments expressed by my esteemed colleague that Dalai Lama is a religious leader. Even yesterday some people met me; and I think, they are meeting the other MPs also, saying that Indian soil should not be allowed for activities which are detrimental to our mutual interest and the relationship with China.

As regards our relationship with the neighbour countries like Bangladesh, Nepal and Bhutan, we should continue to strengthen it. With Bangladesh, the Government is committed to have an Immigration Policy. We have a long relationship with Bangladesh because of historical reasons. But some time ago, developments had taken place which should not have taken place.

The Government, in the Annual Report says: "The guiding principles of Foreign Policy today are founded on pragmatism and the pursuit of national interest without compromising basic and well-established tenets and principles."

Madam, what is this? Is it a surrender to American pressures? Is it taking opportunistic position? Even yesterday, I was looking at certain discussion where it was said that some contracts may be given to some Indian companies. Some Indian labours may be employed in Iraq. We should have to take a very firm position because Iraq has been our friend. Iraq had stood by us even in our difficult times, on the issue of Kashmir and many other issues. We import oil from Iraq. What will happen to our oil import?

So, these are the issues where, I think, the Government of India owes some responsibility to this House. Our Foreign Policy and our economic diplomacy should be clear and fair. In a new world of unilateralism, we should prepare ourselves to meet these challenges, and use this as an opportunity to make ourselves more relevant to regain the position of leadership in the Non-Aligned Movement as also in the developed countries, in the economic arena and in the political situation.

With these few words, I conclude.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Thank you, Madam. I rise to support the Demand for Grant of the Ministry of External Affairs. At the end of the speech made by hon. Shri Raghunandan Lal Bhatia, I put a question. I have great respect for him and I listened with rapt attention to what he said. I also listened with great attention to the speech made by my predecessor Shri Rupchand Pal, though I knew what he would say. It is a tape recorded

version repeated over and over again.

Sir, the point was raised by Shri Raghunandan Lal Bhatiaji that during the time of Congress rule – during the time of Nehruji, Indiraji and Rajivji – India was a non-aligned country. Now, India has lost its dignity. Nobody cares for us. Even Shri Rupchand Pal asked; "Does anybody care for us? Are we relevant?" He asked questions like this.

Madam, I am a student of Political Science, forget about the fact that I am a BJP Member of Parliament. When I was a student of Political Science - I was studying in BA. and MA. - I myself was thoroughly confused about this point taken by my own country. We said that we are non-aligned. But, when USSR attacked Czechoslovakia, attacked Poland, and entered into Afghanistan, there was not a single word of protest. Do we really call ourselves that we are non-aligned? At that time, the world was bi-polar. One pole was led by America and the other was led by USSR. We were fully with the United States of America. But, still it was a fashion in those days that if anybody was left-oriented, if anybody was with USSR, he was non-aligned. But, if anybody is with America, he is a capitalist, he is a bourgeois, and he is a hegemonistic. So, he is not non-aligned. Is it true, Madam? Still I am confused when these things are repeated over and over again.

Madam, if you are so non-aligned, in 1971 Bangladesh war, when the issue was taken up in the United Nation's General Assembly, why is it that only six countries supported us? Why is it that more than 100 countries opposed us? There were so many other non-aligned countries in those days. Why did they not support us in the United Nations General Assembly? Was this the dignity we had in those days, as told by the other hon. Members from the Opposition? Madam, after this 11th September incident in the United States of America, and when we deployed our Army on the border, is it not true that within a span of only three months, 60 foreign dignitaries including Mr. Colin Powell, Mr. Rumsfeld, Mr. Tony Blair, Mr. Putin and Mr. Jack Straw came to India? Everybody came to India within a span of only three months. Does it mean that the world does not care for us?

If they did not care for us, why did they come to India at all? Since they came, it means that they care for us. That is why, I am making this point.

I thank the hon. Prime Minister and I also thank the hon. Foreign Minister for keeping India in a path-breaking engagement with America. That is a total shift in the Indian foreign policy. That is the real pragmatic approach; and that is the real national interest that we are having now. We can say many things. But India is passing through rein of terror. What is the major problem of India today? It is terrorism. Terrorism is the number one problem of India today. Who is fighting against the terrorists nowadays in the world? We agree that there are many dictators in the world which America has sponsored. I agree with that. I also agree that America is not declaring Pakistan as a terrorist country. I fully agree with that.

But is it untrue that America is the only country which is fighting against terrorists nowadays? Is it not true? Let me tell that it is the Osama bin Ladens, it is the Saddam Hussains, it is the Pervez Musharrafs who are the fountain heads of inspiration to the Islamic terrorists all over the world. An attack on these people is an attack on the source of funding; it is an attack on the State which provides safe sanctuaries to terrorists all over the world. You finish them off and the terrorists will have no source of funding. They will have no safe Heavens all over the world. So, it is a fact. It is in our own interest that we should be with the right side of history; and the right side of history now is to be with America.

It is all right that we had a long discussion in this House; we passed a unanimous Resolution – or may be so. On that day, the leaders had a dialogue among themselves and they decided that nobody else other than the leaders will be allowed to speak – only the leaders of parties will be allowed to speak for five minutes. So, a Resolution was passed. The Members of the Opposition Parties pressurised the Treasury Benches to pass such a Resolution. But you go the street and ask the common man as to what is his impression about the Resolution – whether he is happy about it or not. We say that it was an expression of national sentiment, but he says that it was a Resolution of national irrelevance. At the time when the American Army entered Baghdad, we passed that Resolution.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Madam, it was a Resolution of Parliament, moved by the Chair and not by the Minister. So, to cast aspersion on the Resolution passed by the Lok Sabha would tantamount to insulting the House. It was moved by the Chair and it had the resolve of the House. How can he question the Resolution?
...(Interruptions)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I am not questioning it. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH BADNORE (BHILWARA): He is talking about the impression of the people in the street. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : I feel that nobody should talk about the Resolution. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH BADNORE : If it was reported in the Papers, what would you have done about

that? ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Madam, how can he question that? ...(*Interruptions*)

MADAM CHAIRMAN : He has the right to express his views; let him express his views. Please sit down.

...(*Interruptions*)

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Shri Badnore, he is quite capable of defending himself, without both of you. He is quite capable of defending himself. He does not need your help.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH BADNORE : I am not defending him. ...(*Interruptions*)

MADAM CHAIRMAN: He will answer them. You need not say anything.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH BADNORE : Let him also not speak. ...(*Interruptions*)

MADAM CHAIRMAN: No. I have not permitted you to intervene when he is speaking.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH BADNORE : Then, kindly do not allow him also to speak. ...(*Interruptions*)

MADAM CHAIRMAN: I have told them also.

I have given the right to speak only to the main speaker.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : But this right does not permit him to question a unanimous Resolution passed by the House.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: He is talking about the men on the streets. He is not talking about you.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Madam, I am not questioning the Resolution passed by the House. I am talking about what the people in the streets say. I am talking about the people of my constituency. People say like that....(*Interruptions*)

MADAM CHAIRMAN: This cross-talk will not go on record.

(*Interruptions*)*

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : The Arab League did not pass any Resolution against the United States of America. It is a conglomeration of Islamic States. The German Chancellor at the end of the war said that the war should end quickly with the victory for allies.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : We are discussing the Demand of the Ministry of External Affairs and not the conduct of America....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : You should have told the same thing when Shri Rupchand Pal was speaking. He dealt with Iraq only. About 75 per cent of his speech was on Iraq.

As I was saying, Mr. Putin, the President of Russia said that he did not want America to be defeated. Whose victory did he want if he did not want the defeat of the United States of America? Even Jacques Chirac, the hon. President of France, also said that he was happy that it had ended quickly with the victory for allies. France, Germany and Russia, who opposed it from the very beginning, changed their stance. We passed the Resolution on the same day that the American Army should quit....(*Interruptions*)

MADAM CHAIRMAN: You had also supported the Resolution.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Madam, it is just like the statement made by Madam Srimavo Bandaranaike in 1971 when the Indian Army was just going to occupy Dhaka. At that time, she issued a statement that the Indian Army

should quit Bangladesh. That is why the people on the streets are thoroughly confused about the Resolution passed by the House.

My point to the hon. Minister is that he should not go by this type of resolutions of just taking sides. We are criticising America but it is America

* Not Recorded.

which has asked Pakistan to respect the Line of Control. It is the United States of America which sought assurance from Pakistan to permanently end the cross-border terrorism. It praised India for the free and fair elections in Jammu and Kashmir.

It welcomes the initiation of political process with the appointment of Shri N.N. Vohra as the Government interlocutor in Jammu and Kashmir. America supported the healing touch policy of Shri Mufti Mohammad Sayeed Government in Jammu and Kashmir.

America has its own compulsion in not declaring Pakistan as a terrorist nation. When any country takes a decision, it takes the decision on the basis of its self-interest and not on the interests of some other country. So, America has got its own compulsion. But it is true that Pakistan is going to be the next target of USA. I saw a TV interview just about seven days back. The BBC was interviewing two of the Senators of Pakistan in Islamabad. The entire half-an-hour discussion was only on whether Pakistan would be the next target of USA. They discussed it for about half-an-hour with the two Senators of Pakistan on the BBC.

What was the reply of the Senators? They were saying, 'all right, there are so many terrorists in this country but America cannot chew more than what it can digest'. That means already it has attacked two countries and now it cannot attack Pakistan because it cannot engage Army in three countries. They did not say that they do not have terrorists in their country. They are also thoroughly terrorised that now it might be their turn.

Madam, I agree with the remarks made by Shri Tripathi and I would appeal to the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister for External Affairs that India's relationship with the United States of America should not be Pakistan centric. If India has some differences with America, it should address them through dialogue and not through knee-jerk anti-American rhetoric. If we have the differences with regard to Pakistan, then India should undertake an intensive dialogue with the United State of America with regard to Pakistan alone.

MADAM CHAIRMAN : Please wind up now. You are running out of time. You have already taken 16 minutes.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Madam, I am concluding. As regards China, it has been said that Indian soil should not be allowed to be utilised for political purposes by the Tibetans. His Holiness, Mr. Dalai Lama has been an hon. guest of India. India is a country which has given sanctuary to all those people who were oppressed all over the world. In the earlier days, the Christians, the Parsis, the Jews, and even at times the Muslims were also accommodated. I do not go by the people who go by the British historians that Aryans came from the Caspian Sea to occupy India. So my point is that India has accommodated everybody and India has accommodated the oppressed people of Tibet. Now, Chinese have entered in large numbers into Tibet. They are shifting large population to those areas and 60 per cent of Tibet's population is now Chinese. What is the condition of the Tibetans in China? They are all class IV employees. They are the *jhadudars* and the *chaprasis*. All the good things of life have gone to the Chinese. I had been to Xinziang Province where the Uighurs are fighting a sort of cessation war with China. Now, the Hans are inundating that area. (Interruptions)

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt him.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Madam, there should be some meaningful discussion...(Interruptions)

MADAM CHAIRMAN: He has a right to express his views. Please sit down.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Madam, Shri Rupchand Pal thinks that only he can speak on international affairs because he is here for the last 20 years. He thinks that a Member like me who is here for the last four or five years only, cannot speak on international affairs.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: You please address the Chair.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : So, they are totally eliminating and obliterating the Tibetan culture in Tibet. The European Union has given three years' time to China to provide autonomy to the Tibetans. There is a possibility that after three years, if the autonomy is not given to Tibet by China, the Tibetan Government in exile, which is in India, would be given recognition by the European Union.

What the Union Government is going to do? My appeal to the hon. Minister for External Affairs and also to the hon.

Prime Minister, when he visits China, is that they should try to impress upon the Chinese authorities that if not independence, at least some autonomy should be provided to Tibet. There is nothing wrong in doing that.

Madam, I would just like to cite two instances on Kashmir. I would not like to dwell much on the Kashmir issue because Shri Prakash Mani Tripathi has already mentioned about it. One is about what a *paan* shop owner said after the elections were held in the State. He had said that he did not go to cast his vote in the elections because he did not know as to whether the elections in the State would be free and fair. Had he known that the elections would be free and fair, he would have gone taking along with him his fellow villagers to cast his vote against the National Conference Government. In another case, a common man had said that he always lived a life that was sandwiched between the Indian Army and the terrorists. He had always a feeling that he did not have any power. But all of a sudden, during the elections, he realised that he had the power to cast his vote. He went and exercised his power. The Bhartiya Janata Party lost the elections in the State of Jammu and Kashmir but India won, my Motherland had won. That is the achievement of my party and that is the achievement of this NDA Government led by hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. Though the party lost the elections but the prestige of the country was enhanced in the comity of nations.

How did all violence start in the State of Jammu and Kashmir? It started in the year 1987 when the late Rajiv Gandhi was the Prime Minister of India. It was so because during his time the election process was rigged and that is why terrorism had started in the State. It is this Government that has helped in eliminating the menace of rigging in elections. We did not resort to rigging and it is we who have restored democracy in the State.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : This is the impression that he wants to give to the outside world...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I would like to appeal to the hon. Minister for External Affairs that we should develop better relations with the ASEAN countries. We should also establish better relations with the world through the process of globalisation. We should have capacity building and we should also have good co-operation with G-24, Group of 77, G-22, G-50 and SAARC nations. Finally, through a Track II diplomacy, we should see that we develop good relations with the ASEAN countries in the days to come.

Madam, finally I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister for External Affairs and the hon. Prime Minister for leading the country in the right direction.

SHRI P.H. PANDIAN (TIRUNELVELI): Madam Chairman, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to participate in the discussion on Demands for Grants for the Ministry of External Affairs. Cutting across party lines the House is deliberating on the Demands for Grants for this Ministry.

Madam, India has been following the principle of Non-alignment right from the days of Pandit Nehru. We all know what is *Panchasheel* and I need not repeat it. We have been following the principle of non-aggression. But Pakistan is engaging itself in the act of aggression. At one point of time China also committed an act of aggression. We believe in the principle of peaceful co-existence. But some of our neighbours have not accepted this principle.

As regards mutual benefit, we have been benefiting. In the 14th meeting of the Indo-China Joint Working Group on the border dispute between India and China, our External Affairs Minister or the Foreign Secretary would have participated. It has to be resolved through the process of negotiations.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, it is our traditional enemy right from the time of partition. The situation got aggravated after the division of Bangladesh from Pakistan. I would like to tell the External Affairs Minister the attitude of Pakistanis towards India. About twenty years back, when I had visited the UN, I came down to the ground floor to take tea in a tea-shop. That tea-shop happened to be owned by a Pakistani young man. He asked whether I was an Indian. At that time I was the Deputy-Speaker in our State Assembly. When I replied that I was an Indian, he quipped to say that he would see to it that India would be torn into pieces one day. He had that kind of grudge and aggressive feeling in his mind towards India after the division of Bangladesh. Therefore, it is very difficult to erase this kind of feeling. This kind of feeling has been sown into the minds of every Pakistani youth. Now it has been nurtured by President Pervez Musharraf.

Our Prime Minister has time and again said in all-Party meetings that whenever he raised the question of cross-border terrorism with President Pervez Musharraf, he used to raise the question of Kashmir. That was the counter problem that used to be projected by President Pervez Musharraf. I have been consistently making the point in this House that President Pervez Musharraf's action is not *bona fide* insofar as India is concerned.

When the Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party visited our Parliament House, we had been invited to that meeting. We posed a question to the Chairman as to what was his opinion about Pakistan. He said that Pakistan was their traditional friend. China has expressed that view. Therefore, now we have hot neighbours in China and Pakistan. There are other neighbours also. There is an act of depredation in drug trafficking and in ISI activities. But

what have we done to curb these activities?

Madam, when we discussed the question of fencing of our borders in the Home Affairs Committee, we were told that almost all our borders were open. It is a porous fencing. Chinese also can enter India. The barbed fencing is not complete. On all sides of our borders we have only this porous fencing. We have no compound. Even kings had big compounds around their kingdom; but India has no compound of its own. Even the barbed fencing is yet to be completed. Since there is no fencing, there is a lot of scope for infiltration by Pakistanis and Chinese either through Nepal or from any other border.

And there is an act of terrorism being committed by these foreign nationals. When we deliberated about cross-border terrorism in this House, we had all expressed our unanimous opinion that Pakistan should be declared a terrorist State. This was the view of everybody and even the Finance Minister expressed it. I am sorry, he is the then Finance Minister. You are always looking to me as the Finance Minister. I do not see you as the External Affairs Minister since you dealt with Financeâ€¦*(Interruptions)*

There are two routes – the Cyprus route and the Mauritius route. Since you happened to be the Finance Minister, you know it and I am treating you like that. It is to facilitate the foreign investors to get a benefit in India. Whether these two routes, the Mauritius route and the Turkish route, have been closed or not after the amendment? I think it was in the JPC that we had a deliberation on this point. After the submission of the Report to this House, what action has the then Finance Minister and the present External Affairs Minister taken to close the route to save the Indian economy? I think the tax system will benefit those investors.

France is leading the West. Everyone was looking forward to India as to whether it will lead the East. Where are we? Some Members said that nobody is caring for us. I would say that we need not expect anybody to care for us. We are proud that we are a big country with a population of many millions. We have natural resources and even after the Britishers looted us, we are still surviving. Even after Robert Clive was impeached, we have a surviving economy. So, our country has a rich tradition with mineral and other wealth. Our country is surrounded by seas and we have sea wealth.

When our Committee visited Andaman and Nicobar Islands, we were able to see from there that one can go easily by boat to Thailand. There is a mechanism adopted by Thailand. They can come to our territorial waters and drive our fish to their territory and can help their fishermen. That way, our international sea route should also be looked into. It should be safeguarded. Of course, the Coast Guard is there. They are taking steps. But the External Affairs Minister is the monitor and protector of our external region and our internal affairs are being monitored by our Home Minister. You are the compound wall. You should not crack.

I should say that India is a big country. But we should have a closed hand. We should not open it. If we open it, they will come to know about it. We have strong States and Centre. Though it is a multiparty rule, it has prolonged for more than three years. So, it is a stable Government and the neighbouring countries will not have any inclination to damage our country.

Our Prime Minister went to Kuala Lumpur. The Non-Aligned Summit was held under the Chairmanship of Malaysia. The subject was revitalisation of Non-Aligned Movement. That Movement has to be revitalised. I think Government of India would have revitalised the Non-Aligned Movement.

India should be non-aligned. We cannot join a bloc. Small countries join one bloc or the other, like NATO, CEATO and CENTO. They are small countries. They will not be able to protect themselves. They will have to get shelter under somebody, under some country. But India is a big country. So, we should be independent. We should not join any bloc. That was the principle propounded by Jawaharlal Nehru, Nasser and Tito.

In that way, the Non Aligned Movement should be revitalised to create a healthy atmosphere among our neighbours. All our neighbours are small and they are dependent on us. Bhutan is a small neighbour, Nepal is a small neighbour and even Bangladesh is a small neighbour. We have helped Bangladesh by giving them grants and by giving them loans. We have given our locomotives to Bangladesh. It was on the basis of loan. They have not even repaid that till date. So, India, though a big country, has small source of revenue. With that we have been able to help our neighbours. Poverty alleviation programmes are being launched here. At the same time, we are catering to the needs of the poor people who live in and around our neighbourhood.

At this stage, I should ask as to what steps the Government of India has taken to prevent the infiltration of ISI till now. They have been circulating Rs. 500 notes in our country. They are trying to spoil our economy. What steps has the Government of India taken regarding that? I would like to know that.

I will finish within a minute. I happen to be a Member in the Consultative Committee of the External Affairs. So, I know a little.

Hon. Minister of External Affairs visited the United Kingdom to meet the Foreign Secretary. He would have met him. What is the end result of that meeting? What did you discuss in that meeting?

There is a Millbrook Action Programme of 1995 to deal with violations of Harare principles of democracy and human rights. I would like to know what decision was taken at the Conference. I would like to know about SADC, the Southern African Development Community. In that you had a regional organisation consisting of fourteen countries of South Africa, like Angola, Congo and other African countries. India has signed an MoU on the economic front. What has happened subsequent to the signing of the MoU?

I would like to know about Indo-Libyan Joint Commission. I think you would have met them subsequently after 19th October, 2002. What happened in the last one year after this meeting?

MADAM CHAIRMAN : Shri Pandian, you have to wind up now.

SHRI P.H. PANDIAN : Then, there is Indo-Yemen Joint Committee. You have given us the gist of the programme. Let the House know as to what decision was taken at the Indo-Yemen Joint Committee meeting, which was held in New Delhi from October 30th to 31st, 2002. One year has elapsed.

17.00 hrs.

So, probably, he would have circulated to the Department, but the House is not aware of that so far. Therefore, let us know where India stands in the international arena and let us know where India is dominating. Our people think that India is in a dominating position in international affairs. Many countries dominate in international affairs due to their GDP growth. We need not compete with America. That dimension is totally different. We are self-reliant. We are highly democratic and ours is the largest democracy in the world and it has proved to be successful in the whole world.

Sir, I would like to say that the Ministry of External Affairs has been doing well. Maybe there will be some shortcomings, but they may not come to light. If there is some issue relating to the internal security of the country, there will be heated exchanges here and it will come to light, but here the position is different. All the political parties are cooperating with the Government on all international issues. The foreign policy of the country is evolved by the Central Government and all the political parties are cooperating with the Government on all international issues.

With these words, I support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs presented by the Minister of External Affairs who was the former Finance Minister.

श्री सत्यव्रत चतुर्वेदी (खजुराहो) : सभापति महोदया, सौभाग्य से तीन साढ़े तीन साल के बाद 13वीं लोक सभा में यह पहला मौका है जब विदेश नीति पर हमें बातचीत करने का मौका मिला। आम तौर पर यह देखने में आया है और हमारे यहां एक प्रवृत्ति है जो शायद राजनीतिक आवश्यकताओं से उत्पन्न होती है कि इस पक्ष से कोई बोलेगा तो वह आंख मूंदकर आलोचना करता चला जायेगा और उस पक्ष से कोई बोलेगा तो वह प्रशंसा भी आंख मूंदकर करता चला जायेगा। कम से कम यह राजनीतिक मुद्दा नहीं हो सकता क्योंकि हमारे देश में परम्परा रही है कि विदेश नीति के मामले में हमने अभी तक राष्ट्रीय आम सहमति से काम लिया है। अब यह बात खटकने लगी है कि पिछली सरकार के समय में यह आम सहमति थोड़ी सी ध्वस्त हुई लेकिन सब कुछ गलत नहीं है और सब कुछ ठीक नहीं है, यह मेरी मान्यता है।

विश्व का राजनीतिक परिदृश्य बड़ी तेजी से बदल रहा है। पिछले एक दशक में विश्व राजनीति, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति और देशों के बीच अंतर्राष्ट्रीय संबंध एक संक्रमण काल से गुजर रहे हैं। आज विभिन्न आधारों पर ध्रुवीकरण हो रहा है जो पुरानी व्यवस्था को तोड़कर नयी व्यवस्था को जन्म देने का शायद प्रयास कर रहा है। अब व्यवस्था अच्छी होगी या नहीं होगी, यह तो भविष्य बतायेगा। यह भविष्य के गर्भ में

है। लेकिन एक बात सच है और उस सच को बदला नहीं जा सकता कि किसी देश की विदेश नीति उस राष्ट्र के आर्थिक राजनीतिक और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय महत्वाकांक्षाओं के लक्ष्यों को पाने का और सेना के बिना उपयोग के, उन्हें हासिल करने की एक कूटनीतिक कला है। इस दृष्टि से हम देखें तो दो बातें उभरकर सामने आती हैं। पहली बात यह है कि किसी देश की विदेश नीति उसकी अपनी घरेलू परिस्थितियों से अलग हटकर नहीं हो सकती। उस देश की गृह नीति, आर्थिक नीति और सुरक्षा नीति, रक्षा नीति आदि ये तीन नीतियां विदेश नीति के अंदर एकीकृत रूप में समाहित होंगी। अगर नहीं है, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह विदेश नीति दोषपूर्ण है। इसलिए पहले यह देखें कि हम आज वर्तमान में अपनी विदेश नीति पर जो चर्चा कर रहे हैं तो इन बिन्दुओं के आधार पर समीक्षा करें और यह देखें कि हम कहां खड़े हैं।

माननीय सभापति महोदया, हमारी विदेश नीति के तीन मूल तत्व रहे हैं जो हमें अभी तक देखने में आये हैं। हमने अंतर्राष्ट्रीय गुटों से परे हटकर गुटनिरपेक्षता का समर्थन किया। हम उसके आरंभिक सदस्यों में से हैं। उसके प्रणेता सदस्यों में भारत रहा है। दूसरी बात हमने जिस पर सबसे अधिक ध्यान दिया और जिसे अंतर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्रों में रिकोग्नाइज्ड किया गया, मान्यता मिली, हमारे देश को प्रशंसा और सम्मान भी हासिल हुआ, वह थी कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर आणविक निशस्त्रीकरण। सम्पूर्ण निशस्त्रीकरण के बारे में हम सबसे बड़े वकील के रूप में, सबसे बड़े एडवोकेट के रूप में अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंचों पर आवाज उठाते रहे हैं।

और प्रभावी ढंग से पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू, इंदिरा जी और उसके बाद राजीव जी के जमाने तक हम इसे निरंतरता के साथ जारी रखते रहे हैं। शान्तिपूर्ण सह-अस्तित्व का हमारा मूलतः जो सिद्धान्त था, वह इस बात पर आधारित था कि हम समानता के आधार पर सभी देशों से अपने संबंध चाहते हैं, उनको समानता के स्तर पर मानते हैं और प्रत्येक राष्ट्र की सार्वभौमिकता का हम सम्मान करते हैं। आज देखें तो हम कहां खड़े हैं। पिछले कुछ वर्षों के अंदर भारत की गृह नीति, घरेलू हालात एक गुणात्मक परिवर्तन के दौर से गुजरे हैं। अभी तक वह भारत, जो अंतर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्रों में तमाम विविधताओं के बावजूद इस बात के लिए सम्मानित किया जाता था कि उसमें विविधताओं के बावजूद एकजुटता है, तमाम भाआई विविधताओं, सांस्कृतिक विविधताओं, धार्मिक, क्षेत्रीय विविधताओं के बावजूद समूचा राष्ट्र एक संगठित राष्ट्र के रूप में देखा जाता था, लेकिन पिछले दिनों धार्मिक आधार पर, राजनैतिक आधार पर देश के अंदर विभाजन की रेखा खींचने के जो प्रयास हुए हैं, उसने अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समुदाय में भारत की प्रतिष्ठा को आघात पहुंचाया है, इस बात से हम इंकार नहीं कर सकते। हमारी विश्वसनीयता पर कलंक लगा है। न सिर्फ मुस्लिम देशों में हमारे २

ति शंका जाहिर की गई है बल्कि उन पाश्चात्य देशों में, जो आज मुस्लिम देशों के बड़े समर्थक नहीं हैं, वहां भी हमें शंका की दृष्टि से देखा जा रहा है। पहली जरूरत इस बात की है कि विदेश नीति के सफल संचालन के लिए, कारगर संचालन के लिए हम पहले अपने घर के हालात सुधारें। देश के अंदर जितना अलगाववाद बढ़ेगा, इस देश के अंदर पृथक्तावाद को जितनी ज्यादा हवा मिलेगी, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्रों में हमारी आवाज़ उतनी कमजोर होगी, उतनी प्रभावहीन होगी। अगर हमें विदेश नीति का संचालन या अंतर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्रों में अपना स्तर वही बनाए रखना है तो यह जरूरी है कि हम सबसे पहले अपने घरेलू हालात पर ध्यान दें। जो देश इंदिरा जी, राजीव जी के जमाने में तमाम देशों, 108 गुटनिर्पेक्ष देशों का नेतृत्व करता था, आज अंतर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्रों में उसकी स्थिति क्या है, इसके चंद उदाहरण आप देखें।

सभापति महोदय, पिछले दिनों अखबारों में आपने देखा कि अनेक देशों के अंदर एक साथ कई घटनाएं हुईं और उसमें हमने यह पढ़ा। जो चिन्ता का विषय बना, हिन्दुस्तान में ऐडिटोरियल्स लिखे गए कि भारतीय आई.टी. विशेषज्ञों के उम्र तमाम देशों के अंदर हमले हुए, व्यापारियों पर हमले होने शुरू हो गए, उनकी गिरफ्तारियां अनावश्यक रूप से की जाने लगीं और वे असम्मानित, अपमानित किए जाने लगे। क्या यह वही देश है जो 108 देशों का नेतृत्व करता था? आज यहां तक स्थिति आ गई।

अमरीका परस्ती की भी बहुत सी बातें की गई हैं जिनका खंडन भी हमारे कुछ दोस्तों ने किया। मैं मानता हूँ कि जीओ पोलिटिकल रियलिटीज़, जो भू-राजनैतिक वास्तविकताएं हैं, उनसे आंख मूंद कर कोई देश नहीं चल सकता। परिवर्तन आए हैं। स्थिरता की ओर सब जगह गुण-दोषों की चाहे जितनी प्रशंसा की जाती हो लेकिन विदेश नीति में, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में स्थिरता जैसा कोई शब्द नहीं होता, वहां डायनामिज़म होता है। इस परिवर्तनशीलता का मैं हामी हूँ किन्तु किस हद तक। क्या इस हद तक कि कारगिल युद्ध के बाद हमारे यहां जब राष्ट्रपति क्लिंटन आते हैं और सेंट्रल हाल में संबोधित करते हैं तो वे हमारे मुंह पर एक तमाचा जड़ कर चले जाते हैं कि आपके हटाने से पाकिस्तानी फौजें कारगिल से नहीं हटी हैं, मैंने उनको निर्दा दिया था, उसके बाद वे हटी हैं। हमारा समूचा राष्ट्रीय राजनैतिक नेतृत्व वहीं बैठा रहा और एक शब्द भी हमारे मुंह से नहीं निकला।

हमने अपनी फौजों की ताकत के बल पर उनको वहां से हटाया है न कि आपकी कृपा के आधार पर। यह कहने का राष्ट्रीय आत्मसम्मान को बनाये रखने का हमारा कर्तव्य बनता था और यह राष्ट्रीय शर्म की बात है कि हमारा समूचा नेतृत्व खामोश रहा।

कश्मीर समस्या और चीन के साथ हमारे संबंध हम चाहे जितना इंकार करें, सच्चाई यह है कि आज तमाम देशों के साथ हमारे संबंधों पर इन दो समस्याओं की छाया जरूर मौजूद रही है। पाकिस्तान- सेंट्रिक हो गए या चाइना-फौबिया हो गया, हमें इस तरह के कई वाक्य बोले गये। मैं उसमें विश्वास नहीं करता लेकिन मैं एक बात जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि कश्मीर हमारी समस्या है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी कई बार कहा। इसको हल करने कोई बाहर से नहीं आएगा। इस समस्या को हमें अपनी क्षमता, दक्षता और सामर्थ्य से हल करना होगा। हमारे प्रति सहानुभूति व्यक्त करने वाले अनेक देश हो सकते हैं। हमें मनोवैज्ञानिक रूप से समर्थन देने वाले कुछ मित्र राष्ट्र हो सकते हैं लेकिन करना हमें पड़ेगा और हो क्या रहा है ? कश्मीर के बारे में सरकार की नीति क्या है? पिछले चार वॉ में इस सरकार की कश्मीर की नीति है या नीतिहीनता है, मैं इस पर चिन्तित हूँ। सबसे पहले यह सरकार नेशनल कांफ्रेंस की जम्मू-कश्मीर की तत्कालीन सरकार को विश्वास में लिए बिना हुर्रियत कांफ्रेंस के लोगों को जेलों से रिहा कर देती है। अब कुछ न कुछ बातें तो ट्रैक-2 और ट्रैक-4 पर हुईं। संभावना यह थी कि हुर्रियत से बातचीत करके कश्मीर की समस्या का हल निकालने की कोशिश होगी लेकिन हुर्रियत से बात शुरू भी नहीं हो पाई कि पहले ही टूट गई। हुर्रियत से बात टूटने के पहले ही हिज़बुल-मुजाहिदीन के एक वर्ग से बात शुरू हो गई। हुर्रियत वाले नाराज हो गये, नेशनल कांफ्रेंस वाले नाराज हो गये। (व्यवधान)

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Please conclude in 2 minutes.

SHRI SATYAVRAT CHATURVEDI : People have taken 25 minutes. I have just begun.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: I know. I am going by the Party time. I can give 15 minutes each. You have finished 12 minutes. There are two more speakers.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Madam, I withdraw. You please give my time also to him.

श्री सत्यव्रत चतुर्वेदी : हुर्रियत प्रतिनिधि मंडल से बातचीत पूरी भी नहीं हो पाई कि हिज़बुल-मुजाहिदीन से बात शुरू हो गई। घोणा हो गई कि जब तक आतंकवाद बंद नहीं होगा, हम पाकिस्तान से कोई बात नहीं करेंगे, किसी से भी बात नहीं करेंगे। लेकिन उसके दूसरे दिन, हर क्षण, हर पल, हर दिन और हर हफ्ते में इस सरकार की नीति कैसे बदलती है, इसका तमाशा यह देखने को मिला कि रमजान के महीने में एकतरफा युद्धबंदी की घोणा हो गई। अब इस युद्धबंदी के परिणाम हमारे सीमा सुरक्षा बलों पर, रक्षा बलों पर उनके मनोबल पर इसका क्या असर पड़ा, यह बहुत बड़ा विषय है जिस पर बहस की जा सकती है लेकिन समय की कमी है और मैं इसके विस्तार में नहीं जाना चाहता। लेकिन एक तरफ हम बात न करने की बात करते हैं कि घुसपैठ को बंद किए बिना आतंकवाद बंद नहीं होगा और उसके बाद आगरा में तत्काल मुशरफ जी को बुला लेते हैं और आगरा में जो कुछ हुआ और जिस तरह से हुआ, वह सब एक इतिहास का हिस्सा है। सारा विश्व यह मानकर चला कि हम जैसे नौसिखिए राजनीति करने वाले हैं और एक जनरल आकर हमें राजनीति और कूटनीति में मात देकर चला गया। हम बिना तैयारी के वहां मुंह ताकते रह गए। इससे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्रों में हमारी प्रतिष्ठा पर जो बट्टा लगा है, उससे इंकार आप भी न करें और करना चाहें तो आपकी मर्जी। सच्चाइयां तो बदल नहीं जाएंगी। के.सी.पंत जी को वहां का वार्ताकार नियुक्त किया गया लेकिन कोई मिलने नहीं आया।

चलिए, के.सी. पंत जी को छोड़िए। फिर कश्मीर कमेटी बना दी गई। उसके हैड हमारे पूर्व कानून मंत्री जेठमलानी जी बनाए गए। वे वहां गए और लोगों से मिले। किन लोगों से मिले, हमें नहीं मालूम। लेकिन वहां से कुछ लोग जब यहां मिलने आए तो दिल्ली की सरकार ने उनसे मिलने से साफ मना कर दिया। उसके बाद वहां चुनाव हुआ और मुफ्ती मोहम्मद साहब की सरकार बनी। उस वक्त से मुफ्ती मोहम्मद साहब की सरकार भारतीय जनता पार्टी की सरकार के निशाने पर है। पिछले तीन महीने से निरंतर एक के बाद एक उस सरकार के खिलाफ तीर चलाने का काम किया जा रहा है, उस सरकार को डिमोरेलाइज करने का काम किया जा रहा है।

विदेश मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री दिग्विजय सिंह) : वहां की सरकार तो सर्टिफिकेट दे रही है कि केन्द्र हमारी मदद कर रहा है। क्या आपने मुफ्ती साहब का स्टेटमेंट नहीं देखा ?

श्री सत्यव्रत चतुर्वेदी : मैं उस पर भी आऊंगा और इसका उत्तर दूंगा। तीन महीने लगातार आक्रमण करने के बाद अभी जब प्रधान मंत्री जी जम्मू-कश्मीर के दौरे पर गए तो कुछ वहां की सरकार के बारे में सकारात्मक बयान दिया गया। उसके बाद अब जाकर प्रधान मंत्री जी के पहुंचने के बाद जो वहां उन्होंने आश्वासन दिए हैं, उसकी प्रतिक्रियास्वरूप मुफ्ती मोहम्मद साहब का स्टेटमेंट आया है। चुनाव के बाद से लेकर अभी तक मुफ्ती मोहम्मद साहब की सरकार के अलावा और कौन था वहां, वही छः लोग थे, जिनको चार-पांच बार आपकी सरकार में रहते नेशनल कांफ्रेंस ने, जिसकी वहां सरकार थी, जेल से रिलीज किया था, उन्हीं लोगों को फिर से मुफ्ती मोहम्मद साहब की सरकार ने रिलीज किया था, तो इसको लेकर इतना शोर क्यों किया गया, कौन से लक्ष्य प्राप्त हो रहे थे। संसद पर हमला हुआ, वहां फौजें भेजी गईं। बिगैस्ट मोबिलाइजेशन इन इंडिया। दस महीने तक वहां फौजें रहीं। मैंने तब गृह मंत्री जी से पूछा था कि आपने दस महीने तक फौजें वहां रखीं, कुछ राजनीतिक लक्ष्य रहे होंगे, कुछ सैनिक लक्ष्य रहे होंगे, क्या हमें वे हासिल हुए। जो आरपार की लड़ाई की बात हो रही थी, वह तो आर ही आर रह गया, अचानक दस महीने के बाद फौजें वापस बुला ली गईं। कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि अमेरिका के दबाव में यह काम किया गया। मैं नहीं मानता कि ऐसा हुआ होगा। मैं मानना भी नहीं

चाहता कि ऐसा हुआ होगा, अगर ऐसा हुआ है तो यह 100 करोड़ की आबादी वाले राष्ट्र के लिए और 30 लाख की फौज वाले देश के लिए इससे शर्मनाक बात और क्या हो सकती है। आज सारे देश में और देश के बाहर अन्य देशों में भारत की स्थिति बड़ी हास्यास्पद बनी हुई है। हमारे सामने यह होना चाहिए कि एक संतुलित विदेश नीति बनाने के पहले हम एक स्पष्ट गृह नीति बनाएं। हम पहले अपना घर सम्भालें। हम अमेरिका से यह अपेक्षा करते हैं कि वह पाकिस्तान को आतंकवादी देश घोषित करे, लेकिन हमारी सरकार ने पाकिस्तान को मोस्ट फेवर्ड नेशन का दर्जा अभी तक दिया हुआ है। फिर आप दूसरों से कैसे अपेक्षा करते हैं कि वह पाकिस्तान को आतंकवादी देश घोषित करे। यह कौन सी नीति है, इसको आप स्पष्ट करें।

अंत में मैं दो-तीन सुझाव देकर अपनी बात समाप्त करूंगा। आज हमें एक संतुलित विदेश नीति की आवश्यकता है। वह राष्ट्रीय आम सहमति से ही बनाई जा सकती है। उसमें हम अगर अपनी राजनीतिक विचारधाराओं का पुट देंगे तो आम सहमति नट हो जाएगी और वह राष्ट्र के हित में नहीं होगी। इसलिए सभी राजनीतिक दलों से विचार-विमर्श करके एक समग्र विदेश नीति बनाएं।

हमें विस्तार से अपनी विदेश नीति बनानी होगी। हमारे अल्पकालिक और तात्कालिक लक्ष्य क्या हैं, उनको प्राप्त करने की रणनीति क्या होगी, मध्यकालिक नीतिक क्या होगी, वह सुपरिभाषित हो, स्पष्ट हो। इसी तरह से दीर्घकालिक नीति स्पष्ट हो। फिर इन लक्ष्यों को प्राप्त करने का तरीका या रणनीति क्या होगी, इस पर समग्र चिंतन हो।

आपका विदेश मंत्रालय का ढांचा बहुत पुराना है, पुरानी पद्धति वाला है। दुनिया में बड़ा परिवर्तन आ गया है। थोड़ा बहुत परिवर्तन बीच में हुआ है। इस बात की आवश्यकता है इसलिए इस पर गम्भीरता से विचार करें। इस समूचे विदेश मंत्रालय के और आपके जो बाहर दूतावास या अन्य इंस्टीट्यूट्स हैं, उनके बारे में विचार करना होगा, समग्र रूप से नया पुनर्गठन करने की जरूरत है। नई पद्धतियां, आधुनिक पद्धतियां अपनाने की आवश्यकता है। अन्य देशों के अंदर सारी पद्धतियां बदल गई हैं। तीन विभिन्न स्रोतों से सारी जानकारियां इकट्ठी होती हैं। एक जगह पर केन्द्रीकृत सिस्टम उनके पास बना है। जहां पूरी जानकारियां एनेलाइज की जाती हैं और पूरी समीक्षा करने के बाद ऐतिहासिक संदर्भों में सब अलग-अलग प्रभागों में उनकी समीक्षा होने के बाद फिर उससे निर्का निकालते हैं। यहां भी परीक्षण के दौर से गुजरते हैं और इस तरह छनते-छनते फिर विदेश नीति के मूल तत्व हमारी नीति, रणनीति का निर्धारण होना चाहिए। मैं जानता हूँ आज भी हम बाबा आदम के जमाने की पुरानी पद्धति से ही काम कर रहे हैं। आधुनिक युग की चुनौतियों को भारत के आधुनिक युग के लक्ष्यों को पाने के लिए एक संरचना की जरूरत है। इस पर गम्भीरता से विचार किया जाए। हमारे इंडियन ओशियन के दो राष्ट्रों से सम्बन्धों के बारे में समग्रता से विचार होना चाहिए। ब्रिटिश हुकूमत ने हिन्दुस्तान में सुरक्षा के उपाय हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर नहीं, ईरान के अंदर, तिब्बत के अंदर और देश के बाहर बर्मा के अंदर फ्रंटियर्स खोले थे, वहां से हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा होती थी, वक्त बदल गया है, सम्बन्धों को नए सिरे से, नए रूप में विकसित करना होगा। गल्फ में भी, दक्षिण अफ्रीका में भी और जो आप ईस्ट लुक की पालिसी की बात कहते हैं, उसको भी देखना होगा। ईस्ट लुक पालिसी की बात जरूर हुई है, लेकिन इसको जितना इम्पीटस मिलना चाहिए, जितना फोकस मिलना चाहिए, वह नहीं मिला है। ताइवान जैसा देश, मुझे मालूम है आपकी कुछ हैजीटेंस हैं, लेकिन वह आर्थिक रूप से काफी आगे है। वह भी डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. का सदस्य है और हम भी हैं। जब चीन उससे व्यापार कर सकता है और वहां अरबों डालर का निवेश कर सकता है तो हमारे भी उससे व्यापारिक सम्बन्ध बढ़ाए जा सकते हैं।

बातें बहुत थीं, लेकिन समय कम है। अंत में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेश नीति को पार्टिजन तरीके से देखना बंद करना होगा। इसे हमें समग्र रूप में देखना होगा। दूरगामी राष्ट्रीय हितों को लक्ष्य में रखते हुए देखना होगा और गम्भीर चिंतन करना होगा। मैं इस अपेक्षा के साथ अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ कि सम्भवतः मेरी कुछ कड़वी-मीठी बातों से शायद कुछ परिवर्तन आए, कुछ सुधार आए।

MADAM CHAIRMAN : Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab, you must finish your speech within 10 minutes' time.

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB (CUTTACK): I will try to do so.

There are basically three or four points which I would like to mention. We should accept that today we are living in a uni-polar world. For the last 56 years, the only institution, which actually fluttered the flag of multilateralism or provided a proof of multipolarism, was the United Nations. I would also like to mention here about the Non-Aligned Movement about which, I think, a number of times, a mention was made no longer remains a movement. When we discuss the situation about Iraq or the pounding of Iraq by the coalition forces, we should not confine ourselves to say that it is only the American forces which were doing this but we should say that it is the coalition forces which were doing this.

The United Nations, created after II World War, is actually a creature of cold war as has been reported in different spheres, was just a mute spectator. At the same time I would like to mention here very categorically that the Non-Aligned Movement is no longer a movement. It has now turned into a club where around 103 or 107 Heads of State or Heads of Government congregate for about a week's time, exchange their views and give out their point of view on different situations and issues.

A mention has been made about Bangladesh and also about the Kashmir situation. I have a different point of view; I do not know how others would react to it. I was also a student during the seventies just as Shri Kharabela Swain mentioned that he was a student of political science. We come from the same college though he was few years senior to me. It was in December 1971 that the *Muktivahini* forces along with the Indian Forces marched into East Pakistan or Bangladesh, as it is called now. Today, after 32 years, a question arises in my mind. The question is that in 1971, even in 1977 and even during Madam Gandhi's tenure from 1980 to 1984, even later on I have spoken here, that it was a historic moment. I cherish that photograph of General Niazi's surrender; television was not prevalent then. We rejoiced that we achieved a glorious moment and our Indian Army has achieved which we always strove to attain in 1965, which we failed to achieve in 1962. That gave us prestige. Every Indian was proud wherever he went throughout the world. But a question still lingers in my mind. Did we do the right thing? Did we do the right thing, in the context, when we see that Kashmir is bleeding every day? It has become a killing field today. It may have started since 1987 or even since 1948. Every year, or every month, to say the least, Indians are bleeding

in Kashmir. The question is whether we did the right thing in 1971-72. When East Pakistan was there, every day, Pakistan was bleeding; and by the vivisection of Pakistan in 1971, Pakistan has got rid of a decomposed organ for a different reason of course. Pakistan is concentrating more on Kashmir today. But for us Bangladesh has become another sore, on another front. We thought Pakistan would be totally confined to the western front and our eastern borders would be safe. But today that is not so. That is why the question still lingers in my mind. It may occur to many others also.

I had told earlier that when we discuss about the foreign policy of any country, the only interest a country can have – whether it is diplomacy or anything else – is not emotional but of national interest. Many things have been said, policies have been laid out and a lot of money has also been spent on emotional causes. It may be just before the Vietnam War; it may be for many other reasons. But what was our national interest? Today, what should be our interest? The national interest can be not him, but to make the country strong. I remember, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar was in service in 1989. This occurred then. He was present there.

I had the privilege of being in Belgrade to attend the Ninth NAM Conference where in the last night, after around 10.30 or so suddenly we were brought back to the Conference Hall to witness a new chapter to history was being added. We heard Dr. Julius Nyerere's speech and along with him were the then hon. Prime Minister, late Shri Rajiv Gandhi. There the 'Group of 15' was formed. In 1989 it dawned on all the leaders and on all the members of the NAM that it is not the right way to proceed, as the NAM is growing. Trade and commerce should be the cornerstone and we should have a Group of 15 where we can tide over the situation which has developed during the last so many years after the fall of colonialism, after the death blow was given to colonial powers by Hitler. But there has been a little change of power centres after the Second World War. Colonialism in a different garb is still prevalent in this world.

Even today when Indian traders are doing trade and commerce with other countries especially with Latin American or African countries, our trade and our commerce has to be practised *via* Paris, *via* Frankfurt and *via* London. We cannot have trade with Latin American countries directly or through any developing countries. We cannot reach African countries through Cairo or through South Africa or any other country. We have to go *via* Germany, *via* France or *via* London and trade and commerce is being determined from those places. Still the same old colonial practice is prevalent. If you want to be rich, if you want to be economically and militarily strong, then attempt has to be made to make India strong. But the question today is what attempt is being made to make this country economically stronger?

I agree, there are many aspects when we discuss about foreign relations. One aspect is how we look at our neighbours. How friendly we are with them. How much our neighbours believe in us and to what extent they can come along with us. To inculcate a feeling of fraternity, a big country like ours has to help our neighbours financially, morally and emotionally in a diplomatic way. I know.

17.33 hrs. (Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

a lot of money has been spent with a number of projects in Bhutan. Though small attempt has been made with Myanmar, we are yet to open our coffers for investment in Bangladesh and in Nepal in a big way. With Pakistan, of course, the old Indus Treaty is there. However, there are many other aspects where we can work out. But still my anxiety is that for the last 56-57 years we are concentrating mainly on Kashmir. We have to tide over that situation and do not get bogged down in our domestic problem by highlighting it in international arena. ...(*Interruptions*)

I was talking about trade and commerce. There was a time when India was rich in trade and commerce. At that time, we controlled the Indian ocean. the maritime activities. But later on in the Middle Ages, it was the Arabs who controlled it. However, the Europeans overthrew Arabs and that is how they controlled the landmass for a longer period.

Now I would come to another aspect of history. The aspect is the Army exerted the first power, which controlled the land and through Army that power centre controlled the world. They were the super power. At one point of time for a brief period it was the Greeks, but for a longer period it was the Romans. But later in the middle ages, even towards the end of the 19th Century, the forces that controlled the sea controlled the power in the world. They were the Europeans. In the 20th Century, after the First World War, even till this date, the power, which controls the sky, controls the power of the world. We have to accept these facts.

Today, after the demise of the Soviet Union, for the last so many years, more than a decade, it is the United States, and we have to accept this fact, which controls the sky. How can we overcome this situation of today as a free independent nation is the big question.? It can only happen by strengthening our economic power and by becoming an economic giant.

I remember here another interesting aspect and I want to share it with you; it is not a secret though. At that time I

was not a member of any Government delegation; but I was present as a member of the Press in the Oval Office. Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao was the Prime Minister. An interesting thing happened in the Oval Office. We were four or five Press persons present there and an interesting question was asked by President Clinton. Perhaps, it was in 1994. The question was : "Mr. Prime Minister, why is it that you are spending so much of money on defence? You are a developing nation. This money can be diverted to the social sector so that the nation can prosper".

As a member from the Press we were all eager to hear how our Prime Minister was going to react. It was a very tricky question though. It was a very delicate situation that before three or four members of the Press the President of the United States of America, in his Oval Office, asked that question to our Prime Minister. ...(*Interruptions*) That is way in which they are recognised .

But Rao Saheb was clever to the true sense of the term. He was an intelligent man. He was speaking not only as a Congress Prime Minister but he was representing this great nation of ours. I remember his reply because that impressed me very much. His reply was : "India is a functional democracy. It is an ancient civilisation which has attained freedom after long struggle of 90 years." He explained this because the President, Mr. Clinton said : "As Japan has progressed, as Germany has become economically strong, why India can not do this? We will protect your skies." These are the words which he mentioned. He said : "We will protect your skies". It was because at that time all those missiles like Agni and the like were coming on. That was, perhaps, one of the topics which both of them discussed during their one-to-one discussion. Perhaps, they might have discussed about it earlier. But before us, our Prime Minister said : "We have attained freedom after a long struggle of 90 years. You, Mr. President, support us to maintain the democratic temper of our country". And it ended there.

I am sure our foreign policy is in safe hands today. I had other aspects also to speak on; but I would conclude within another two-three minutes. Taking the changed situation of the world into consideration, we should climb out from the time capsule of Nehru era. I hear in this House and also I read in many other forums where many of our think tanks always fall back on what happened in the Fifties, what happened in the Sixties and what happened in the Seventies. But what is happening today? We cannot be confined to a time capsule. We have to accept the situation of today and proceed accordingly. That is how we can prosper, we can compete and we can excel.

Today when we accept that the world has become a unipolar world and our national interest lies if the world becomes a multi-polar world, what should we do?

In what manner we can strive to attain our desired position? I think, in that prospect, we have to strive to make the United Nation more functional. For the last many years, despite whoever is the Foreign Minister and despite whoever is the Prime Minister, many a time a discussion has been going on why does India not become a permanent member of the Security Council. I would expect our hon. Minister for External Affairs to throw light on this issue.

I would also like to state here that more stress should be given on trade and commerce while we expand our relationship in the world. . The last thing I would like to say is that when we want to increase our military strength, at the same time, we should also expand our economic strength. Then only, people will listen to us. This may be my presumption that it is for this reason that – I do not know whether other Members will agree with me or not – a successful Finance Minister for five years has taken the reins of the Ministry of External Affairs and for this very reason and a successful Minister of External Affairs has taken the reins of the Ministry of Finance.

Sir, I thank you again for allowing me to express a few words and conclude by saying that I support the Demand for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs.

श्री राशिद अलवी (अमरोहा) : स्पीकर साहब, आज हम यहां एक बहुत अहम ईश्यू पर बहस कर रहे हैं। किसी देश की फॉरेन पॉलिसी अपने देश के हितों और इंटरैस्ट को देखकर बनती है। आज हम पहली बार पार्लियामेंट के अंदर इस अहम मामले पर बातचीत कर रहे हैं। देश को आज़ाद हुये 55 साल से ज्यादा हो गये हैं, आधी सदी गुज़र गई। आधी सदी कोई मामूली वक्त नहीं होता है। इस आधी सदी में दुनिया का नक्शा बदल गया है और हिन्दुस्तान का नक्शा भी बदल गया है। 1947 में कागज़ात पर जो नक्शा होता था, वह आज नहीं है। रूस जैसा मुल्क बिखर गया। आज से 54 साल पहले जो फॉरेन पॉलिसी थी, यकीनन आज वह नहीं हो सकती लेकिन जिस वक्त हम यहां बातचीत कर रहे हैं, उस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर हमारी फॉरेन पॉलिसी पहले से ज्यादा अहमियत रखती है। युनाइटेड नेशन्स बिखर गया है। उसकी ताकत खत्म हो गई है। मैं वे सब बातें दोहराना नहीं चाहता, जो मुझसे पहले हमारे साथी कह चुके हैं। युनाइटेड नेशन्स जिस मकसद को लेकर इस दुनिया के अंदर बनाया गया था, आज उसकी अहमियत खत्म हो गई है। हमारे चारों तरफ जो पड़ोसी मुमाल्लिग हैं, जिनसे पिछले 55 सालों से हमारी दोस्ती होनी चाहिये थी, उतनी दोस्ती नहीं हुई है बल्कि बहुतों के साथ हमारी दुश्मनी बढ़ी है। दुनिया के अंदर जो मुमाल्लिग दोस्त होने चाहते थे, वे दोस्त नहीं रहे और अपने नये दोस्त हम बना नहीं पाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इसमें कोई बुरी बात नहीं लगती कि अगर कुछ मुमाल्लिग हमें छोड़कर चले जायें, और हमारे कुछ नये दोस्त बन जायें। सरकार दोस्त मुमाल्लिग बनाने की कोशिश कर रही है जिसके लिये हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। अगर सरकार हिन्दुस्तान के हित में अमरीका से दोस्ती करना चाहती है तो जरूर करनी चाहिये लेकिन क्या हमें इस में किसी हद तक कामयाबी मिली है। क्या हम उस दोस्ती को आगे बढ़ाने में कामयाब हुये हैं? क्या अमरीका ने हमें पूरी दुनिया के सामने ज़लील करने का काम नहीं किया है? अभी हमारे वज़ीरे-आज़म ने कश्मीर में बहुत अहम बयान दिया जिससे सारे हिन्दुस्तान का आवाम जुड़ा हुआ है क्योंकि इससे सारी दुनिया में हमारी फॉरेन पॉलिसी की अहमियत बढ़ती या घटती है। आज सब से बड़ा सवाल यह है कि वज़ीरे-आज़म ने कश्मीर में जाकर यह बयान क्यों दिया, दिल्ली के अंदर यह बात क्यों नहीं कही कि हम पाकिस्तान से अच्छे रिश्ते चाहते हैं। इस बात को कौन मना कर रहा है कि हमारे पाकिस्तान के साथ अच्छे रिश्ते नहीं होने चाहियें?

हम लगातार कहते चले आ रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान क्रॉस बॉर्डर टैरिज्म को खत्म करे। जिस वक्त वजीरे-आजम कश्मीर में बोल रहे थे, उस वक्त फॉरेन मिनिस्टर दिल्ली में कह रहे थे कि जब तक पाकिस्तान टैरिज्म बंद नहीं करेगा, हम पाकिस्तान से कोई बात नहीं करेंगे। लेकिन कश्मीर में वजीरे-आजम कह रहे थे कि हम हर तरीके की बात पाकिस्तान से करने के लिए तैयार हैं। कश्मीर के अंदर जाकर इस तरीके का बयान देना इसकी अहमियत को बढ़ा देता है। एक तरफ हमारा कहना है कि हम कश्मीर के मामले में किसी से बात नहीं करेंगे, किसी के साथ समझौता नहीं करेंगे। मेरा कहना है कि यह बयान टैरिज्म को और मजबूत कर देगा। हम इस बात को मान रहे हैं कि कश्मीर का मामला डिस्प्यूटिड है। अगर कश्मीर के मामले को हल करना है तो पाकिस्तान भी एक पार्टी है। यह हमारी पूरी फॉरेन पॉलिसी को बदल देगा। मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार को इस हाउस के अंदर वाजे तौर पर कहना चाहिए कि इस मामले में हमारी क्या पॉलिसी है। क्या इन हालात के अंदर हम पाकिस्तान से बात करने को तैयार हैं, क्या कश्मीर का मुद्दा हम पाकिस्तान के साथ बात करके हल करना चाहते हैं। एक तरफ हम लगातार कर रहे हैं कि श्री मुफ्ती मौहम्मद सईद, जम्मू-कश्मीर के चीफ मिनिस्टर, टैरिस्टों को छोड़ रहे हैं, कश्मीर की समस्या को बढ़ावा दे रहे हैं। मैं इसी हाउस में एक बार कह चुका हूँ कि 54 सालों में कितनी सरकारें आईं और कितनी सरकारें गईं, लेकिन कश्मीर की समस्या का समाधान नहीं हुआ। एक मुफ्ती मौहम्मद सईद की सरकार, जो लोगों के द्वारा चुनी हुई सरकार है, उन्हें टाइम देना चाहिए, उन्हें मौका देना चाहिए। वह अपने तौर पर जिस तरह से हल करना चाहें, इस मामले को हल करें। दो साल-चार साल के बाद देखें, अगर वह नाकाम हो जाते हैं तो हम भी कहेंगे कि ये कमियां आपकी रहीं, अगर ये न होती तो शायद कामयाब हो जाते। लेकिन कश्मीर के अंदर ऐसा बयान देना, मैं नहीं समझता कि यह बहुत ज्यादा सही बात थी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इराक की यहां बहुत चर्चा हो चुकी है। चाहे इराक का मामला हो, चाहे पाकिस्तान का मामला हो, तमाम मामलात जाकर अमरीका से जुड़ जाते हैं और हमारी फॉरेन पॉलिसी में जिस तरीके की बातें इस रिपोर्ट में अमरीका को लेकर कही गई हैं, इराक के बारे में मैं बहुत तलाश कर रहा था, जिसे अमरीका ने तबाह और बरबाद कर दिया, जो मजलूमियत की एक कहानी बता रहा है, इस पूरी रिपोर्ट में मुझे बड़ी मुश्किल से पांच-छः लाइनें इराक के बारे में मिलीं। वह इराक जो हमेशा हिंदुस्तान का साथ देता रहा, वह इराक जिसने पाकिस्तान की जंग में, चाहे वह 1965 की जंग हो या 1971 की जंग हो, वह किसी के साथ नहीं खड़ा था, इराक हिन्दुस्तान के साथ खड़ा था। वह इराक जो यूनाइटेड नेशंस में पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ हमारी मदद करता रहा, मुझे बहुत मुश्किल से इसके अंदर पांच-छः लाइनें मिलीं, यह लेटेस्ट रिपोर्ट वा 2002-2003 की है, इसमें अमरीका के मामले में सरकार का कहना है - The terrorist attacks in the United States on 11 September, and on the Indian Parliament on 13 December have led to a deepening of Indo-US relations in the field. यह पहली बार मैं देख रहा हूँ कि हम पर भी हमला हुआ, उस पर भी हमला हुआ और हमारे रिश्ते बहुत मजबूत हो गये। यह कितनी मुजहका किस्म की बात है। इस बात में रिश्तों को मजबूत करने का पैमाना देखिये, हिन्दुस्तान की फॉरेन पॉलिसी देखिये कि उनके ऊपर इतना भारी हमला कर दिया, हमारे ऊपर इतना भारी हमला कर दिया, हम दो दोस्त हो गये और अमरीका किस तरह से हमारे साथ दोस्ती निभा रहा है। उसने अफगानिस्तान पर हमला किया, हमने कहा हमारी जमीन भी ले लो, हमारा आसमां भी ले लो, हम पेट्रोल भी देंगे, हम डीजल भी देंगे और अपने अड्डे भी देंगे, आप हमारे पास आओ। अमरीका ने कहा, नहीं, हम आपके पास आने वाले नहीं हैं, हम पाकिस्तान का इस्तेमाल करेंगे। उसने हमें जलील करने का काम किया। जब इराक के ऊपर हमला किया तो उस पर फिर यहां बहस हुई, फिर कहा गया कि हम बीच का रास्ता निकालना चाहते हैं और आज यह भी कहा जा रहा है कि बीच का रास्ता सही रास्ता था। इराक में जो कुछ हुआ, उसने आज यह साबित कर दिया कि हमारी पॉलिसी यही होनी चाहिए थी। मेरा सिर शर्म से झुक जाता है, क्या हम अपने दोस्त को इसलिए मरवा देंगे कि कल को हमें उससे फायदा मिलने वाला है। मैंने पहले भी इस हाउस में कहा था और आज भी कह रहा हूँ कि इराक अमरीका की आखिरी मंजिल नहीं है।

अफगानिस्तान के बाद इराक, इराक के बाद सीरिया, उसके बाद ईरान और उसके बाद हिन्दुस्तान भी उसके निशाने पर है। यह वक्त साबित कर देगा। आज दुनिया में हमारे दोस्तों की तादाद बढ़ी नहीं है, घट रही है। फॉरेन पॉलिसी अगर राजनीतिक दल अपना फायदा देखकर बनाएंगे तो देश कभी मजबूत नहीं हो सकता है। जिस राजनीतिक दल की सरकार आए और वह सोचे की विदेश नीति हम अपने हिसाब से बनाएंगे तो इससे टैरिज्म भी बढ़ेगा और दुनिया के मुमालिक के लोग, उनके एजेन्ट उस मुल्क में रहना शुरू कर देंगे। फॉरेन पॉलिसी कभी राजनीतिक दलों के इंटरस्ट पर नहीं बनाई जाती है, देश के हितों को ध्यान में रखकर बनाई जाती है। टैलीग्राफ ने इराक के बारे में लिखा है :-

"The Bharatiya Janata Party is truly a Party of petty businessmen. It cannot see beyond minor advantages to be had out of the Iraq crisis. The Indian position on Iraq is a result of certain hopefulness about strategic gains. As the situation unfolds, New Delhi realises that the war in Iraq will create a firmament in the Muslim world. Iraq is just the beginning of the Americans engagement in a Muslim country. Subsequently, it would have to deal with Iran, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and others. There are powerful forces in New Delhi which are looking at the conflict in Iraq through communal glasses and believe that India stands to gain from this conflict of civilisations."

अगर फॉरेन पॉलिसी इसलिए बनेगी कि इसमें हमारे राजनीतिक दल का क्या फायदा होगा, अभी हमारे कुछ साथियों ने कहा कि इस्लामिक टैरिज्म का लफ्ज़ इस्तेमाल किया गया। फॉरेन पॉलिसी पर डिसकस किया जा रहा है और इस्लामिक टैरिज्म की बात की जा रही है। जो रिजॉल्यूशन सारे हाउस ने यूनेनिमसली पास किया था, उसकी चर्चा जिस तरह से की गई, फॉरेन पॉलिसी में राजनीतिक दलों का फायदा नहीं देखा जाता है, देश के हितों का फायदा देखा जाता है। अभी मैं दो-तीन मिनट लूंगा। आप घंटी बजाएंगे तो मैं डिसटर्ब हो जाऊंगा। मैं दो-तीन मिनट में अपनी बात खत्म कर दूंगा। **वै। (व्यवधान)**

सर, बुश साहब ने एक स्टेटमेंट में कहा है कि :-

"Pakistan is a friend and a strategic ally."

यह जुबान अमेरिका का प्रेज़ीडेन्ट पाकिस्तान के बारे में बोल रहा है। हामिद करज़ई ने कहा है :-

"Pakistan is a very close friend of ours."

जिस अफगानिस्तान की नई सरकार के बारे में हम यह सोचते थे कि वह हमारा साथ देगी, नई सरकार बनेगी तो हिन्दुस्तान का साथ देगी, वह पाकिस्तान के ज्यादा नज़दीक है। अमेरिका पाकिस्तान के ज्यादा नज़दीक है और हम इस तलाश में हैं कि किसी तरह से अमेरिका के साथ हमारी दोस्ती हो जाए और उस दोस्ती के लिए कितने मुल्कों को हम नाराज़ करने पर तुले हैं। इराक के इस वाक्य में गिनती के लोग अमेरिका के साथ नहीं खड़े थे और तब भी कहा था कि सरकार को चाहिए कि आगे बढ़े और दुनिया के उन तमाम मुमालिक को लीड करे जो इराक के इस वाक्य के खिलाफ हैं। फॉरेन मिनिस्टर ने कहा कि हमें फॉरेन पॉलिसी बनाने से पहले देखना पड़ेगा कि कतर भी इराक का साथ दे रहा है, साउदी अरेबिया भी साथ दे रहा है, कुवैत भी साथ दे रहा है। मैं अदब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हिन्दुस्तान की पॉलिसी यह देखकर बनेगी कि कतर की फॉरेन पॉलिसी क्या है, कुवैत की फॉरेन पॉलिसी क्या है, साउदी अरेबिया की फॉरेन पॉलिसी क्या है? ये मुमालिक नहीं हैं, अमेरिका की क्रॉलोनीज़ हैं जो उनके दम पर जीते हैं, उनके दम पर मरते हैं। वे कमज़ोर मुमालिक हैं। अगर हिन्दुस्तान का नाम आप उनकी फेरिहस्त में जोड़ना चाहते

हैं तो मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है।

आज ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि हम दुनिया में अपने दोस्तों की तादाद बढ़ाएं और हिन्दुस्तान को मजबूत करें। जब तक हम तय नहीं करेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान को अमेरिका के मुकाबले पर लाना है तो हम आगे नहीं बढ़ सकते हैं। आज दुनिया में पावर का बैलेन्स खराब हो गया है।

रशिया के खत्म हो जाने से अमरीका अकेली ताकत रह गई है। यदि आज हमें कुछ करना है, तो अपने को इतना मजबूत करना पड़ेगा जिससे कि हम अमरीका के मुकाबले खड़े हो जाएं। अगर हम अपने को मजबूत नहीं करेंगे, तो चीन खड़ा हो जाएगा। चीन उसी लाइन पर चल रहा है। आप मुझे माफ करें, हमारे अंदर नैशनलिज्म की भावना उतनी नहीं है जितनी चीन में है। आज चीन नैशनलिज्म की भावना पर काम कर रहा है। हम बंटे हुए लोग हैं। जब तक हम अपने देश के अंदर कम्युनलिज्म और कास्टिज्म खत्म कर के इस देश को एक होकर मजबूत करने का काम नहीं करेंगे, तब तक इस देश को आगे नहीं बढ़ा सकेंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आखिर में सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि कई ऐसी गल्फ कंट्रीज हैं जिनकी एम्बेसीज में हमारे बहुत कम आफीसर हैं, जबकि वहां बहुत बड़ी संख्या में भारतीय काम करते हैं। इसलिए मेरी फॉरिन अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर से दरखास्त है कि ऐसी गल्फ कंट्रीज की एम्बेसीज में हमारे ऑफीसरों की तादाद बढ़ाएं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब समाप्त कीजिए।

श्री राशिद अलवी : सर, मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। इसके साथ-साथ मैं सिर्फ यह दरखास्त करना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे वह पाकिस्तान हो, चाहे वे दूसरे नेबरिंग कंट्रीज हैं, उनसे हिन्दुस्तान को फायदा हो या नुकसान नहीं होगा, लेकिन जो भी फ़ैसला करना है, वह हिन्दुस्तान की इज्जत और हिन्दुस्तान की शक्ति को ध्यान में रखकर करना चाहिए। In the end, I support these Demands for Grants.

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय,

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह जी, शायद आपने सुना नहीं। मैं आपको सिर्फ पांच मिनट का समय दे रहा हूँ।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पांच मिनट में ही समाप्त करने का प्रयास करूंगा।

महोदय, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति संकट में है। उसे देखते हुए विदेश विभाग पर आपने सदन में बहस करने की अनुमति दी, यह अच्छी बात है। यह बहुत अहम विषय है। विद्वान लोग बताते हैं कि आर्थिक नीति और आर्थिक स्थिति ठीक होने से विदेश नीति भी उसी के मुताबिक चलती है। इसी ख्याल से शायद विदेश मंत्री और वित्त मंत्री में अदला-बदली हुई है। जसवन्त सिंह जी की पोस्ट पर यशवन्त सिन्हा जी चले गए हैं और जसवन्त सिंह जी, यशवन्त सिन्हा के पद पर आ गए हैं। मेरी समझ में आ रहा है कि आर्थिक नीति को ठीक करने के बाद अब सिन्हा जी विदेश नीति को ठीक करने विदेश मंत्रालय गए हैं। इस प्रकार हमारे देश में आर्थिक स्थिति और विदेश नीति दोनों ठीक हों, यह फार्मूला अपनाया जा रहा है। इसीलिए सिन्हा जी आर्थिक स्थिति को मजबूत कर विदेश नीति को मजबूत करने गए हैं।

श्री सत्यव्रत चतुर्वेदी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सिन्हा जी देश की आर्थिक स्थिति को मजबूत करने के बाद विदेश नीति को मजबूत करने के लिए विदेश मंत्रालय गए हैं।

MR. SPEAKER: With the approval of the House, I extend the sitting of the House till the debate on this issue and the Minister's reply are over, and the Demands for Grants are voted.

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : महोदय, कौटिल्य का पुराना सिद्धान्त था कि अपने पड़ोसी देश को ठीक रखना चाहिए और उससे अच्छे सम्बन्ध रखने चाहिए। विदेश नीति बनाते समय पड़ोसी देशों से सावधान रहकर विदेश नीति बनानी चाहिए। कुछ दिन पहले हम लोगों ने गुजरात डॉक्ट्राइन के बारे में सुना था। जो विदेश नीति के काबिल लोग हैं, वे इस बात को जानते हैं। हम लोग तो सुनते रहते हैं, समझते रहते हैं, देखते रहते हैं और सीखते रहते हैं। हमने सुना था गुजरात डॉक्ट्राइन के अनुसार कि जो पड़ोसी देश हैं, उनको कुछ राहत देकर, उन्हें कुछ रियायत देकर और कुछ सहकर भी अपना बनाकर रखना चाहिए।

महोदय, हमारा पड़ोसी देश चीन है। अभी हमारे रक्षा मंत्री, जिन्होंने एक बार चीन को अपने देश का नंबर वन शत्रु बताया था, उसे अनुकूल बनाने के लिए चीन गए हैं। अब हमें पता नहीं कि अनुकूल बना पाएंगे या नहीं, या वहां से बीमारी के कीटाणु लेकर देश में चले आएंगे। यानी जिस पड़ोसी देश को उन्होंने अपने देश का शत्रु नंबर एक बताया, वे उसी को अनुकूल बनाने के लिए चीन गए हैं। अब पता नहीं कूटनीति के सिद्धान्त पर उनका यह लफ्ज ठीक था या नहीं। दूसरा हमारा पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान है। पाकिस्तान के मामले में हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी ने कहा कि वह इराक से भी ज्यादा खतरनाक है, यानी इन्होंने इराक को भी लपेट लिया और इराक के ऊपर अमरीका की कार्यवाही को ठीक बताया कि इराक ब्लेमलैस नहीं है। इन्होंने इराक पर अमरीका की कार्यवाही का औचित्य समझा।

18.00 hrs.

फिर अपनी फौज भी पाकिस्तान की सीमा पर डट गई। हम आर-पार की लड़ाई सुनते रहे और यह सुनते रहे कि हम बात नहीं करेंगे। फिर प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बयान दिया कि हम बात करेंगे, क्रास बार्डर टेरेरिज्म खत्म करेंगे, लेकिन अब वह स्वर कमजोर पड़ गया है, वार्ता वाला स्वर मजबूत हो गया है। हम नहीं समझ पाते कि इसमें क्या नीति चल रही है, क्या राय है। अब चीन भी हमारी जमीन को लिए हुए है। पार्लियामेंट ने बहुत पहले प्रस्ताव पास किया था कि हम चीन से अपनी एक-एक ईंच धरती मुक्त करा लेंगे तभी हम दम लेंगे। उसे लोग भूल गए हैं, लोगों को याद नहीं है।

महोदय, तिब्बत का दलाईलामा हमारे यहां रहता है। भगवान बुद्ध को यहां ज्ञान प्राप्त हुआ, उनका यहां जन्म हुआ और विश्वशांति का संदेश फैला। तिब्बत बुद्धिस्ट देश था, वहां चीन ने कब्जा किया और अब यहां दलाईलामा साहब डटे हुए हैं। हम ऐसा सुनते हैं कि तिब्बत की संस्कृति चीन को समाप्त करने जा रही है और वहां पर्यावरण को दूषित कर रहे हैं। वहां हथियारों का जमावड़ा हो रहा है, इसलिए विदेश नीति की सफलता हम मानेंगे कि इसमें विदेश नीति कूटनीतिक स्तर पर तिब्बत को शांति वाला जोन स्थापित करने का प्रयत्न करें। तिब्बत में जो उपद्रव जा रहा है, वहां जो आणविक शक्ति और हथियार, बारूद एकत्र किए जा रहे हैं, वहां के पर्यावरण और संस्कृति को नष्ट करने की बात हो रही है। हम सुनते हैं कि दलाईलामा का प्रतिनिधि मंडल चीन में गया था। वहां दोनों की वार्ता शुरू हो गई है। चीन और दलाईलामा के बीच में वार्ता शुरू हो और वहां जो आटोनोमी चाहते हैं तथा जो कुछ भी यथासंभव हो, वह किया जाना चाहिए, चूंकि तिब्बत से हमारा पुराना सांस्कृतिक रिश्ता है। वैसे तो चीन से भी हमारा अच्छा रिश्ता था, वहां से फाह्यान दूसरी-तीसरी शताब्दी में यहां आए थे। उस समय चीन से हमारा अच्छा रिश्ता था, वह बुद्धिस्ट कंट्री था। भगवान बुद्ध का जो 15-20 मुल्कों में प्रभाव फैला था, उस हिसाब से वह हमारा नजदीकी था। हमारे प्रयत्न से चीन यूएनओ में सदस्य बना और अब वह हमारा दुश्मन हो गया है, अब तो डिफेंस मिनिस्टर कहते हैं कि उन्होंने हमारी जमीन पर कब्जा एवं आक्रमण किया। लोग कहते हैं कि अमेरिका पर भरोसा नहीं किया जाना चाहिए। कुछ लोग अमेरिका की तरफदारी करके भाग कर रहे हैं, हम नहीं जानते कि वे ज्यादा काबलियत के कारण कहते हैं। लोग कहते हैं कि ओसामाबिन लादेन वहीं पैदा हुए। कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि इराक ब्लेमलैस नहीं है। इराक का भी शुरू में अमेरिका मददगार था और सारे उपद्रव की जड़ में, रासायनिक हथियार, सब अमेरिका से आए थे। उन्होंने कहा कि उनके पास प्रूफ है। हम ऐसा सुनते हैं कि कल पाकिस्तान में भी कैमिकल जांच करने के लिए इंस्पेक्टर गया है, आज के अखबारों में हमने कहीं देखा। कैमिकल की कहां-कहां जांच की जाएगी, हमारे यहां वह कब आएगा। इसलिए इन सब पर विदेश नीति की सफलता हम लोग मानते हैं कि पड़ोस के मुल्क को पहले अनुकूल करना चाहिए। यूएनओ को मजबूत किया जाना चाहिए।

महोदय, हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया का छठा हिस्सा है, 102 करोड़ की आबादी है, जमीन 2.4 प्रतिशत है, लेकिन आबादी 16 प्रतिशत है। यूएनओ में युनाइटेड सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल में हम सदस्य नहीं हो पा रहे हैं, क्या विदेश नीति और कूट नीति है और ये लोग अपना प्रभाव एवं समर्थन दुनिया के मुल्कों के बीच में जुटाते हैं। दुनिया का छठा हिस्सा युनाइटेड सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल में सदस्य नहीं रहेगा, इसका क्या पहलू एवं महत्व है। हिन्दुस्तान के बिना उसका कोई मतलब नहीं रह जाता, लेकिन उसमें भी हमें सदस्य नहीं बना रहा है। हम लोग वोट में पिछड़ रहे हैं। इसलिए यूएनओ की मजबूती और हमारे जो पुराने सिद्धांत हैं, नॉन एलाइनमेंट पालिसी है। जब दो गुट थे तो हम तीसरे गुट थे और उसका नेतृत्व कर रहे थे। जब एक गुट खत्म हो गया तो दो गुट बच जाने चाहिए। अब लोग कहते हैं कि यूनीपोलर, यूनीपोलर हो गया। कैसे यह दुनिया चल रही है, हमारा दूसरा गुट नॉन एलाइनमेंट वाला कहां चला गया। रूस वाला खत्म हुआ, उसे भी उसी में मिला कर दूसरा गुट करना चाहिए। तीन में से एक गुट खत्म हुआ तो दो रहने चाहिए, लेकिन तीन में से एक खत्म हुआ तो ये अपने आप कहते हैं कि ये खत्म हो गया। नॉन एलाइनमेंट पालिसी को खत्म होने की विफलता विदेश नीति की विफलता मानते हैं। अलवी साहब बता रहे थे कि सारे पड़ोसी मुल्कों की अलग-अलग गिनती की जाएगी।

बंगलादेश हमारी वजह से बना, लेकिन वह भी नाराज ही चल रहा है, क्या पालिसी इनकी है। नेपाल बगल में है, वह भी बहुत खुश नहीं है, वह माओवाद के चलते अपनी तबाही में पड़ा हुआ है और हम लोग कहीं उसे नहीं बचा पाते। हमारे मूल का आदमी जहां दुनिया भर में है, उसे भी संरक्षण हम नहीं दे पाते। हिन्दुस्तानी मूल का आदमी फिजी में राष्ट्रपति था, उसका अपहरण कर लिया, बंधक बना लिया और हम कुछ नहीं कर सके। इस मुल्क के किसी आदमी को भी हम नहीं देख पाते, इसलिए हम सभी मानते हैं कि यह विफलता है।

भगवान बुद्ध का मशहूर भिक्षापात्र था, जो वैशाली के लोगों को भगवान बुद्ध ने केसरिया में दिया था। जब भगवान बुद्ध ने वैशाली में भाग लिया कि हमारा महानिर्वाण तीन महीने बाद होगा तो वैशाली के लोग उनका साथ छोड़ नहीं रहे थे, केसरिया तक 20-30 किलोमीटर तक चले गये तो अन्त में भगवान बुद्ध ने वैशाली के लोगों को अपना भिक्षापात्र दे दिया। दूसरी शताब्दी में कनिक-2 उसे उठाकर पेशावर ले गया और वहां से अभी अफगानिस्तान के कंधार में वह रखा हुआ था। उस समय श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मेनन डिप्टी मिनिस्टर और हक्सर साहब अफगानिस्तान के एम्बेस्डर थे और श्रीधर वासुदेव सोनी एक्स चीफ सैक्रेटरी थे, उन्होंने लेख में लिखा कि भगवान बुद्ध का भिक्षापात्र वहां पर है। कनिंघम ने इतिहास के जमाने में देश में सब जगह खुदाई कराने का काम किया, उन्होंने भी लेख लिखा है, उसमें भी कहा गया है कि भगवान बुद्ध का भिक्षापात्र कंधार में है। हमने उल्लेख सहित माननीय विदेश मंत्री और माननीय राज्य मंत्री दोनों को लिखा है। श्रीधर वासुदेव सोनी का लेख और कनिंघम का भी लेख मिला है। हम आग्रह करते हैं कि कूटनीति का प्रयोग करके अपनी एम्बेसी को वहां खबर करके उसे अपने देश में लाया जाये। उसका फोटो भी आया है और सारा ऐतिहासिक सबूत है कि वह भगवान बुद्ध का मशहूर भिक्षापात्र कंधार में है, वह हिन्दुस्तान में लौटना चाहिए और वैशाली में लौटना चाहिए, जो कि 2600 वां पहले भगवान बुद्ध के द्वारा दिया गया था। हम देखते हैं कि इनकी कूटनीति क्या काम कर रही है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपको दस मिनट दिये गये थे, अब समाप्त करिये।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : अन्त में, विदेश व्यापार के लिए डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. हुआ कि सामान की फ्री आवाजाही होगी, एक देश से दूसरे देश में सामानों की बिक्री होगी। हम आग्रह करते हैं कि आज सामान की आवाजाही हो रही है तो आदमियों की, इंसान की भी आवाजाही फ्री हो, आप पासपोर्ट प्रथा खत्म करवाइये, तब विदेश नीति की हम सफलता मानेंगे। जब पासपोर्ट प्रथा खत्म होगी तो हिन्दुस्तान के लोग दुनिया भर में फैलकर गरीबी और गैरबराबरी सब खत्म कर देंगे। इसके लिए पासपोर्ट प्रथा खत्म हो और डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में जैसे सामान की आवाजाही में फ्रीडम है, उसी तरह से आदमी भी एक देश से दूसरे देश में फ्री होकर आये जाये, विश्व पंचायत और विश्व संसद की स्थापना हो, उस तरफ हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय को काम करना चाहिए।

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत (अजमेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सरकार द्वारा प्रस्तुत विदेश मंत्रालय की अनुदान मांगों का पुरजोर समर्थन करता हूं। मैं आपकी आज्ञा से कहना चाहूंगा कि वास्तव में किसी भी देश की विदेश नीति का आधार उस देश के राष्ट्रीय हित होते हैं।

वर्तमान परिस्थितियों में कांग्रेस के मित्र अपनी पुरानी नीतियों की दुहाई दे रहे थे। मैं आपके माध्यम से उनसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि 1949 के अन्दर तिब्बत को तस्तीरी में रखकर चीन को किसने सौंपा था? 1949-50 में नेहरू जी ने सौंपा था। कश्मीर की समस्या जो आज तक हमारे लिए सिरदर्द बनी हुई है, अगर नेहरू जी का आदर्शवाद उस समस्या को अपने तक सीमित नहीं रखकर सरदार पटेल को सौंप देता तो शायद उस समस्या का हल हो जाता। लेकिन कश्मीर की वह समस्या आज तक हमारे देश के लिए सिरदर्द बनी हुई है। कारगिल-कारगिल आप बार-बार कहते हैं और फौजों की आर-पार की लड़ाई की बात अभी भाटिया जी और दूसरे माननीय सदस्य कह रहे थे। मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूं कि आखिर 1948 में हिन्दुस्तान की सेनाएं पाकिस्तानी कबायलियों को खदेड़ते हुए सारे कश्मीर के हिस्से को खाली कराते हुए पाकिस्तान की ओर खदेड़े जा रहे थे। हमारी सेनाएं तिरंगा ध्वज फहराते हुए विजयश्री को प्राप्त करती जा रही थी।

ऐसे समय में यू.एन.ओ. के अंदर शिकायत करने पर यू.एन.ओ. ने कहा कि सीज फायर यानी लड़ाई रोको। उस समय जनमत संग्रह की बात कहने वाले पंडित नेहरू जी थे जिनके नाम की बार-बार दुहाई दी जा रही है। यहां गुटनिरपेक्षता का नाम लिया जा रहा है। इसे कौन नहीं जानता। दुनिया का इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है। गुटनिरपेक्षता के तीन नेता थे—कर्नल मार्शल जोसफ टीटो, आज यूगोस्लाविया की क्या स्थिति हो गयी है, ? कर्नल नासिर, 3आजाज वह मिश्र कहां है। है ? सुखदेव गणराज्य नाम का देश बन गया, वह मिश्र कहां

है ? नेहरू जी NAM के नेता थे, 1962 में उन्होंने कहा कि मैं सपनों की दुनिया में रहता था। जब चीन ने हमारे ऊपर हमला किया तब (व्यवधान)हिमालय की सीमाओं से चढ़कर चीनी सेनाएं आ गईं। उन्होंने कहा कि मैं सपनों की दुनिया में रहता था तब (व्यवधान)हिन्दी चीनी भाई-भाई का जो नारा था, वह मिट्टी में मिल गया। आखिर इसके लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है ? (व्यवधान)कश्मीर का 2/5 हिस्सा 1948 में पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में चला गया। (व्यवधान)इसके बाद लद्दाख का अक्सईचिन हिस्सा, आज भी 14400 वर्ग मील का हिस्सा चीन के कब्जे में है। आखिर 1947-48 से लेकर 1964 तक हमारे देश की विदेश नीति के सूत्रधार पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू थे। उसके बाद भी कहा जाता है कि श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी, राजीव गांधी। (व्यवधान)उस समय दुनिया दो ब्लाक्स में बंटी हुई थी। (व्यवधान)दो गुटों में बंटी हुई थी। (व्यवधान)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (LATUR): We object to these kinds of statements being made here. If these kinds of statements were made, we would be entitled to rebut these statements. ...*(Interruptions)*

श्री पवन कुमार बंसल : आप उस वक्त कहां थे। (व्यवधान)

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत : मैं हिस्ट्री की बात कह रहा हूं। (व्यवधान)दुनिया दो गुटों में बंटी हुई थी। (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप प्रधान मंत्री जी कहकर बोल सकते हैं। किसी इंडीविजुअल व्यक्ति का नाम लेकर आप न बोलें।

...(व्यवधान)

श्री पवन कुमार बंसल : श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने 1942 में क्या किया था ? â€(व्यवधान)

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका संरक्षण चाहता हूँ। â€(व्यवधान)

श्री पवन कुमार बंसल : 1942 में क्या हुआ था ? श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने क्या किया था। â€(व्यवधान)

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत : नीतियों का दुपरिणाम आज तक हमारे देश को भुगतना पड़ रहा है। â€(व्यवधान)

श्री पवन कुमार बंसल : 1942 में श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी जो आज के प्रधान मंत्री हैं, उन्होंने माफी मांगी थी क्योंकि उन्होंने किसी के खिलाफ गवाही दी थी। â€(व्यवधान)

श्री विजयेन्द्र पाल सिंह बदनोर : कोई जमीन तो नहीं दी थी। â€(व्यवधान)

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत : उस समय दुनिया दो हिस्सों में बंटी हुई थी। एक तरफ साम्यवादी राट्र थे और दूसरी तरफ अमरीका था। â€(व्यवधान) एक गुट अमरीका था। â€(व्यवधान) सच्चाई को स्वीकार करना चाहिए। â€(व्यवधान)

श्री पवन कुमार बंसल : श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने माफी मांगी थी। â€(व्यवधान) आप जाकर पूछिये। â€(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप भाण देते समय किसी का नाम न लेकर पालिसी पर बोलिये। फार्मर प्राइम मिनिस्टर की पालिसी पर बोलने में कोई गलती नहीं है।

...(व्यवधान)

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आने वाले जो इतिहासकार हैं, जब वे निपक्ष रूप से कलम उठायेंगे और इस देश का इतिहास लिखेंगे कि आदर्शवाद के नाम पर देश को रसातल में धकेलने वाला कौन है। आज आदर्शवाद की दुनिया नहीं रही। आज हकीकत और अपनी हैसियत को देखकर हमें अपनी विदेश नीति का निर्धारण करना होगा। श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के नेतृत्व में एन.डी.ए. सरकार जिस नीति का अनुसरण कर रही है, वह भारत की हैसियत और दुनिया की हकीकत को देखकर उस विदेश नीति का अनुपालन कर रहे हैं। केवल पुराने गीत गाते जाओ और वर्तमान की स्थिति से आंख मोड़ लो, यह शत्रुमुर्ग की नीति का ही परिणाम है। जब रेगिस्तान में कोई विपत्ति आती है तो शत्रुमुर्ग रेत में मुंह छुपा लेता है और समझता है कि अब मुझे कोई नहीं देख रहा ठीक उसी प्रकार से इनकी स्थिति है।

मैं आपके माध्यम से चाणक्य का एक कथन उद्धरण करना चाहूंगा। कौटिल्य ने कहा-

"अपनी मर्यादाओं का ज्ञान होना, दूसरे राज्यों की परम्परा का आदर करना, अति दुस्साहस में गलत बात न करना, शब्दों के व्यवहार में उतनी सजगता बरतना जितनी सजगता से प्रहरी रक्षा करता है और अपनी नीतियों के प्रति पूर्ण प्रतिबद्धता, ये विाम से विाम स्थिति में दूसरे राज्यों में एक कुशल नीतिज्ञ की सहायक होती है।"

यह कौटिल्य का कथन कितना सटीक है। पिछले दिनों इराक का प्रस्ताव पास हो रहा था, वह कंडमनेशन और डिप्लोमेशन दो शब्द थे। शब्दों के लिए कौटिल्य ने हजारों वां पहले इस बात को कह दिया कि शब्द का इतनी सजगता के साथ प्रयोग करना चाहिए जैसे प्रहरी सजगता के साथ पहरा देकर रक्षा करता है।

इसलिए अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के नेतृत्व में, एन.डी.ए. की सरकार जिस राष्ट्रीय नीति का अनुसरण कर रही है, वह राट्र के हित में है। पहले दुनिया दो हिस्सों में बंटी हुई थी - एक का नेता रूस था, दूसरे का नेता अमरीका था। हम अमरीका का विरोध करने के नाम पर कभी रूस की तरफ झुक जाते थे। लेकिन आज रूस की जगह ग्यारह गणतंत्र खड़े हो गए हैं, सोवियत रूस USSR टूट गया है और रूस को आर्थिक हितों के लिए स्वयं अमरीका की ओर मुखातिब होकर देखना पड़ रहा है। दुनिया में ऐसी एक ताकतवर शक्ति अमरीका रह गई है। हम मानते हैं ---

बहादुर कब किसी का आसरा ऐहसान लेते हैं

उसी को कर गुजरते हैं जो दिल में ठान लेते हैं

दिलबर मर्द का लोहा सब मान लेते हैं

जो कमजोर होता है

कान उसके सब पकड़ लेते हैं।

इसलिए हमें राष्ट्रीय शक्ति अंदर से पैदा करनी पड़ेगी और आर्थिक सम्पन्नता, अगर घर मजबूत होगा तो हमारी विदेश नीति भी मजबूत होगी। आर्थिक सम्पन्नता होगी तो हमारी विदेश नीति भी मजबूत और प्रभावी होगी। आज एक अरब की आबादी वाला हमारा देश दुनिया की बहुत बड़ी ताकत बन सकता है, उसमें इस प्रकार की संभावयता है।

पिछले दिनों अमरीका के अंदर दो प्रकार के सर्वेक्षण हुए थे। उनका निर्का यह निकला कि अमरीका के अंदर भारत को चाहने वाले, भारत के प्रति मित्रता का भाव रखने वाले, भारत के प्रति सहयोग का हाथ बढ़ाने वाले लोगों के प्रतिशत में वृद्धि हुई है। अभी समय नहीं है कि मैं सारे सर्वेक्षण का निर्का आपके सामने रखूँ। राजनैतिक निर्का, राजनैतिक भवियवाणी उन्होंने उसके आधार पर की। इसलिए आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम दुनिया की हकीकत को समझकर, अपने हितों को जानकर, चाहे अमरीका हो चाहे रशिया हो, चाहे दुनिया के और देश हों, कौन नहीं जानता इराक में मित्र देशों की ऐलायंस सेना जीत गई है और उसके बाद रशिया, जर्मनी और फ्रांस, जो पहले विरोध कर रहे थे, वे भी अब स्वर में स्वर मिलाकर इराक के पुनर्निर्माण की बात कर रहे हैं। अगर हम भी इराक के पुनर्निर्माण में अपनी हिस्सेदारी की बात करते हैं, भारतीय हितों की बात करते हैं तो इसमें तनिक मात्र स्वार्थ की बात नहीं होगी। इराक हमारा मित्र रहा है लेकिन कौन नहीं जानता कि इराक के ऊपर जब संकट आया, उसके पड़ोसी सीरिया, लेबनान भी उसकी सहायता के लिए नहीं आए, सऊदी अरब भी उसकी सहायता के लिए नहीं आया। दुनिया का कोई मुल्क ऐसा नहीं था जो उसके साथ आया हो। केवल आदर्शवाद के नाम पर हिन्दुस्तान को कहते हैं, यह करो, वह करो। दुनिया की हकीकत से हम आंख नहीं मूंद सकते, हमें सच्चाई को स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा।

मैं इस संदर्भ में एक और कोटेशन आपके माध्यम से प्रस्तुत करना चाहूंगा, जिसमें कहा गया है - नेहरू युग के आदर्शवाद का बोझ उठाने की क्षमता अब भारत की नहीं है, शीत युद्ध का जमाना गया। जब अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समुदाय इसको कुछ हद तक झेल गया, कारण स्पष्ट था। उस समय राष्ट्र संघ में भारत का वोट उस ब्लाक को चाहिए था लेकिन अब आर्थिक हितों के उमर सारी दुनिया का नजरिया बदल रहा है। जो आर्थिक दृष्टि से मजबूत हैं, वही डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के माध्यम से या दुनिया के अंदर बाजार ढूँढ कर अपनी शक्ति को बढ़ा सकते हैं। इसलिए अपनी हैसियत और हकीकत को देखकर कार्य करना चाहिए।

अभी अमरीका के राजदूत ने त्यागपत्र दिया। यह ठीक है कि हमें अपनी शक्ति पर भरोसा करना चाहिए। हम न अमरीका की तरफ ताकना चाहते हैं, न दुनिया की किसी और ताकत की ओर ताकना चाहते हैं। वीर भोग्या वसुन्धरा। हमारे यहां पंजाबी में एक कहावत है - दुनिया मनदी जोरां नूं, लख लानत है कमजोरां नूं। आज हमारे अंदर इतनी पोटेंशिएलिटी है। सब प्रकार की पैदावार वाला देश, सब प्रकार की क्षमताओं वाला देश, सब प्रकार की जलवायु वाला देश, महान् सेनाओं, जिनका महान्, गौरवपूर्ण इतिहास रहा है, ऐसा यह देश दुनिया कि किसी देश का गुलाम नहीं बन सकता, दुनिया के किसी भी देश का पिछलगू नहीं बन सकता। भारतीय जनता पार्टी या एन.डी.ए. सरकार इसी नीति में विश्वास करती है कि हमारा राष्ट्र आर्थिक दृष्टि से सम्पन्न बने, स्वयं शक्ति वाला देश बने, एकता हमारी शक्ति हो ताकि दुनिया के अंदर हमारी शक्ति को लोग मानें।

एक और बात कहना चाहता हूँ। हमारे पड़ोसी देश भारत को बड़ा भाई समझकर पता नहीं क्यों डरते रहते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें दीर्घकालिक नीति का परिचय देना चाहिए और न पड़ोसी देशों के साथ ऐसी समरस स्थिति, बड़े और छोटे का भेदभाव भूलकर, उनकी तरफ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाना चाहिए। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कश्मीर जाकर दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाने और दिल्ली के दरवाजे खुले रखने तथा दिल के दरवाजे भी खोलने की बात कही है।

वह राष्ट्र के हित की दृष्टि से सर्वथा उचित है। हालांकि उन्होंने यह कहा है कि पाकिस्तान को जो सीमापार का आतंकवाद है, जो क्रॉस बॉर्डर टैरेरिज्म है, उसे रोकना पड़ेगा। पाकिस्तान के लोगों का भी स्टेटमेंट आया है। हमने पाकिस्तान के साथ तीन-तीन बार युद्ध किए हैं और अब अगर युद्ध होगा तो पाकिस्तान को मुंह की खानी पड़ेगी और हिन्दुस्तान का वर्चस्व फिर बढ़ेगा।

अंत में कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम लोग शक्तिशाली होंगे, स्वावलम्बी होंगे, सब प्रकार से आत्म-वशीभूत होंगे तो दुनिया के अंदर हम अपना वर्चस्व स्थापित कर सकते हैं। आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए समय दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपके प्रति आभार व्यक्त करता हूँ।

SHRI AJOY CHAKRABORTY (BASIRHAT): Sir, after 200 years of freedom struggle, we got Independence from the British imperialism. After Independence, the then Government under the leadership of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru decided the foreign policy of our country. It was a policy of non-alignment. That policy was approved and supported by the entire nation. That policy was decided with consensus and it was approved by the countrymen also.

Sir, our Communist Party of India had huge differences with the Congress Party and we did fight against the misrule of the Congress Party not only at the Centre but in the States also. We have suffered irreparable loss. So many comrades of ours were put in jail. They sacrificed their lives while fighting against the misrule of the Congress Party. In spite of that, we wholeheartedly supported the foreign policy of the then Government. We wholeheartedly cooperated with the then Government as far as foreign policy was concerned.

Sir, our traditional, glorious, and age-old foreign policy was maintained up to the time of the United Front Government. But since the BJP Government has come into power, there is a shift in that glorious and age-old foreign policy.

I fully agree with Shri Bhatia that our foreign policy is being decided as per the dictats of Washington. The former President of the USA, Mr. Bill Clinton, while addressing the Joint Session, said that India is their natural ally. I quite sharply differ from his version. If India is a natural ally of the USA, why do the USA not refrain Pakistan from indulging in cross-border terrorism? Pakistan wants to destabilise our country right from Jammu and Kashmir to North-Eastern States. With this mischievous design, they are continuing with the anti-Indian activities at the behest of the USA. They are doing all this mischief against our nation and our motherland with direct or indirect support of the USA. The American President, their leaders come to India and have discussions with our Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs. After that they go to Pakistan and sitting with Mr. Nawaj Sharief and Mr. Parvez Musharraf, they are sponsoring many things there. They are rendering full assistance, cooperation, and financial assistance to Pakistan so that they can use their Armed Forces against India. Mr. Colin Powell told - everybody knows that - that after the Iraq issue, they will settle the issue of Jammu and Kashmir. Who is Mr. Colin Powell to settle this issue? We do not want any third party intervention. We can settle such issues through bilateral talks with Pakistan and other neighbouring countries.

The United States unilaterally, along with the support of its greatest sycophant Tony Blair, ignoring all public opinion, bypassing and neglecting the Security Council, attacked Iraq and unleashed a fatal assault on humanity, killing thousands and thousands of innocent children and women. I am sorry to say that at that point of time our hon. Prime Minister had said in this House that we would follow a middle path. What is a middle path? Either one is in favour of war, or one is against war. I would like to take this opportunity to remind the hon. Members of this august House that whenever the world had been in the throes of a deep crisis, in the olden days, our former Prime Ministers Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru and the late Indira Gandhi gave the leadership. I would like to recall that when France and England took the plea of Suez Canal to attack Egypt, the then Prime Minister of India Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru took a bold step against this attack. Whenever the world has been in the throes of a deep crisis, our former Prime Ministers, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru and the late Indira Gandhi took a bold stand and the entire nation was behind them. But in the present days, I am sorry to say that our present Government has failed to take a bold stand against the United States of America. The 'Might is right' principle is being pursued by them. They are the big brothers of the world. They already have attacked Iraq and are now targeting Iran and Syria. They would do

anything as per their wish.

Sir, ours is a great country. It is a country of more than 100 crore people. I would like to urge upon the hon. Minister for External Affairs that this Government should take a bold stand so that an appropriate message goes to the world. Our great country has always supported the cause of the smaller countries who have been fighting for their independence, who have been fighting against imperialism and colonialism. This has been the glorious tradition of our country. But now this Government seems to be shifting from such a tradition.

Sir, through you, I would like to humbly submit and urge the Government of India to fight for its self-respect. That is the desire of more than 100 crore people of this country. The Government must take a bold step and should fight against imperialism. The whole country would stand behind the Government in this cause, otherwise we would fight the policies of this Government not only in this House but also outside this House for the prestige and honour of this great country.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Sir, how much time do I have?

MR. SPEAKER: It would be good if you could complete within 15 minutes.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Sir, I would like to divide my speech in three parts. The first part would relate to the practical aspects. The second part may relate to the policy aspects and the third part may relate to the principles that we have been following with respect to India's foreign policy.

Sir, in my opinion, the Ministry of External Affairs needs more funds. The funds that are available to this Ministry are not sufficient. Fortunately, the present External Affairs Minister was the Finance Minister and probably he might have refused to give more funds to this Ministry when he was the Finance Minister because they say that the Ministers may change but the Ministries do not change. But he has an idea as to how the necessary funds could be made available and probably he would use that experience to see that the activities of the Ministry of External Affairs are funded with the amounts that are really required.

We had the opportunity of visiting some of the Indian Embassies in other countries. We found that they were better equipped than the offices of the Government of India are equipped in India. But, if they were compared with the offices of other countries, there was a lot of difference between the standard being maintained in the Embassies of those countries and that of the Indian Embassies over there. In order to see that our Ambassadors and other officers in foreign countries are on par with the Ambassadors and officers of other countries, it is necessary that our offices should be modernised. They should have all the equipments which are available to other Embassies today in the modern world. Otherwise, it becomes very difficult for them to cope with situations that become prevalent in other countries and their efficiency would not remain as good as the efficiency of the officers of other countries. I do not have to say anything more than this on this point.

The foreign policy of the Government of India is the foreign policy of India itself. It is not the foreign policy of a Party. It becomes the foreign policy of the nation only when there is a consensus at least in the House and at least on some points. The Governments, the Prime Ministers and the Ministers in the past did try to create a sort of common understanding on the foreign policy of India. But, sometimes intemperate statements are made by certain persons. Fortunately, that has not been the case with the Governments and the Members of the Council of Ministers. But intemperate statements are made by the people without understanding the nuances involved in the foreign policy at different levels and some sort of unnecessary bitterness is generated. It would be in the interest of the country to avoid such situations.

I have been listening to the speeches made by the hon. Members in this House. One point which has been made by more than one Member in this House is that unless India is economically strong, India's foreign policy cannot be effective. That is what probably those Members had tried to say. I had the opportunity of hearing this kind of statement having been made at one time by the Members sitting on the other side and the Members sitting on this side getting up and saying that when India became independent, the economic situation of India was not better than what it is today and yet what was said at that time by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and later by other Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers was heard with rapt attention by the world, in spite of the fact that India was not as strong economically as it is today. Why did that happen? That did happen because those who were making the foreign policy had understood the world history, the world politics, the world economics and what was happening throughout the world. They had applied their mind to different difficult issues which were prevailing at that time in the world. That is why they were very clear in their minds as to what should be done, what should not be done; what should be said and what should not be said; and how it should be said. On all these points they were crystal clear in their minds and that is how that really gave us this standing.

Fortunately for us, the Governments and the people who have been in the Governments have been doing that. But, at times we do find that some mistakes are committed. The problems are not clearly understood and sometimes we

are vague in our minds. That is why when we make the statement on behalf of the Government or on behalf of the Parliament or on behalf of other persons or on behalf of a Party, difficulties are created.

What is important for our foreign policy to be successful is the clarity of ideas, clarity about the issues involved, clarity about the principles involved and clarity about pragmatism also. People have been saying that we shall have to protect the interests of our country. Who says that we do not have to protect the interests of our country? Who can object to this idea? They have been saying that we have principles. Yes. Unless our policy is based on certain principles, it is not going to last for a time which is required for it to be successful.

Principles are important but, at the same time, in our life and our foreign policy also, principles of pragmatism are also used and we shall have to be pragmatic. There is no doubt about it. We are not saying that the Government should not be pragmatic or the people sitting in the Opposition should not be pragmatic. They have to be pragmatic in life as well as in the governance of the country. In foreign policy also, they have to be pragmatic. But pragmatism should not be treated as opportunism. Pragmatism should not be a confusion or pragmatism should not be something which cannot be in tune with the principles that we have accepted. And if it comes down to the level of opportunism or ignorance or not understanding clearly the situations that pragmatic policy cannot also be helpful. In some cases, this has happened and I will refer to that later on.

Having spoken on the general principles, I would like to refer to our relations with some of the countries. Pakistan is our neighbour. We have been saying that we would like to have good relations with Pakistan. But, unfortunately, relations between the two countries have not been comfortable. On the contrary, relations have been very troublesome and difficult for both the countries.

What do we do about it? One of the ideas which is put forth is, let us talk with them. We have no quarrel with this idea. If the Government wants to talk, if the country wants to talk with the Government of Pakistan and with the people of Pakistan, we have no difficulty. We support this kind of an approach. On the contrary, we have been saying that one method of at least trying to solve this issue is to talk to them. We have no quarrel about it. But there should be a finesse in talking to them.

I have full respect for our Prime Minister. What did he do? When he went to Pakistan last time sitting in the bus, probably, he had in his mind that he should cover an extra mile to show that he was very keen to talk to them. His intention was that nobody should have any doubt about it. But practically speaking, that was not clearly understood by Pakistan and immediately after he came back, we had the Kargil war. So, going and talking with them without preparation - preparations at all levels, preparations at the officers level, preparations at the Secretaries level, preparations at the level of Foreign Ministers - will not yield results. And Prime Minister talking to the Prime Ministers of other countries would have been better if the talks had taken place after necessary preparations for it was done.. So, we are saying please talk to them but talk to them with preparation, talk to them with clarity in mind and if you do not do that, the talks will not produce any results.

What is the other extreme? I do not know under what circumstances the Foreign Minister made the statement. I have not heard his statement. I have not read his statement. He is a very mature politician and a Minister. He would not make a statement off the cuff unless somebody was asking him to make a statement. Is the situation in Pakistan not like the situation in Iraq where pre-emptive action could be taken? Something of this kind may have been asked by somebody and probably, he said, "Yes, the situation is, probably such that pre-emptive action could be taken." And he is in a position to explain to us about it. I am not finding fault with him.

I have privately said these things. Now, I am saying this on the floor of the House. But there are people who are trying to extract something from the Minister and something from the Members and present it in a wrong fashion. Unnecessarily the discussion goes on in the country and outside also and on such alleged statements sometimes difficulties arise. Then, some people had to say that the situation is not like that and this should not be done by this country and that should not be done. What I am trying to say is that certainly the Foreign Minister is not a person who would make a statement like that. But no one else or the Foreign Minister should make a statement like this.

Pre-emptive action is not in the jurisdiction of the Foreign Minister; it is in the jurisdiction of the Defence Minister. If at all anybody has to speak about it, it should be either the Defence Minister or the Prime Minister. The Foreign Minister would be talking about peace, good relations and friendship, which he has been doing and we support him on that. If by mistake or because somebody has asked it and he has said it, the only request that we would like to make is that let us try to avoid it and let us try to be more careful.

Vigilance is the crux of the matter. If we have to deal with our neighbour, Pakistan, we need vigilance. We need vigilance to see that there is no terrorism. If we want to have good relations with them, we need preparation and vigilance. If we want to be effective in other ways also, vigilance is the crux. That should be our policy. Let us talk to them. Let us talk to the Government and talk to the people. Let us avail of the opportunities which are available and understand the realities. At the same time, have alternate plans in your mind to deal with that country in a manner

which will establish peace and prosperity for both the countries and avoid war and terrorism.

Bangladesh, Nepal, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Maldives are our other neighbours. Fortunately, for us we have good relations with Sri Lanka. I think the relations are free from any difficulties. Even if there are some small difficulties, the Government is in a position to solve them. But as far as our relations with Bangladesh, Nepal and Myanmar are concerned, we have a feeling that there is scope for doing better. If statements with respect to Bhutan are made, which may not be liked by the people or the Government over there, that would not be in the interest of India and Bhutan. We read some statements in the newspapers with respect to the terrorist activities, camps, etc. Even if the statements have to be made, they can be made in a language which will not create any bad blood between a country like Bhutan and ours.

Nepal is facing some difficulties. We should help them to the extent we can. Probably the Government has been doing it. Maldives is a good country. People from this country go there and people from there come to our country. But with regard to Bangladesh, I have a feeling that relations in the last two or three years have not been as good as they were before that period. Maybe it is because of the change of the Government in that country or maybe because of certain other things also. But that is a country with which we should have better relations.

The most important thing with respect to our immediate neighbours is the institution of SAARC. The institution of SAARC was created to provide a forum to the Heads of the States and to the Heads of the Governments to come together occasionally and discuss political, economic, social, cultural, scientific, trading and industrial relationship. I think, SAARC was created with great expectations. SAARC did work for some time properly. But later on it was found that SAARC has not been that effective and the strength of SAARC is appearing to be getting reduced. Can we do something to see that SAARC is strengthened?

Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar is present here. When we were going to Nepal once to create a SAARC Union of Parliaments, he did ask at that time, 'Why not create a SAARC Parliament?' I said that this is a good idea. European Parliament is there. If we can create SAARC Parliament, it would be good. But I do not think that immediately it is going to happen. The idea is good. Let it be discussed.

If it is possible and acceptable to all the countries, we can move in that direction. Apart from creating the SAARC Parliament, SAARC itself has to be strengthened. The trade relations between SAARC countries, SAFTA and other things have to be strengthened and a lot has to be done for this purpose.

Having said this about our immediate neighbours, I would like to say something about the Non-Aligned Movement now. Non-Aligned Movement is something which brought the countries of the world together and provided them an opportunity to discuss political, economic, social and cultural matters and it went from strength to strength. It became one of the biggest organisations in the world and those who did not like the Non-Aligned Movement had started criticising it and slowly we have come to a stage when some people in our country and in the Parliament also have had the audacity to stand up and say that the Non-Aligned Movement is irrelevant. They say that when there are no blocs, why should there be a Non-Aligned Movement? I do not think that Non-Aligned Movement came into existence simply to fight two blocs. Politically it may not be that relevant, militarily it may not be that relevant, but there are economic, cultural and scientific issues and no forum would have been better than the forum of Non-Aligned Movement for strengthening relations between the countries in these fields. So it should be strengthened.

With regard to Arab countries, I think a situation has developed in the world in such a manner now that we shall have to be a little more careful and sympathetic and the good relationship that we have with them has to be maintained and improved upon.

As far as the European countries are concerned, UK is a country with which we can have better relations. But France and Germany are the two countries which are taking an independent stand in international affairs. We do not have to take sides in international affairs, but strengthening of our relationship with France, Germany and the United Kingdom will always be very useful.

The European Union is becoming stronger and stronger and I think the European Union has a future also. Apart from having good relations with the European countries like France, Germany and the United Kingdom, we should have good relations with the European Union also.

Russia is a country which stood by India in times of need. Russia has always stood with India in many difficult situations. The friendship with Russia, fortunately, is continuing. If possible, we should put in more efforts to see that our friendship with Russia is further strengthened. With regard to our friendship with them, in Russia, generally they say: "do not take the friendship for granted". So, we shall have to put in more efforts to maintain our friendship with Russia, and when efforts are not made, the friendship can become weak. This point has to be kept in mind by us.

China is one of the countries about which we shall have to think a lot. I am very sorry to say that from our country

statements have been made that China is our enemy number one. Anybody who understands the issues relating to defence would not say this. We do not want to create many fronts, a front on the North, a front on the West etc. Wars have been lost when the countries had to fight on many fronts. Apart from this, China is an ancient country which has the Eastern culture. It has similarities with the culture in India. The Laos philosophy and the Buddhist philosophy have been identical. Culturally also, there are many similarities between China and India and Panditji specially put in extra efforts to see that there is friendship with China. Unfortunately, something happened in between. We shall have to overcome that and we shall have to see that a country like China remains a friend of ours.

As far as USA is concerned, it is a big country. It is a great power and today it is the mightiest country in the world. That is why we would like to be friendly with USA. Nothing has to be said and nothing has to be done which will create difficulties in the matter of relationship between India and USA. It would also understand the importance of this friendship.

If we are strong enough, if we are clear enough, if we are sympathetic enough with that country also and with its policy, they will also respect our friendship. This relationship with the United States of America is going to be a difficult relationship requiring lot of skill and vision. We shall have to deal with it in a proper manner with a view to have the friendship strengthened. We may not agree with all that they have been doing.

Take the issue of Iraq. I was very happy to hear one of the Members speaking about Iraq. Iraq has happened. On that point, there have been differences of opinion in America, in the UK, in India, in the Parliament, maybe in the Government also, and yet that has happened. After that, we shall have to see that the people in Iraq are supported. But I hate to think of the idea of earning something for India out of the difficulties suffered by Iraq. Somehow or the other, it does not fit in the principles which India has been following. We would rather like to help them. We would like to give them the money to help them and not to earn something out of their difficulties. That kind of idea is abhorrent to us. I would not like to subscribe to that kind of idea. I am sure that the Government also is of that view.

Lastly, I would like to make one point and sit down. Let us formulate a policy, which is really in the interest of the country. Let us formulate a policy which is pragmatic also and not opportunistic. But at the same time, let us follow the principles. They really can help our policy and I have no doubt in my mind that this Parliament, this country and the leaders in the country have done that and they will continue to do that.

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (AKOLA): Thank you Sir. Before I begin, I would like to say a few things about what has happened in the House. I was discussing this with my hon. colleague Shri Shivraj Patil also. Many Members, while speaking on the subject of External Affairs, have referred to the issue of Jammu & Kashmir also and they have questioned whether the Government of India has a policy as far as Jammu & Kashmir is concerned.

The Government of India does not have any policy for any other State and I take it for granted that all hon. Members of the House will refer to Jammu & Kashmir as an integral part of India and not as a separate State because we have a foreign policy and we consider it only if it is a separate country. Otherwise, it is a part of a State and that part of the State has become an issue of Defence. It does not become an issue of External Affairs. This Parliament has been part of the process of internationalising the Kashmir issue. With these words, I will just say a few words on which the hon. Minister is going to reply.

We want to develop relations with the USA. We have begun late and we have been relying very heavily on the American people and the Government to support for the cause of terrorism. But I have been reading quite a lot and I have been visiting European countries, especially, Geneva, whenever there is a meeting of the United Nations on Social Issues, where I happen to meet many of the European representatives right from the Governments to the NGOs. One of the major issues which has been of concern not only to the American people, but even to the Europeans is that they are having an insecurity among themselves that in the coming years they will be ruled by others. This is one of the concerns and one part of that concern is the drug industry which is one of the nexus which starts from Afghanistan to Pakistan through India and it goes to the Western world.

Terrorism cannot be a ground where we build up friendship.

I would like to know this from the Minister himself. It is because he is going to reply. I know, this basically concerns the Home Ministry. But, is he going to take up with the Government of India and with the Home Ministry the question of drugs, the routes that are there in this country? If you want the Governments of European countries, if you want the Government of the American people to support us in our cause, one of the anxieties which they are having is that the younger generations are being finished off by this drug industry, and that is one of the major

concerns. Is the Government of India going to make that as an issue of friendship? If it is going to make it so, I will welcome it.

The other issue which I would like to raise is the aftermath of Iraq. As many Members have spoken on that, I am not going to speak on that. It is not the first time that the United Nations has been by-passed; it has been by-passed in the past also but when it was by-passed, it was a bi-polar world. Even though the United Nations was by-passed, it was balanced by the two super-powers; but now when it has been by-passed, there is a uni-polar system. There are two institutions which are more important. I would like the Minister to be very categorical and to take the House into confidence. It is because we are not able to analyse as to what is going to happen in respect of the future of the United Nations and the future of the NATO. If anybody had heard the discussions which are going on in the European channels, the crack has developed. It is because of communism that Europe got united and formed the NATO. But, communism is no longer a threat to the world. Therefore, due to in-built cracks in the civilization, the NATO started cracking up. The nexus or the new friendship that is being developed by France and by Germany is now interacting at different levels. We would like to know from the Minister what is going to be the situation of NATO on this issue.

Thirdly, we would like to know what is going to be the future of the United Nations. What is going to be its role? Is its role going to be only of a recommendatory body? Or, is it going to be of an opinion of the world? That is what we would like to know.

There are two issues which are more important to me. I would like the Minister to clarify them. Somewhere in the month of November-December – I would mention some names and I would like the Members not to react on it because it is a fact which has happened – the FBI has raided some of the donors who are staying in the USA, and those who have been donors of RSS. I would like the Minister to clarify whether this is a fact. One of the reasons why they have done it is that even RSS is a religious terrorist organisation and they will not tolerate any religious terrorist organisation in this. If that is the case, what is going to be your relation? It is because you represent a section of that institution in the Government itself.

Lastly, we are relying very heavily on USA to control Pakistan. This House should know one of the most important things - I am studying it for quite a long time, I would not like to mention it myself but I would like to ask the Government – that between the period 1950 and 1960, the Americans were, no doubt, interested in this area. I am saying not of financial investment but of Defence investment. What kind of defence investment has been made in Pakistan by the United States during 1950 and 1960? That is one of the most important things. It is because when we had offered all things to the American people, the American Government turned us down; they went towards Pakistan. Even in the case of Agra Summit, let me say - and if anybody goes through my speech, after that what has happened, I have very clearly pointed out - that Pakistan was on the verge of being declared internationally bankrupt State.

19.00 hrs.

Sir, G-7 and G-5 countries have disagreed for their loans being refinanced or being extended. Had not the 11th September incident taken place, in the month of October, Pakistan would have been declared as a debt State and all kinds of sanctions would have been imposed on them.

Sir, the situation has changed. The geo-political situation has changed. There is terrorism which has taken place. Some countries are interested in those areas which we represent. I am just asking you for this reference from 1950 to 1960. They should be placed on the Table of the House.

If this country is to survive, we will have to take a hard decision. We are coming to a stage where we have a bankruptcy of leadership at the national stage. If the country is to be saved, we will have to take a very hard decision in the coming days on the question of Pakistan. I would like the External Affairs Minister to be very specific on this issue.

SARDAR SIMRANJIT SINGH MANN (SANGRUR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak. I represent a Party of the minority, the Shiromani Akali Dal. I will be grateful if this House listens with patience as to what we, the minority, feel about the India's Foreign Policy.

Now, we have been heard in the forums of India's Foreign Policy, which is something very positive. But previously this Foreign Policy was shaped by some bureaucrats and politicians of the Indo-Gangetic basin. And with the changing fortunes of the present Government, I wonder whether in the future, this Foreign Policy will be decided by a few in the Tiber basin. I say this because we, the Sikhs, live closer to the belts where the Foreign Policy of India is formulated. We live next to Pakistan, next to Afghanistan, and next to China. All these three States have a major role in formulating the India's Foreign Policy. Therefore, we do need to be heard and I am glad that this present Government is showing some keenness to listen to us. Therefore, we welcome what the Prime Minister has said, a

thaw between relations with Pakistan and India.

Our Party is deeply interested in a thaw with Pakistan because we are the major people who are going to be affected if there is a nuclear holocaust in the sub continent. The Sikhs have a mighty interest in what happens in Pakistan because you would be surprised to learn that half of our *Gurdwaras* are in Pakistan, half of our culture is there, half of our tradition is there, and half of our history is over there. So, we have a vested interest in having good relations with Pakistan and we want a free flow of trade with Pakistan, commerce with Pakistan, exchange of goods, and tourism so that we have friendly relations. That is why, we do welcome this policy of the Prime Minister in Kashmir and here in New Delhi.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, we feel that since we have so much investment over there, *Samjhauta Express* should be revived and bus services should be started.

Our railway wagons should start rolling into Pakistan carrying our agricultural goods, especially our seed potatoes to Afghanistan. Wagha border must be opened for trade, commerce and tourism of the cultural, religious and personal kind. That is what we want.

Our Party has also learnt some lessons from the Iraq war. The first lesson is that the minorities should not be taken so lightly. They must be integrated into the system with wider democracy, with a wider role and with more hearing given to them, like we want representation in the Union Cabinet's Security Committee and in the Nuclear Command and Control System that India has built. We do not want to be treated like the Shiite Arabs and the Khurds. We want real democracy. We want India to follow the international guidelines on human rights practices. We want the international U.N. conventions of humanitarian laws to be recognised by the Indian State, such as, crime against genocide, crime against the heritage of the people. We want the Rome Protocol, whereby the International Criminal Court at The Hague has been established, to be recognised. These are some of the policies that we want India should implement.

Our lament is that we are living in a Rip Van Winkle syndrome of the Jawaharlal Nehru, Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi eras. We want to break out of this system. If the lessons from Iraq are to be learnt, we must realise and understand that, now with the superior air power, naval bases and land armies of the West, India can never become a first-class power, but we would become a first-class second-rate power. We should do the best as we can by building our economy and remaining in the middle path of foreign policy and the world power structure. The foreign office must study the Munroe doctrine and the policy of splendid isolation. So, the Shiromani Akali Dal (Amritsar) will strongly support any new changes in India's foreign policy. We want to say good-bye to the bad old days and enter into a new era.

श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले (मालेगांव) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे आपने इस विषय पर बोलने का समय दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूँ। हमारी अर्थ नीति पर परराष्ट्र नीति निर्भर करती है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि नेहरू जी से लेकर वाजपेयी साहब तक, किसी ने यह नहीं सोचा कि देश का अहित हो, सब सोचते थे कि देश का हित हो।

महोदय, मैं आदिम जाति का आदमी हूँ, मेरे पूर्वज बहुत पराक्रमी थे। वहाँ लोग राम का नाम लेते हैं और हनुमान जी भी उनके साथ हैं। आगरा में जो करार हुआ, शिवाजी महाराज के साथ औरंगजेब ने जो बर्ताव किया, लेकिन जिवा महाला की वजह से शिवाजी बच गए। महाराष्ट्र के उमाजी नाइक, भागोजी नाइक और खाजा नाइक जी हमारे पूर्वज थे।

झांसी की रानी के बारे में मेरे मित्र बता रहे थे कि वहाँ आदिम जाति की रानी ने मध्य प्रदेश में इतने जोरदार तरीके से अंग्रेजों का मुकाबला किया, लेकिन किसी के पास उसे लिखने के लिए स्याही नहीं मिली, यह थोड़ा दुर्दैव है, इसलिए मुझे आन्तरिक नीति का बहुत दुख होता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बाबा साहेब ने एक घटना लिखी और घटना के बारे में बोला कि 1947 में मंदिर और मस्जिद की जैसी स्थिति थी, वैसी ही रहनी जरूरी है, लेकिन छः दिसम्बर, 1992 को बाबरी मस्जिद गिरी, यह ठीक नहीं हुआ। इस बारे में बाबरी मस्जिद क्या है, यह कहना ठीक नहीं है। लेकिन बाबा साहेब की घटना का अवमान किया, यह ठीक नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपका समय समाप्त हुआ, आप बैठिये।

श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले : मेरा कहना है कि इस बारे में वि.सारे देश में फैलाया गया, किसी ने कहा गर्व से कहो हम हिन्दू हैं, किसी ने कहा गर्व से कहो हम मुसलमान हैं, इस तरह से आतंकवाद को बढ़ाने का काम आपने किया है। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि रा्ट्रनीति क्या होगी, कैसी होगी, इराक अमेरिका का क्या सम्बन्ध है, हमारा पाकिस्तान के साथ क्या सम्बन्ध है, इससे आगे बढ़कर भारत के जो आदमी हैं, ये सब एक साथ मिलकर रा्ट्र के हित में जननी जन्मभूमि स्वर्ग से महान है, यह हर तरफ से हर आदमी को बोलना चाहिए।

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN (CHIRAYINKIL): Sir, I am constrained to oppose this Demand for the following reasons.

The first is that it was recommended by the Standing Committee:

"The Committee therefore strongly recommends the Ministry to take concrete steps at least now to make

realistic budgetary projections in future taking into account all the inputs available with the Ministry and anticipated happenings in the financial year so as to avoid the huge unspent balance at the close of the year."

So, it is crystal clear that there is an unspent balance. If time were available, I would deal with other matters. Now, in the instant case, I may submit that we have several passport offices in the country. They are all functioning in rented buildings with no space even to sit there. People crowd there in hundreds and this would give rise to corruption in the office. Also, there is not sufficient staff in these offices. So, the poor man finds it very difficult to get a passport at the appropriate time. We cannot afford them any job but they may go elsewhere, to a foreign country, and get a job. There are about seventeen lakh Malayalis working in Gulf countries, by obtaining passports. They are earning foreign exchange also but there is inordinate delay even now in getting a passport even if they could easily obtain a visa. This is the situation available in the country. So, I would request the hon. Minister of External Affairs to take immediate steps to remedy the situation by providing more staff. In the Middle-East countries, there are Malayalis working in lakhs and lakhs but they do not know any other language except Malayalam. So, the staff in those Consulates must know Malayalam. At least one person with knowledge of Malayalam must be posted there to cater to the needs of the Malayali workers who are employed in the Middle-East.

Coming to another aspect, we have not spent \$ 5 billion for purchase of a building in Washington.

We have not spent five billion crore dollars for the purchase of a building. But, at the same time, we do not find any fund to construct our passport offices. They are still in the rented building. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan, your point is well taken. Please sit down.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Please give me one more minute. ...*(Interruptions)*

Now in the Iraq issue, we were following a middle path. When we were following a middle path, knowingly or unknowingly, our hon. Minister of External Affairs made a declaration to that effect. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Kunwar Akhilesh Singh is the last speaker. Please go ahead with your speech.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Sir, I have not concluded. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Ramdas Athawale, I have called your name, but you were not present in the House. Please sit down.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Sir, I have not concluded. Let me conclude. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You can make your last sentence.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Now in the case of pre-emption strike, our hon. Minister has explained the position. Then, came the retort from Pentagon and not from Islamabad that there is no comparison between India and Pakistan. Pakistan is not a terrorist country even though they are committing the offence of cross-border terrorism. So, even in those days when we were following the middle path, the US Administration, the Pantagon, is taking a stand, which is antagonistic to our interests. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan, please sit down.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : So, please do not rely too much on the US Administration in the matter of dealing with terrorism.

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश मंत्रालय की अनुदान मांगों पर हो रही चर्चा में आपने मुझे भाग लेने की अनुमति दी, उसके

लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूँ। विश्व के बदलते हुए परिदृश्य को दृष्टिगत रखते हुए निश्चित तौर पर विदेश मंत्रालय के खर्चों को और बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता है। साथ ही साथ विदेशों के अंदर हमारे जो दूतावास हैं, उन दूतावासों की कार्यक्षमता में वृद्धि करने की भी आवश्यकता है। अभी जो हमारे पासपोर्ट कार्यालय हैं, उन पासपोर्ट कार्यालयों में जो भ्रष्टाचार व्याप्त है, विदेश मंत्रालय उस भ्रष्टाचार को भी दूर करने का प्रयास करे। इसके साथ साथ पासपोर्ट कार्यालयों में दलालों का जो गिरोह है, उस गिरोह के विरुद्ध यदि आप कठोर कार्रवाई नहीं करेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि पासपोर्ट कार्यालय के अंदर भ्रष्टाचार दूर नहीं हो सकता। इसके लिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप वहाँ आकस्मिक छापे डलवायेंगे तो निश्चित तौर पर वस्तुस्थिति से आप अवगत होंगे।

आज विदेश नीति पर इसी के माध्यम से चर्चा हो रही है। राष्ट्रीय जनतांत्रिक गठबंधन की सरकार जब से बनी है, विदेश नीति की कूटनीतिक विफलता स्पष्ट तौर पर उजागर हुई है। अभी पिछले दिनों 13वीं लोक सभा के गठन के पश्चात् जिस तरह से नेपाल की राजधानी काठमांडू से भारतीय विमान का अपहरण हुआ और उस अपहरण के पश्चात् अपहरणकर्ताओं और दुर्दान्त आतंकवादियों को छोड़ा गया, रिहा किया गया, जिस तरह से हमारा देश उन आतंकवादियों के समक्ष नतमस्तक हुआ, निश्चित तौर पर हमारी विदेश नीति की जो असफलता है, वह उससे रेखांकित हुई है।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को जब कभी अदृश्य ताकत रात को प्रेरणा देने का काम करती है तो सवेरे उनकी भाषा बदल जाती है। उस अदृश्य ताकत के दबाव में मैंने साढ़े तीन वॉ में यही देखा है कि वे बार-बार अपनी भाषा बदलते रहे हैं। वे साल भर कहते रहेंगे कि किसी भी कीमत पर हम पाकिस्तान से वार्ता नहीं करेंगे, पाकिस्तान के सामने घुटने टेकने का काम नहीं करेंगे लेकिन जब अदृश्य ताकत अपना प्रभाव छोड़ेगी तो प्रधान मंत्री जी की रातों-रात भाषा बदल जाती है। जब भारत की संसद पर आक्रमण हुआ तो प्रधान मंत्री ने इसी सदन के अंदर जो वक्तव्य दिया, यदि उस वक्तव्य को निकालकर देखें तो स्पष्ट तौर पर यह बात साबित हो जाती है कि प्रधान मंत्री आज जो कुछ कह रहे हैं और उस समय सदन के अंदर जो कहा था, दोनों बातों में विरोधाभास है। समाजवादी पार्टी भारत और पाकिस्तान के मधुर रिश्तों की हिमायती है।

अगर भारत के सम्मान और स्वाभिमान को बेचकर हम पाकिस्तान से रिश्ते मधुर करने की बात कर रहे हैं, अगर हम अपने आत्मसम्मान को बेचकर, गिरवी रखकर पाकिस्तान से अपने संबंधों को मधुर करने की बात कर रहे हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह की दोस्ती की हमें आवश्यकता नहीं है। पिछले दिनों जिस तरह भारत और पाकिस्तान की सीमा पर हमने अपनी सेनाओं की तैनाती की और लगातार छ महीनों से ऊपर हमारी सेनाएं सीमा पर डटी रहीं, उससे पूरी दुनिया में क्या संदेश गया और किसके दबाव में आपने उन सेनाओं को वापस बुलाने का कार्य किया।

इराक युद्ध के संदर्भ में पिछले सत्र में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इसी सदन में जो वक्तव्य दिए, उनके वक्तव्य को निकालकर देख लिया जाए। उन्होंने कहा कि हम बीच का रास्ता निकाल रहे हैं। उन्होंने इसी सदन के अंदर यह आशा व्यक्त की थी कि युद्ध नहीं होगा, लेकिन उनकी ये आशाएं निराधार साबित हुईं और अमरीका और ब्रिटेन ने बर्बरतापूर्वक इराक के ऊपर हमला किया। मानवता कराहती रही, चीखती रही, चिल्लाती रही और हम मूकदर्शक बनकर बैठे रहे। आपकी कृपास्वरूप देश को शर्मनाक स्थिति का सामना नहीं करना पड़ा और आपके हस्तक्षेप से इस सदन ने एक प्रस्ताव पारित किया जिससे हम दुनिया के सामने थोड़ा मुंह दिखाने लायक हो गए वरना सरकार ने पूरी दुनिया के अंदर देश को शर्मिंदगी की स्थिति में लाकर रख दिया था। अभी इराक के सवाल पर माननीय सदस्यों ने जिस तरह के वक्तव्य दिए हैं, उससे भारतीय जनता पार्टी के लोगों की इराक के संदर्भ में जो सोच थी, वह स्पष्ट तौर पर उजागर हो गई है। मैं सत्यव्रत चतुर्वेदी जी की इस बात से पूर्णतया सहमत हूँ कि हमारे देश की जो गृह नीति है, अर्थ नीति है और जो सत्तारूढ़ दल है, वह जब तक अपने दलगत हितों से ऊपर उठकर देश हित में विदेश नीति को लागू नहीं करेगा, तब तक हम सही और स्पष्ट नीति नहीं लागू कर सकते। कहीं न कहीं अल्पसंख्यकों के प्रति जो दुराग्रह के भाव इनके मन में हैं, वे दुराग्रह के भाव स्पष्ट तौर पर इराक के सवाल पर देखने को मिले हैं। (व्यवधान)

अभी कश्मीर के सवाल पर खारबेल स्वाई जी ने अपनी सरकार की पीठ थपथपाने का काम किया। मैं बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि उसी कश्मीर के अंदर जो कश्मीर में बसे हुए लोग हैं, जिन्हें कल तक देशद्रोही और राष्ट्रद्रोही करार दिया जाता था, आज अगर कश्मीर के अंदर शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से चुनाव सम्पन्न हुए हैं तो इसका श्रेय सरकार को नहीं जाता, इसका श्रेय वहाँ की जनता को जाता है। वहाँ के शान्तिपूर्ण चुनाव इस बात को प्रदर्शित करते हैं कि वहाँ की जनता देश के अंदर आस्था रखती है, उसका लोकतंत्र के अंदर विश्वास है। जो इनकी विदेश नीति है, उसकी विफलता, हमारे बगल में नेपाल है जो दुनिया का एकमात्र हिन्दू राष्ट्र है, आज नेपाल से भी इनके संबंध अच्छे नहीं हैं, बंगलादेश की स्थिति आपके सामने है, भूटान, श्रीलंका और पाकिस्तान, हम पड़ोसी मुल्कों से भी अपने रिश्ते मधुर नहीं बना पाए हैं, हम यह नहीं कह रहे हैं। इनका दल लगातार यह आरोप लगाता रहा है कि नेपाल के अंदर पाकिस्तान की खुफिया एजेंसी आई.एस.आई. अपनी गतिविधियाँ फैलाती चली जा रही है। यदि नेपाल भारत का मित्र है और उसके अंदर पाकिस्तान की खुफिया एजेंसियाँ अपनी गतिविधियाँ बढ़ाती चली जा रही हैं तो यह हमारे लिए शर्मनाक स्थिति है। हमारी खुफिया एजेंसियाँ क्या कर रही हैं, सरकार क्या कर रही है, क्यों नहीं नेपाल के ऊपर दबाव डालकर हम इस तरह की स्थिति का सामना करने के लिए नेपाल सरकार को आगे आने के लिए विवश करने का कार्य करते हैं।

आज सार्क सम्मेलनों की विफलता भी साबित हो चुकी है। इसलिए हम इस सदन के माध्यम से विदेश मंत्री जी, यह चाहेंगे कि यदि सार्क पार्लियामेंट के गठन के लिए हमारा देश पहल कर सके तो हमें सार्क पार्लियामेंट के गठन के लिए, अब वक्त आ गया है, पहल करनी चाहिए क्योंकि आज यूरोप ने यूरोपियन पार्लियामेंट का गठन करके निश्चित तौर पर दुनिया में अपना एक अहम स्थान बनाने का कार्य किया है। (व्यवधान) हमें भी उसका अनुसरण करना चाहिये।

अभी रासा सिंह रावत जी कह रहे थे कि अमरीका में भारत समर्थकों की तादाद बढ़ रही है। अभी जब इराक का युद्ध हो रहा था तो उसी अमरीका के अंदर इराक के युद्ध के विरोध में लाखों लोग प्रदर्शन कर रहे थे। उसके बाद भी अमरीका और ब्रिटेन की गठबंधन सेनाओं ने इराक पर बर्बरतापूर्वक आक्रमण किया। इसलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस मुगालते में मत रहिए कि अब अमरीका के अंदर भारत समर्थक लोग बढ़ रहे हैं तो अमरीका उन समर्थकों के दबाव में भारत का हितैषी हो जाएगा। (व्यवधान)

देश की आजादी के बाद से अब तक का इतिहास रहा है कि अमरीका कभी भी भारत का हितैषी नहीं रहा है। इसलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें अमरीका से सावधान रहना चाहिए और गुटनिर्पेक्ष आन्दोलन के दौर की भारत की भूमिका का हमको निर्वहन करना चाहिए।

श्री रामदास आठवले (पंढरपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अटल जी की सरकार की देश की नीति ही ठीक नहीं है तो विदेश की नीति कैसे ठीक होगी। प्रधान मंत्री का मंत्रालय ही ठीक नहीं है तो श्री यशवंत सिन्हा का विदेश मंत्रालय कैसे ठीक होगा।

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister need not take it very seriously.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAMDAS ATHAWALE : No. You take it seriously. अपने देश के बारे में हमें जरूर गर्व है। कहने का मतलब यह है कि हमें हमारे देश पर अभिमान होना चाहिए और हमारे देश की विदेश नीति दुनिया में गर्व की बात होनी चाहिए। इसीलिए हमारा यही कहना है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ अभी-अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया है। (व्यवधान) पाकिस्तान के साथ बहुत बार दोस्ती का हाथ फैलाने के बाद भी जनरल मुशर्रफ के दिमाग में दोस्ती की बात नहीं

आती है। हम पाकिस्तान के साथ सही में दोस्ती करना चाहते हैं लेकिन यहां का आतंकवाद खत्म करने के लिए पाकिस्तान की सरकार क्या-क्या करने वाली है। हम तो पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ती दिल से करना चाहते हैं। हमारे देश की बहुत बड़ी परम्परा है। इसीलिए हमारा कहना है कि अगर पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ती करनी है तो पाकिस्तान की भी दोस्ती की तैयारी होनी चाहिए लेकिन उसकी आतंकवाद फैलाने की तैयारी है। इतनी बार धमकी देने के बाद भी, पूरी आर्मी बॉर्डर पर कितने दिन तक वहां रही और प्रधान मंत्री जी बता रहे थे कि आप आगे बढ़ो, हम आपके साथ हैं, डरने की कोई बात नहीं है और पूरे देश के 110 करोड़ लोग आपके साथ हैं। आप पाकिस्तान के साथ युद्ध एक बार कर दीजिए। केवल कारगिल और जम्मू-कश्मीर का एरिया ही नहीं, एक बार पाकिस्तान पर कब्जा करने की आवश्यकता है। जिस प्रकार से अमरीका ने इराक पर किया। हम अमरीका का समर्थन नहीं करते हैं, रूस का समर्थन नहीं करते हैं लेकिन अमरीका ने इराक पर हमला करके इराक को कब्जे में ले लिया है और हालांकि उसको कब्जे में लेने की आवश्यकता नहीं थी। इसी तरह एक बार यशवंत सिन्हा जी, आपके पास डिफेंस नहीं है, आवश्यकता थी। मगर अभी जार्ज के पास है। इसलिए लड़ाई करनी है तो जिम्मेदारी आपकी नहीं है लेकिन उसके लिए हमारा इतना ही कहना है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ती का हाथ आपने बढ़ाया है तो मुशर्रफ जी को भी आपका साथ देना चाहिए।

अटल जी, जनरल मुशर्रफ के सामने क्यों फैला रहे हो दोस्ती का हाथ,

वह । एक दिन कर देगा घात।

MR. SPEAKER: I am removing that word from the record.

श्री रामदास आठवले :ठीक है। निकाल दीजिए। शब्द निकाल दीजिए मगर हमारी भावना यही है क्योंकि हम देश से प्रेम करने वाले लोग हैं और इसीलिए हमारा इतना ही कहना है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ आप मत करो बात, क्योंकि पाकिस्तान के साथ बात करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

पाकिस्तान के साथ मत करो बात, दिखा दो उनको अपनी शक्ति का हाथ।

पाकिस्तान को सबक सिखाने के लिए हमारी जो विदेश नीति है, **वै०** (व्यवधान)

संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री तथा पर्यटन और संस्कृति मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्रीमती भावनाबेन देवराजभाई चीखलीया) : रामदास जी की भावना हो सकती है लेकिन सदन की भावना नहीं है।... (व्यवधान)

श्री रामदास आठवले : सदन की भावना यही है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ युद्ध होना चाहिए। अगर आप मेजोरिटी लेना चाहते हैं तो ले लें। कहने का मतलब यह है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ युद्ध होना ही चाहिए।

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy that the House under your leadership has taken up for discussion the Demand for Grant of the Ministry of External Affairs. I believe that it is being done after eleven long years. The last time that the Demand for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs was discussed in the House was in 1992. Therefore, all of us have reasons to be happy with the fact that Business Advisory Committee and you, Mr. Speaker, decided that we should discuss Foreign Policy and the functioning of the Ministry of External Affairs through the discussion on Demand for Grant.

I am also very happy at the level of discussion; the quality of discussion which has taken place starting with my distinguished colleague Shri R. L. Bhatia and ending with Shri Ramdas Athawale. I think all distinguished hon. Members have made their points of view. There have been many suggestions for action. We have taken note of them. I may not be able to reply to all the points that have been raised, but I certainly wish to touch upon the important issues that have been raised here.

Let me begin, Mr. Speaker Sir, by saying that foreign policy as an integral part of the overall policy of this country with a view to promoting, globally, the best interest of this nation has been an issue which has never been debated in this country on the basis of petty political considerations. This country, as one unit, has always stood behind the Government of the day whenever the Government of the day has had or has been called upon to take important decisions in the history of this country.

Shri Bhatia started with defining the objectives of foreign policy. One cannot have any quarrel with those objectives. The broad objectives of the foreign policy of this country have always been very clear; the direction has been very clear; and the thrust has been very clear. It is another matter that with respect to developing situations, from time to time, those broad principles have to be nuanced; they have to be further refined in order to suit a particular situation; in order to sub-serve the broader national interest.

Sometimes, there have been occasions where the understanding of national interest has also been differently interpreted. Some people have understood national interest in one way, and others have understood it in another

way. But, I cannot think of a single occasion where all the parties together have not come behind the Government or have not stood behind the Government of the day in the pursuit of foreign policy. This is something, which is evident even today.

The Resolution on Iraq, Mr. Speaker Sir, which this House adopted was once again a demonstration of that broad national consensus with regard to foreign policy. We had problems -- as I mentioned that day -- with regard to the language of that Resolution, but ultimately we all agreed on a certain formulation, and under your leadership, Mr. Speaker Sir, it was possible for us to adopt a Resolution and show to the world the unity and the strength of the national consensus which backs our foreign policy.

We have the advantage today, we have had this advantage also in the past of having one of the most distinguished and successful Foreign Ministers of this country as the Prime Minister of the country today. It is under his leadership that the foreign policy of this country has been conducted over the last five years, and will be conducted in future.

I have also had the distinction of succeeding a very successful External Affairs Minister who gave a certain status and a certain stature to India's standing in the international comity of nations. Therefore, my task has been made both easy and difficult in the given situation because I have had such an illustrious predecessor.

We have had some exchanges in this House in the course of the debate because some sentiments were expressed about the past glory of India in the world arena. It is quite natural that we should recall those days. Then, some issues were raised with regard to the past mistakes also. If we give in to the temptation of recalling the past achievements, then the temptation to recall the past mistakes will become difficult to resist. I do not want to go into that kind of a debate in my reply.

Let me begin, Mr. Speaker, Sir, by referring to some general issues, the Non-Aligned Movement. Speaker after speaker referred to the Non-Aligned Movement and bemoaned the fact that India lost its pre-eminent position in the Non-Aligned Movement; in fact, the Non-Aligned Movement itself seems to be losing its relevance. In the Kuala Lumpur Summit, which was held in February, the revitalisation of the Non-Aligned Movement was the subject of discussion. South Africa, which was the Chairman of NAM for over four years before Malaysia took over in Kuala Lumpur, had called two meetings: the first one at a place called Zambeli and, therefore, it became known as the Zambeli Group or the Zambeli process. These meetings were held with a view to providing the vitality to NAM in the Twenty-first Century because NAM itself realised that somewhere it was being swapped of that vitality and, therefore, there was need to think about it.

The second Zambeli Group meeting, which was held, I think, in December in Cape Town, was personally attended by me. I went as the External Affairs Minister of India to Cape Town to attend this meeting. Let me, through you, Sir, take the House into confidence and inform the House that three full Foreign Ministers were present in that meeting: one was South Africa because South Africa was the host, the second was Malaysia because Malaysia was going to take over the Chairmanship from the South Africans, and the third was India. All other countries in that Group, which consisted of former Chairman of NAM and members of the Group, and also the Arab League Representative, Mr. Aamar Moosa, were represented by State Minister, Deputy Minister or at the official level. Why did I decide to go to South Africa to attend the Second Zambeli Group meeting? It is because I wanted to prove and once again demonstrate the commitment of India to the continued relevance of this Movement.

Let me also take the House into confidence, through you, Sir, and say that the South African Foreign Minister, who was chairing the Session, asked me 'India' to suggest the agenda for the continued relevance of NAM which could then be adopted at the Kuala Lumpur Summit, and the Indian Delegation worked hard. I think, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar will agree here, having belonged to the Foreign Service at one time, that we have some of the finest brains in the Indian Foreign Service. We get very good quality assistance from them. We put out heads together and, the next day, we presented a set of recommendations on what the agenda of NAM should be for the Twenty-first Century. I have some satisfaction in informing the House, through you, Sir, that, that agenda was adopted without any change, without any modification and that was the agenda which was adopted even at the Summit in Kuala Lumpur. That is the contribution which India has made to the continued relevance of the Non-Aligned Movement. But at the same time, I would also like to point out that both in Cape Town as well as in Kuala Lumpur, the issue of Iraq, for instance, came up.

What is it that Non-Aligned Movement should say on Iraq? There was sharp division on that because many members of the NAM had one point of view and many others had another point of view. We played our role in order to ensure that we adopted a Resolution, both in Cape Town as well as in Kuala Lumpur, which was consistent with the consensus of NAM, as well as with the relevance of NAM, as well as with the dignity of NAM. These Resolutions were adopted. But, should India become the leader of NAM, unchallenged leader of the world? I must confess that I have no such pretensions.

Leadership is not assumed. Leadership is a role which evolves. There was a period of time in our history when there was a leadership role for us along with others. We were not the unquestioned leader of NAM. There were others who were equally important. Today, in a different world, in a different context, if we were to go and say that we were the leaders of NAM, then, even the position that we have today will be lost. That is because, however small a country may be, however we might think unimportant a country might be, they are not prepared today to accept the leadership of another country automatically, without question. So, we are working with other members of NAM without claiming, without loudly claiming, that we are the leaders of NAM and everybody must listen to us. They will listen to us, they do listen to us, if we have a valid point to make. We will continue to make those valid points. We will continue to make contribution to the Non-Aligned Movement. We will continue to see that the Non-Aligned Movement plays its role.

Let me also remind this House, when we talk of the leadership of India in the Non-Aligned Movement in the past, that many of us do remember what happened when Bangladesh operations took place. During the operation in Bangladesh there was a Security Council Resolution. It could not be passed because our friend, the then Soviet Union, vetoed that Resolution in the Security Council. There is a procedure in the UN called the Uniting for Peace Procedure under which seven members of the Security Council, or 50 per cent of the membership of the General Assembly, can call a meeting of the General Assembly to discuss that issue. A procedure which was not, or could not be, adopted in the case of Iraq in the current crisis, was adopted in the case of Bangladesh. When this issue came up, the Resolution against India was passed by 104 members voting for the Resolution against India, 11 with India voting against the Resolution, and some others abstaining. The only non-aligned countries which voted with India were Cuba and Bhutan. The others were, apart from India, the then Soviet Union and countries of Eastern Europe.

I am just reminding the House that even in the heyday of the Non-Aligned Movement, there have been instances where we have not been able to convince the Non-Aligned Movement of our point of view. Therefore, while the commitment to the Non-Aligned Movement will remain, while we will continue to work for the success of this Movement, I think both in terms of the leadership of India as well as in terms of the current state of affairs, let us not expect too much.

In fact, when I was going to Cape Town, I had asked my Ministry to organise a meeting in Sapru House of some intellectuals who could give some inputs on the Non-Aligned Movement. One of the intellectuals, I was told, had said that the Non-Aligned Movement is dead but we cannot bury the dead body. I did not agree with this. I went to South Africa. We were going to Kuala Lumpur, I called a meeting at my level in which I had discussions with intellectuals, former foreign service officers, some members from the political class of this country.

I know that even within major political parties, there are differing perceptions and relevance of NAM. But I leave it at that.

Sir, Shri R.L. Bhatia initiated the debate. His first question was with respect to China, and I am happy that he heads the 'Eminent Persons Group' from our side. He heads it because we have complete confidence in Shri R.L. Bhatia and his ability of representing the point of view of India in the 'Eminent Persons Group'. I also had the good fortune of meeting the Eminent Persons from both sides when the last meeting was being held in New Delhi.

Sir, we seek friendly, cooperative and good neighbourly, mutually beneficial relationship with China on the basis of the principles of *Panchsheel*, on the basis of mutual sensitivity to each other's concerns and equality. We remain committed to the process of dialogue to resolve outstanding differences and to build a constructive and cooperative relationship with China.

Sir, there was a Conference on Asian Security organised by the IDSA in January, and they had invited me to inaugurate it. I would like to take a little bit of the time of this House in reading from the speech which I had delivered there. I quote:

"It is true that there are important differences between India and China. Some of the wounds inflicted by the conflict of 1962 have been slow to heal and their scars have not fully disappeared. Reliable and widespread reports of Chinese nuclear and missile proliferation to Pakistan cause deep concern. The Chinese position on issues such as Sikkim and India's candidature to a permanent seat in the UN Security Council sows doubts. There is also a sense of disappointment over the pace of improvement in the relationship.

Let me, however, assure everyone gathered here that India's approach to relations with China is and will remain forward-looking and infused with a sense of optimism. India's policies will not be based on fear of Chinese power nor envy of China's economic achievements. They will be based on the conviction that a prosperous India is inevitable. So is a strong and prosperous China. It is, therefore, logical, reasonable and in the enlightened self-interest of the two countries to learn, not just to live with each other but also

address differences and build on what is common. Further, both India and China are too large and too strong -- I repeat -- are too large and too strong to be contained or cowed down by any country including each other."

Sir, this was the speech which I had delivered, and this was the speech which, I am sure, Shri R.L. Bhatia is aware, was widely appreciated in China and in the Chinese media.

Sir, what is our considered position on Tibet? Our considered position is that we recognise Tibet to be an autonomous region of China, and this is the position which remains. Our relations with Tibet are historical, spiritual and religious in nature. The Dalai Lama is respected in India as a spiritual and religious leader. He is not supposed to indulge in political activity on Indian soil. But we have favoured a direct dialogue between His Holiness the Dalai Lama and the Chinese Government to resolve their all outstanding differences, and I am happy to say that some dialogue has started.

The Chinese Prime Minister Mr. Zhu Rongji was in India in January last year. Our Defence Minister is already in China. Our Defence Minister gave a speech also in the same Conference in IDSA. He explained this remark which is attributed to him about China being India's enemy number one. I know this for a fact that China was extremely keen to have the *Raksha Mantri* visit China. The visit had to be postponed in view of the developments in Iraq. Fresh dates were fixed. The Defence Minister is in China. I understand that he is getting a welcome which is almost at the same level as that of the visiting Head of the Government. That is a kind of welcome that the Chinese are giving to the Defence Minister. He has had very useful talk. We will have a complete report of his visit, when he returns.

The Prime Minister is scheduled to visit China. As Shri Bhatia has said the dates are being fixed. We are hopeful that he will be visiting China soon. You, Sir, led a Parliamentary delegation to China. You had very good meetings. Our trade with China has crossed five billion dollars. It has become one of our largest trading partners. I am referring to this because in my previous capacity in this House, I have heard a great deal of concern about the new Chinese invasion in the economic field, and how India will not be able to hold its own. We have held our own. Our exports to China are growing exponentially. There is nothing, absolutely in any area that should cause any apprehension or concern in our minds, specially in the economic field. We are determined to increase our involvement, our engagement with China in the economic and other fields.

As far as the LAC and the boundary question is concerned, there is a set procedure and an agreed procedure; a three-stage formula. We are making progress. I am sure, we will continue to make progress. There will be difficulties. There will be impediments on the way. We will not allow those difficulties or impediments to create any fissures in that overall understanding. For all these years – almost two decades – peace on India-China border has held. We are determined to ensure that it holds in future also. That will be our attitude as far as China is concerned.

Sir, with Russia, our relationship has achieved new heights. It is not merely - as Shri Shivraj Patil was saying - that we had succeeded in maintaining the relationship of the past. In fact, Russia went through a tumultuous period, when the old Soviet Union broke up. We have not only been able to maintain that but improve our relationship with Russia in various areas. There is a very close interaction now. The two Heads of Governments visit each other under our strategic partnership every year. It was under that arrangement that President Putin was in India in December. I had been to Russia in February. I will be going again to Russia some time in May. The Prime Minister will be visiting Russia around the end of May, because he had been invited along with a few limited number Heads of Governments for the 300th anniversary celebration of the city of St. Petersburg. So, he will be going to Russia. As I said, in all areas of cooperation, we have very intense relationship. We describe our relationship with Russia not merely as friendly, but as civilization, because it is something which has stood the test of time. This is one relationship that India cherishes; this is one relationship to which we shall continue to invest in order to make sure that we will continue to make progress.

Let me now come to Europe. We now have a summit with the European Union; and the EU is expanding. They are going up from 15 to 25. Come 2004, ten more nations are going to join the EU. It is becoming a pan-European Union in its coverage. What is more is that the European Union is now acquiring a political and strategic personality. That is what is happening. It started as a trade body. It has now gradually grown into a real union with a common currency.

The only countries with which the European Union has a summit are China, Japan, the US, Canada and Russia, making it five; and the sixth country with which EU has a summit is India. We have had more than three summits so far. Italy is going to assume the leadership, the chairmanship or the presidency of EU from 1st of July. The next

summit is due in Delhi in November. We are working hard to make that summit also a success. Each summit is accompanied by a business summit of the EU. This also is extremely successful.

Let us now take ASEAN. Ten countries in East Asia have come together and formed ASEAN, as you know. The 'Look East' policy is Shri Narasimha Rao's policy. We are following that policy. I was a little surprised that the references to Congress' contribution to foreign policy ended with the late Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, and no reference was made to Shri Narasimha Rao. It was left to Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab to refer to Shri Narasimha Rao. It was in his time that the 'Look East' policy was formulated. We have followed up on that policy. The elevation of India to the summit level dialogue of ASEAN has been a major achievement. The first time the summit was held in Phnom-Penh, in November last year. The Prime Minister and I had travelled for the summit. It was an extremely successful summit from our point of view because the Prime Minister of India suggested to the ASEAN that we should have a free trade agreement; he said that ASEAN and India should have a free trade agreement. We suggested a ten-year time frame with an early harvest concept built into it.

We are negotiating a free trade agreement separately with Thailand. We are negotiating a comprehensive economic cooperation agreement with Singapore. The Singapore Prime Minister was here recently to sign that agreement. But with ASEAN now, like China and like Japan, India is in the process of negotiating a free trade agreement.

With ASEAN, the only countries which have a summit level relationship are China, Japan and South Korea. India is the fourth country which has summit level relationship with ASEAN.

Similarly, our involvement with post-Taliban's Afghanistan has been very intense and has been extremely intense. We are doing a lot of very useful work in Afghanistan through that 100 million dollar assistance or grant which had been

promised by the Prime Minister. We are building schools; we have contributed to the upgradation of the Indira Gandhi Children's Hospital in Kabul; we have contributed buses to them; and we have given them three aircraft to fly. We are drilling tube-wells; we are helping in agriculture. It is a long and broad spectrum of developmental approach and humanitarian assistance.

We are training their people; we are engaged with Afghanistan like never before. This is something which is appreciated by the people of Afghanistan. One of the earliest steps that I made when I came to this Ministry was to visit Afghanistan; and unlike most visitors, I did not remain confined to Kabul. I travelled to Herat; I travelled to Mazaar-e-Sharief; I went to Kandahar. I went to all these places; met the local Governors and discussed with them what are their requirements in terms of rehabilitation and development.

20.00 hrs.

So, we are doing a lot of work in Afghanistan.

Our engagement with Central Asia has reached unprecedented levels. I myself went to Tazakistan, Kazakistan and Kirghistan recently. I was the first Foreign Minister to have gone there. I do not claim this as a great distinction but it just happened by chance that I was the first Foreign Minister of India who went Tazakistan, Kazakistan and Kirghistan in all these 10-12 years. This is a new dimension to our relationship, the involvement of India or the engagement of India with Central Asia.

I did not hear a word about Africa and the Latin America in the course of the debate but with these countries, with these continents, we have very serious engagements. With Africa and COMESA we have signed a Memorandum of Understanding. We are trying to raise the level of our engagement with all the regional groupings in Africa; SEDAC, COMESA, Community of Countries in East Africa. In fact, the trip that I am making in the next few days, the House may be surprised to know, is a trip to Tanzania and Botswana. I am not running to New York or Washington but I am going to Tanzania and Botswana because it is important that these countries feel that India gives them importance.

Sir, our engagement with Mauritius is well known. In regard to South Africa, let me again take the House into confidence. The Foreign Ministers of South Africa, Brazil and India are meeting in the month of June in Brazilia. We have decided to get together to discuss what has been described here as the new International order and the role that the developing countries like India, South Africa and Brazil should have in the developing world.

Similarly, with Latin America, I plan a trip to Latin America, particularly to Brazil and Peru. There is a Reo Group with which we have had interactions over a period of time but this interaction had been minimal because we met during the UN General Assembly. We are in discussion with Mercosur, it is a combination of Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, for a summit, for a PTA leading to FTA with them. We are in touch with Andean Group and CARICOM. My colleague, Shri Digvijay Singh had made a trip to Latin America where he discussed all these things

and his visit has contributed a great deal to their understanding of India. We have had the Mexican Foreign Minister's visit here. We had the Colombian Foreign Minister's visit here. I am glad to inform the House through you that the Chilean Foreign Minister is coming here and I am going to talk to her tomorrow. This is the first time ever that the Foreign Minister of Chile is travelling to India. When the Paraguay Foreign Minister came to India, he reminded me that this was the first time that a Paraguay Foreign Minister was coming to India. That was a return visit for Shri Digvijay Singh's visit. So, our engagement with Latin America is improving. We are taking care of the persons of the Indian origin in that part of the world.

Much has been said about our immediate neighbours. Let me dispel any impression in this House or anywhere else that our relationship with Nepal is not the very best. I heard somebody saying that we have problems with Nepal. We have no problem with Nepal. There are some problems within Nepal but we are in touch with Nepal. We are giving all the assistance that Nepal needs in order to be able to fight or deal with the problem there. We have the best of the relationship with Nepal. We have the best of the relationship with Bhutan, Sri Lanka and Maldives. There were some problems with Bangladesh.

As a Minister of External Affairs, again one of the earliest visits I made was to the immediate neighbourhood. I started with Maldives. I went to Sri Lanka, Nepal, and Bhutan. Then I travelled to Bangladesh and we had a very good discussion. Then, there was some problem and I invited the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh to visit Delhi and we had a very candid discussion. Things have improved. We have had discussions at the level of the Commerce Secretaries of both the countries. The Foreign Secretary will be travelling to Dhaka at the end of this month to have Foreign Office consultations. We have decided that the Joint Commission between Bangladesh and India will meet in Dhaka before the 15th July and I hope those dates will also be fixed. There are issues between Bangladesh and India. But it does not mean that our relationship is not very cordial and friendly. We are in touch with them. Bangladesh Foreign Minister and I speak whenever it is necessary even on phone.

Sir, with Japan, again I would like to say that we have been able to get over that phase which had started with our nuclear tests in 1998. As we know, Japan is one country which did suffer a nuclear holocaust. Therefore, their mind set is very different. They were disappointed, no doubt, when we went for our nuclear tests. We have been explaining it very patiently to them and I am very glad once again to be able to tell the House that the Japanese Foreign Minister visited New Delhi. I think Japanese Foreign Minister came to India after six to eight years. She visited New Delhi and we had very good discussions. The National Security Advisor was in Japan recently. He had also had very good discussion. The Japanese Prime Minister was in India. Our Prime Minister went to Japan. Our Raksha Mantri and other Ministers had also gone there. We are engaging Japan at all levels – economic, political and strategic. We have a global partnership with Japan. So, with most of the countries we have this relationship.

Now, I come to more difficult part. I will come to Pakistan. I have deliberately decided to talk about Pakistan last because an impression goes round that there is nothing more to India's Foreign Policy than Pakistan. I would talk about America also. Let me begin by saying that as far as the United States of America is concerned, we worked hard to establish cordial, friendly, and good relationship with them over the last few years. There was a great deal of misunderstanding once again after the nuclear tests. The House is aware that US with some other countries had imposed economic sanctions on India in the wake of the nuclear tests. But engagement with the US has led to an understanding. I am making bold to say that sustained hostility with the United States of America cannot and should not be the policy of India. We are the largest democracy of the world. The US is also a powerful democracy. Just as we will not under estimate the strength of democracy in our country, we would and should not under estimate the strength of democracy in the US. There is no reason why the two largest democracies should not work together. I am not for a moment saying that we agree on all issues. We do not and the most recent disagreement has been on the issue of Iraq. But single issues do not define relationship between two countries because the relationship covers a vast area.

Therefore, despite these differences -- we have other areas of difference, where we are patiently working together and some of them may continue and some of them may vanish, I cannot predict that -- we would continue to promote friendship between India and the United States of America. There have been exchange of visits between the USA and India and the relationship is being guided by the shared commitment of the Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and President George Bush which was outlined in November, 2001 when they met in Washington. Therefore, without compromising on anything, I would like Shri Rupchand Pal and some others to please take note of it, without compromising our national interests, without compromising on our principles if we can build a great relationship with the USA, then we would try and do so. That is why I said, this compulsive hostility to the US is something a baggage that we should leave behind. It does not suit our national interest. It is not conducive for the world peace.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : When you say that there is a baggage of compulsive hostility, are you suggesting that there was a deliberate promotion of compulsive hostility with the US in the past? Is that the charge you are bringing against the Governments run by the Congress in the past?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: No. I think, you are reading too much into what I have said. What I meant to say was that there are sections of opinion in the country which do have this compulsive hostility towards the US. This comes out every now and then. I am also saying that in the past, I am not making this to Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar as a charge, we have dwelt more on our differences than on our commonalities. What is the difference today? How has the situation changed? It is not because those differences have vanished but both countries have decided that we will emphasise the commonalities more than our differences. We will continue to deal with our differences. We will continue to evolve a common plan but that should not be the sum total of our relationship.

Sir, I am glad that Shri Rashid Alvi has come back. But I was wondering about the paragraph from where he quoted. I got the Annual Report of the Ministry. I have gone through both the chapters on US and the introductory remarks but I could not find that sentence where we have said that our relations with the US has improved.

SHRI RASHID ALVI : It is there.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Please tell me the page number.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : It is at page 78. I am reading out that paragraph.

"The terrorist attacks in US on 11th September, 2001 and on the Indian Parliament on 13th December, 2001 have led to the deepening of the Indo-US co-operation in this field."

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: It says about deepening of the Indo-US co-operation in fighting terrorism...(Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : It is there. I am reading what is written there...(Interruptions)

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Shri Rashid Alvi read out as if Indo-US relations have deepened as a result of that terrorist attack in the US. The terrorist attacks have led to the deepening of Indo-US co-operation in this field. Why is there any misunderstanding on this?

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : In which field?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: It is in the field of fight against terrorism.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Does the United States also recognise that there is cross-border terrorism?

Your own admission is that there has been double standard in their measurement of terrorism.

SHRI RASHID ALVI : Just let me say one sentence. अगर आप इस वे में यह भी कहेंगे कि सिर्फ इसलिए कि वहां पर कोई टैरेरिस्ट एक्टिविटी हुई है और हमारे देश में भी हुई है, इसलिए इस फील्ड में हम ज्यादा नजदीक आ गये तो किस तरह नजदीक आ गये? क्या पाकिस्तान में उसने टैरेरिज्म के लिए एक बिलियन डालर का उसका कर्जा माफ नहीं किया है, क्या उसे एड नहीं दी है, क्या पाकिस्तान के मामले में उसने अपनी पालिसी बदल दी है? इस फील्ड में आप कहां नजदीक आ गये, कैसे नजदीक आ गये, यह आप बताइये? (ब्यवधान) हमने पूरा पैराग्राफ पढ़ा है। (ब्यवधान)

श्री यशवन्त सिन्हा : आपने अपनी बात कह दी न।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने अपनी बात कही है, अभी आप बैठिये।

SHRI RASHID ALVI : You have come very close to US. Even then I ask you simply one question. Can you trust US and is America a trustworthy country?

MR. SPEAKER: It is very simple. There is a difference in the perception with which you have made your points.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: The impression which Shri Rashid Alvi created in this House by quoting from the Annual Report was that because of the terrorist strike in the US and on Indian Parliament, we have come closer together.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR: That is what you have said.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: No. We are just saying that it has deepened cooperation in this field.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Please accept that it is a ridiculous sentence not written by you, but your officers. Pull them up and move on.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I do not share the mindset of Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar. I have never shared it. I am sorry, I do not share it *vis-à-vis* the officers. There is no question of pulling up anyone because what has been said in the Annual Report is exactly what we meant to say. There is no mistake. So, what should I pull them up for?

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : That is what we are objecting to. You share the view of your poor draftsmen and

are suggesting that international cooperation has increased only because there was an attack on them and an attack on us. It is an extremely unfortunate position that the Minister of External Affairs, instead of exercising his ministerial responsibility, in exactly the same way as he behaved in the Ministry of Finance, is just finding excuses.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: The Indian Foreign Service, as Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar will know, is one Foreign Service which is sought after internationally for its drafting capabilities. If Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar believes that that quality has degenerated after he left the Service, I am sorry, I do not accept it.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : It certainly has. I just do not see why the Foreign Minister must stand up for a poorly drafted sentence.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, how much more time do you need to complete?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Just a few more minutes and I will be done.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Maybe the IAS has drafted that line. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RASHID ALVI : Attack on Parliament is just one incident. In India also we have been seeing things which are happening for the last fifteen years.

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down now.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: The Report has to be read in its totality. That sentence occurs after many many sentences and it is in a certain perspective.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : That is the second sentence in the paragraph.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: But there are many more paragraphs before that.

I now come to the final issue of Pakistan and then I will be done. ...*(Interruptions)*

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : आप अपनी गलती स्वीकारिये।

श्री यशवन्त सिन्हा : जबरदस्ती गलती स्वीकारिये? अतः (व्यवधान) मैं उसके ऊपर आता हूँ। बंसल साहब, आप बहुत अधीर हो जाते हैं। शिवराज पाटिल जी ने उसे रोज़ किया है, मैं उसे टच करूंगा, मैं कहीं भाग नहीं रहा हूँ।

It has been a difficult relationship with our neighbour, Pakistan, not in the last few years, but since 1947, since the sub-continent of India was partitioned. This is something which is history.

There have been ups and downs in this relationship over the last 55 years. I do not want to take the time of the House over the history of this. But I would like to say that the first and the most preferred option of the Government vis-à-vis Pakistan is the option of peace, is the option of friendship and the option of dialogue. This is the first and most preferred option. The Prime Minister has clarified it in Srinagar and he has clarified it today that for a meaningful dialogue to begin, it is important that infiltration and cross-border terrorism is brought to an end and those terrorist camps which are there in Pakistan are dismantled. That is the position as explained by the Prime Minister today. As he said, the ball is in the court of Pakistan. If Pakistan were to respond, they were to see evidence in the ground, then we will certainly move forward in that direction.

Now, there are many people who see a divergence of the position taken by me and the Prime Minister and much has been written and said on this. Let me quote from what I said in the interview which I gave to *The Hindustan Times*. The question was:

"USA and UK, without UN support, attacked Iraq. Is not Pakistan, which has weapons of mass destruction, a lack of democracy, and shelters international terrorists, a fit case for such action?"

I would quote my reply also.

"It is a fit case. I won't oppose it. But whether they (they means US and UK) will is up to them. We can't go to someone and ask them to attack another country. We keep pointing out the activities in Pakistan, and in them, the role of the Pakistan army; the drug business centred in Pakistan; and third, how, in PoK, people are repressed and trampled upon."

We keep pointing it out in our dialogue with foreign countries. This is what I said. The headlines of the news report of this interview was "Pak a fit case for attack without UN support: Sinha." I do not choose the headline. And that is why, I said that I would quote from what I have said.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : You said that it is a fit case. You have just read it out to us. Your first two sentences are exactly reflected in the headlines. Once again, I would request you to improve your drafting ability, now that you are no more in the IAS and you have joined the Ministry of External Affairs.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: The great honourable Mani Shankar Aiyar, I do not want to waste my time joining issue with you in this House on this particular point.

I was speaking in the other House when the Iraq Resolution came up and there, this issue had been raised and I had clarified it there. I had said that as far as comparison with Iraq is concerned, I said that we have reasons to believe that Iraq does not have weapons of mass destruction. I said that we have reasons to believe that Iraq is not linked with Al-Qaeda and terrorism. So, the only thing which is common as far as these three criteria are concerned, between Iraq and Pakistan, if at all, is the issue of lack of democracy. So, this impression that I was thereby lending support to US action in Iraq was entirely erroneous. I hope this will clarify the issue as far as Pakistan is concerned.

In the end, I would like to say that I was not surprised to hear a charge once again in this House because I have heard this charge over four years as the Finance Minister. This is with regard to the independence and autonomy of our decision-making process, whether it be the economic policy, foreign policy or any other policy. I think, as a great nation, we do injustice to ourselves by immediately linking every decision to some pressure or the other and that too, with this Government. Members like General Tripathy and Shri Kharabela Swain have pointed it out. Did we carry out the nuclear tests in May, 1998 also under American pressure?

Was that also the result of American pressure? Was the missile test also the result of American pressure? Why should the foreign policy of this country based on a broad national consensus? Our foreign policy is based on a broad national consensus and must continue to remain based on a broad national consensus, for the simple reason that when I stand up on behalf of India, I am not standing up on behalf of any particular party. I am standing up for the whole country. When the Prime Minister speaks, he speaks for the whole country. He is the Prime Minister of India.

We have our small differences. We will continue to have them because that is what politics is all about. But my very humble plea would be, let us not weaken India's position and let us not weaken India's case by appearing to be divided and by accusing each other of acting under pressure. India does not act under the pressure of any country. That is why I quoted from my speech on China to say that we are too big, too great and too large a nation to be cowed down by anyone. We will not be cowed down. We will continue to follow our policies independently and according to our best judgement of our national interest.

I am quite sure that when we do that the whole House, the whole country will support it because we will be acting in the best national interest.

MR. SPEAKER: A few cut motions have been moved by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal to the Demand for Grant relating to Ministry of External Affairs. Shall I put all the cut motions to the vote of the House together or does the hon. Member want any particular cut motion to be put separately?

The cut motions were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the Demand for Grant relating to the Ministry of External Affairs to vote.

The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the Fourth column of the Order paper be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 2004, in respect of the heads of Demands entered in the Second column thereof against Demand No. 30 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs. "

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, the House stands adjourned till eleven of the clock tomorrow.

20.28 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock
on Thursday, April 24, 2003/Vaisakha 4, 1925 (Saka).*
