

Fourteenth Loksabha**Session : 5****Date : 03-08-2005**

**Participants :** Vajpayee Shri Atal Bihari, Panda Shri Prabodh, Bansal Shri Pawan Kumar, Pal Shri Rupchand, Yadav Prof. Ram Gopal, Khanduri AVSM, Maj.G Bhuwan Chandra, Yadav Shri Devendra Prasad, Chaliha Shri Kirip, Pathak Shri Brajesh, Prabhu Shri Suresh, Tripathy Shri Braja Kishore, Sangma Shri Purno Agitok, Dhindsa Shri Sukhdev Singh, Singh Shri Manvendra, Maken Shri Ajay, Fernandes Shri George, Ramadass Prof. M., Singh Shri Dushyant, Deora Shri Milind Murli, Athawale Shri Ramdas, Singh Dr. Manmohan, Pal Shri Rupchand, Singh Dr. Manmohan, Deo Shri Bikram Keshari, Singh Dr. Manmohan, Topdar Shri Tarit Baran, Singh Dr. Manmohan, Khanduri AVSM, Maj.G Bhuwan Chandra, Singh Dr. Manmohan

&gt;

Title: Discussion regarding statement made by the Prime Minister on 29.7.05 on his recent visit to the United States of America.

**14.02 hrs****DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193**

MR. SPEAKER: The House shall now take up Item No. 21.

In the ballot, Shri Prabodh Panda's name came out as number one, and accordingly his name is there on the Agenda Paper. But Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee wanted to make his submission first and wanted to initiate the discussion. To enable him to do so, I requested Shri Prabodh Panda to accommodate Shri Vajpayee. He has very kindly agreed to that and I appreciate his response.

Now, I am very happy to invite Shri Vajpayee to initiate the discussion and I will call Shri Prabodh Panda next. Shri Vajpayee, you may sit and speak.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (लखनऊ) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत और अमेरिका द्वारा जारी किए गए संयुक्त बयान पर चर्चा का अवसर प्रदान करने के लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ। मेरे और मेरे साथियों की ओर से अमेरिका की खुशनुमा यात्रा के लिए प्रधान मंत्री जी को बधाई।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत-अमेरिका समझौते में कई विषयों का जिक्र है। व्यापार, ऊर्जा, कृषि, विज्ञान, तकनीकी एवम् आतंकवाद पर इस समझौते में महत्वपूर्ण घोषणाएँ की गई हैं। हम दोनों देशों के बीच व्यापार, कृषि एवम् विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में बढ़ते हुए सहयोग का स्वागत करते हैं। ऊर्जा पैदा करने के लिए नए साधन जुटाने के प्रयासों का हम समर्थन कर लड़हड़ हड़्डे हैं।

जिस विषय पर हमारी चिंता है, वह है भारत में बदलती हुई परमाणु नीति। भारत ने आज तक एक स्वतंत्र परमाणु नीति अपनाई है और विश्व ने इस नीति का, हमारे वैज्ञानिकों के प्रयासों का लोहा माना है। चाहे पोखरण के विस्फोट हों या परमाणु बिजली के संयंत्र हों अथवा कैंसर से लड़ने के लिए आणविक शक्ति का उपयोग हो, परमाणु विज्ञान के सभी क्षेत्रों में विगत दशकों में हमारे वैज्ञानिकों ने अनेकानेक उपलब्धियाँ हासिल की हैं। यह सम्भव हो पाया एक स्वतंत्र नीति के कारण, जिसकी कमान हमेशा हमारे हाथ में रही है।

कांग्रेस की सरकार रही हो या एनडीए की, एक विषय पर कभी समझौता नहीं किया गया था और वह था भारत की परमाणु नीति की स्वतंत्रता। पोखरण में आणविक विस्फोट के पश्चात, विश्व के कई देशों ने हमारे खिलाफ अभियान छेड़ दिया था।

हमारे सामने गंभीर आर्थिक और सामरिक चुनौतियां थी। उन कठिन परिस्थितियों :दृष्टदृष्टः ङ्कों भी भारत की परमाणु नीति स्वतंत्र रही है।

सामरिक दृष्टि से अति-महत्वपूर्ण परमाणु हथियारों के होते हुए भी हमने स्पष्ट रूप से कहा कि भारत परमाणु शस्त्रों का युद्ध में पहले प्रयोग नहीं करेगा। भारत उन रा्ट्रों के विरुद्ध भी परमाणु अस्त्रों का उपयोग नहीं करेगा, जिनके पास इस तरह के हथियार नहीं हैं।

हमने क्रेडिबल मिनिमम न्यूक्लीयर डिटेरेंट को अपनी परमाणु नीति का केन्द्र बिंदु माना है। हम नहीं चाहते कि शस्त्रों की होड़ में हम भी लग जाएं, परमाणु निशस्त्रीकरण के लिए आज भी हम उतने ही कटिबद्ध हैं जितने कि नेहरू जी के समय में थे। विश्व को यह भी भरोसा है कि हमारे परमाणु शस्त्र गैर-सामरिक नियंत्रण में हैं।

यह सब हम पर किसी ने थोपा नहीं था, यह नीति हमारी अपनी है। हमारी नीति हमारी जरूरतों, हमारी महत्वाकांक्षाओं और रा्ट्र की सुरक्षा को ध्यान में रखकर बनाई गयी नीति है। सबको साथ लेकर, चर्चा करके हमने यह नीति बनाई थी। जनवरी, 2003 में यह नीति भारत सरकार ने स्पष्ट रूप से घोषित की थी। भारत-अमरीका समझौते से हमारा ;ी स्वतंत्र परमाणु नीति पर कई प्रश्न उठे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपके माध्यम से मैं इन चिंताओं को उजागर करना चाहता हूं। सबसे पहले चिंता का विषय है भारत की तरफ से किया गया यह वायदा कि भारत के परमाणु कार्यक्रम को सामरिक और गैर-सामरिक दो भागों में विभक्त किया जाएगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, सरकार ने यह शर्त मानने से पहले जरूर इस विषय पर वैज्ञानिकों से चर्चा की होगी । इस विभाजन की तकनीकी कठिनाइयों के बारे में सरकार को जानकारी जरूर होगी। इससे भी महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न यह है कि क्या इस विभाजन से सामरिक क्षमता पर असर नहीं पड़ेगा? अध्यक्ष महोदय, बदलती परिस्थितियों में भारत की सामरिक जरूरतें भी ; बदलेंगी। आतंकवाद के इस युग में किस प्रकार के हथियारों की कब जरूरत होगी, क्या आज हम यह निश्चयपूर्वक कह सकते हैं। हमने अगर सामरिक कार्यक्रमों की सीमा तय कर दी तो भविष्य में क्या हमारे हाथ सदा के लिए बंध नहीं जाएंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी परमाणु शस्त्रों की क्षमता पर परोक्ष रूप से लगाए जाने वाले इस बंधन के बारे में रा्ट्र को विश्वास में लिया जाना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस समझौते में दूसरा चिंता का विषय है अमरीका के साथ मिलकर आणविक पदार्थों के उत्पादन पर रोक लगाने की संधि के लिए प्रयास करने की प्रतिबद्धता। इस संधि में कौन देश भाग लेंगे? क्या यह जैनेवा में चल रही अंतर्राष्ट्रीय बातचीत से भिन्न है? अगर भिन्न नहीं है तो क्या इस द्विपक्षीय समझौते को, भारत के भविष्य को ध्यःदृष्टः न में रखकर किया गया है।

मान लीजिए कुछ रा्ट्रों ने संधि की शर्तों को नहीं माना, तो इस घोषणा से भविष्य में हमारे आणविक पदार्थों के उत्पादन पर कहीं एकतरफा रोक तो नहीं लग जाएगी? क्या उसका असर रा्ट्र की सुरक्षा पर नहीं पड़ेगा। अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे वैज्ञानिक भारत में प्रचुर मात्रा में उपलब्ध थोरियम का उपयोग परमाणु ऊर्जा का उत्पादन करने के लिए प्रयासरत हैं। क्या इरःदृष्टः; समझौते से, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय निरीक्षणों के चलते इन प्रयासों पर कोई असर तो नहीं पड़ेगा? थोरियम तकनीक में अगर हम सफल हो गए तो आणविक शक्ति के उपयोग में सभी बाधाएं समाप्त हो जाएंगी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस समझौते में भारत को परमाणु शक्ति सम्पन्न रा्ट्र के रूप में अमेरिका ने मान्यता नहीं दी है। अमेरिका ने भारत को, मैं यहां उद्धृत कर रहा हूं, " A responsible State with advanced nuclear technology" कहा है। ब्राजील, कनाडा, जर्मनी और जापान के पास अत्याधुनिक परमाणु तकनीक है, उसी तरह जैसे भारत के पास है। पर एक अंतर है। उनके पास परमाणु शस्त्र नहीं हैं। क्या इस अंतर के बःदृष्टः; वजूद इन रा्ट्रों को मिलने वाली सभी सुविधाएं भारत को भी मिलेंगी? या भारत परमाणु शस्त्र वाला रा्ट्र होने के नाते जिम्मेदारियां तो उठाएगा, लेकिन उसे कोई लाभ नहीं दिया जाएगा ? ऐसी जटिल परिस्थितियों में इस समझौते पर रा्ट्र को विश्वास में लेने की हमारी मांग सामयिक है। परमाणु नीति रा ;ट्र की नीति है। किसी एक पार्टी या सरकार की नीति नहीं है। इस पर रा्ट्रीय आम-सहमति बनाने की आवश्यकता को कम करके आंका नहीं

जा सकता। हमें सरकार से यह अपेक्षा है कि इस समझौते को कार्यान्वित करते समय सदन को विश्वास में लेगी।

SHRI PRABODH PANDA (MIDNAPORE): Hon. Speaker, Sir, at the very outset, I must thank you as you have given me an opportunity to go with the discussion and make my submission on the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister in this august House about the recently signed agreement between our Prime Minister and the US President. I also got the opportunity to listen to the observation and submission made by the hon. former Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

This agreement has far reaching consequences particularly in the areas of nuclear energy and agriculture. It is a new thing that agriculture has also been included in this agreement. So far as our foreign policy is concerned, it is based on a strong foundation of Non-Alignment Policy which was initiated by none other than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He was the architect of the foundation of Indian foreign policy. Pandit Nehru viewed the central aim of Indian foreign policy and said that it had to be democratising external relations to make prosperous phenomenon and only public opinion can put nation States on to a vital role.

Since the days of Independence, right from the days of Nehru, India is broadly following this line, though we have witnessed the trend of weakening and diluting this stand overtly and covertly at different times. The recent Joint Statement and prior to that Indo-US Defence Framework seemed to have been a deviation from India's independent foreign policy of Non-Alignment and also from the spirit of the Common Minimum Programme of the UPA Government. Hence our party, the Communist Party of India, has expressed serious concern over the Joint Statement of 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2005 and also on the Indo-US Defence framework as well. It seems that this is a continuation of the pro-US shift which was initiated by the former India Government led by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. During the NDA regime we had noticed a trend of shifting to the US, diluting thereby the agreed national independent foreign policy. I am not going to recall those points in this context.

Our party, as a responsible national Left party, has remained opposed to the nuclear weaponisation programme which was initiated by the NDA Government after the 1998 nuclear tests at Pokhran. Our party does not subscribe to the view that advocates nuclear weaponisation as a path of India being a great power State. We have consistently been arguing that India should have an independent nuclear policy. It has been our constant demand. It was the BJP-led Government at the Centre that first had shown the willingness to be a junior partner of the US in exchange of India being recognised as a nuclear weapon State by them without acquiring the legitimate position in the nuclear club. Today, even in course of his submissions, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has also pointed out the something.

The current agreement is a continuation of that. It marks the end of India's independent disarmament nuclear policy. It should be noted that the US neither supported our claim for a Membership in the UN Security Council, nor has recognised India as a nuclear weapon power, but merely, as mentioned by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, as a State with advanced nuclear technology. It should be noted that though India reciprocally agreed to stop nuclear testing, there has been no such commitment made by the US. It has been told that India has joined the free world and it has

graduated from being a victim of discrimination to having a beneficiary status. Now we are investing our deep faith upon the Bush Administration that attacked and damaged heavily countries like Afghanistan and Iraq. We know their track record. We also know that they are continuing with blockade against Cuba and there is even apprehension of an attack being launched on North Korea.

There is an apprehension of attack on North Korea. We know their aggressive role all over the world. But in the prevailing global scenario, while USA has appeared as a more aggressive super power in the so-called unipolar world, attacking and destroying every democratic norms, and denying international democratic norms, it is ironical that our Prime Minister has signed a joint statement with President Bush with a great hope to create an international environment conducive to the promotion of democratic values. What is painful is that with a stroke of a pen, India has become something more than a major non-NATO ally of the US. Is it in consonance with our independent Non-Alignment Foreign Policy which was initiated by no less a person than Pandit Nehru? The essence of Non-Alignment Policy is anti-imperialism. But this agreement and the recognition of USA is that India is supposed to be a junior partner of USA and something more than a non-NATO ally. Is it not a deviation?

If we come to global energy stability, the question arises whether our interest is in alignment with those of the US. We have friendly relations with Myanmar and Iran. Both these countries have gas reserves that are vital for our energy security. I recollect that hon. Minister, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, envisages to launch the novel project of India-Myanmar gas pipeline. But is there any possibility which exists after this agreement? There is enough ground of suspicions and apprehensions in this respect.

May I refer to the Prime Minister's address in Jakarta on the occasion of Africa-Asia Summit? In this respect, he told that the framework within which we produce and consume energy is determined elsewhere.

**14.23 hrs.** (Mr. Deputy-Speaker *in the Chair*.)

I do not know what did he mean by 'elsewhere'. Whom did he want to point out? He said that we must end this anomaly. But it is quite amazing to us that his assertion to the Editor of *Washington Post* is quite different as he made a remark that the proposed Iran-India gas pipeline was fraught with risks. Why did he make such remarks? It is not understandable to us. I think he himself should clarify this point in this august House. May I ask the UPA Government as to whether a plan has been contemplated or envisaged to launch the Iran-India gas pipeline? Does it still stand? It is because he has said that it is fraught with risks. It would be an acid test for the Prime Minister and the Government so far as democratizing the international scenario with the help of this agreement is concerned.

Let me come to the issue of terrorism. Yes, terrorism is a factor of world concern. It has now become a world phenomenon. We have been suffering from that. We have been facing the challenge of terrorism and extremism in our own country. There is no doubt about that. But that does not mean that terrorism was explored only after 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2001, when the World Trade Centre was demolished in the USA. Was there no symptom of terrorism before 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2001? Take the case of Osama Bin Laden. Who created that person? Who created that extremist outfit? It was created by none other than the USA itself. Is Bush administration not constantly patronising

terrorism in Latin America till today? Who designed plans to assassinate Mr. Fidel Castro? It was the USA, which did it.

Our hon. Prime Minister might be aware of the fact that the Bush administration had refused to hand over Luis Posada Carriles, who is one of the most notorious terrorists in Latin America. It is clear to us that the USA is willing to bind other countries in the name of fighting terrorism when it serves their own interests. Regarding terrorism, and terrorist activities in border areas, we have been talking of cross-border terrorism for several years. We have been talking about problems of Jammu and Kashmir for several years. What is the attitude of the USA towards Kashmir? Still they think that Kashmir is a disputed area. They want to have their presence in that area, which is called the PoK, the Pakistan occupied Kashmir.

Sir, let me be allowed to come to the agreement with regard to agriculture. It is very interesting. Both leaders, our Prime Minister and the President of the USA agreed to launch an "US-India Knowledge Initiative on Agriculture" which will focus on promoting teaching, research, service and commercial linkages. The Memorandum of Understanding on Science and Technology has made it clear that teaching and research would focus on bio-technology or genetic engineering, which is often referred to as second Green Revolution. This is not the first time that the US-driven agriculture agenda is being imposed on India. The Green Revolution was introduced forty years ago. We have gathered much experience since the first initiative on Green Revolution, particularly in Punjab and some other States. Has it not fuelled terrorism and extremism in eighties in Punjab? That was the outcome of the Green Revolution.

It was the Green Revolution – the US-driven Agriculture Agenda. While our leaders and the President resolve to combat terrorism relentlessly, they are promoting the technologies and trade models which serve the US corporate interests and destroy farmers' livelihood security, thus becoming the breeding ground of terrorism.

Sir, while Indian scientists and policy-makers are working out self-reliant and ecological alternation for the generation of agriculture in India, another vision of agricultural development was taking shape in American Foundation and aid agencies. There are three groups, which is known to everyone, of international agencies involved in transferring the American model of agriculture to India. One is the private American Foundations, the USA Government and the World Bank. The Ford Foundation had been involved in 1952. The Rockefeller Foundation had been involved since 1953. What is the vision? The vision was based not on cooperation with nature but on its conquest; not on the intensification of nature's process but on the intensification of credit and inputs like chemical fertilizers and pesticides; not on self-reliance but dependence; and not on diversity but uniformity. It is a deliberate attempt to shift India's agriculture research and agriculture policy from indigenous and colonial model to an exogenous and high input one. So, this is about agriculture.

For us, the agreements are instruments of corporate dictatorship and they are not instruments of democracy. They will fuel more anger, more discontent and more frustration. What happened in Punjab? What happened in Andhra Pradesh? They are talking about fighting extremism but extremism is growing. They are fighting for democracy but democracy is gradually ignored.

Sir, we are talking about the root of terrorism in our democratic affairs. This is the child of economically unjust and anti-democratic policies. If the distressed people are not helped, then they

get violent. If they blame themselves, they direct violence inwards to commit suicides. If they blame others, they turn their violence outwards.

This is the violence of extremism. So far as our domestic affairs are concerned - in relation to facing the problems arising out of terrorism - the important solution in dealing with the terror is to increase people's freedom and security by protecting their livelihoods, their culture, their right to resources and their democratic choices in how their society and lives are organised. I think and I also apprehend that the India-US Agreement on Agriculture and Science and Technology will do the opposite.

Lastly, this is to mention in this context that we might be happy with a feeling that India is considered to be a junior partner of the USA. But a junior is a junior and no more than that. The USA is the main dominating force and will be dominating over us in every aspect in the global scenario to achieve their design and we have to succumb to their will. So, this is going far from our accepted, nationally agreed and independent foreign policy. Hence, this joint statement is quite unfortunate and it is contrary to our national tradition. Therefore, it is objectionable. I express my serious concern over this agreement.

Sir, our country is an important constituent of the developing countries of this world, particularly the developing countries which came into existence after the demise of colonialism. India happened to be the leader of the Non-Aligned Movement that was initiated by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and our former Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi happened to be the Chairperson of the Non-Aligned Movement. It was basically anti-imperialism. India can make remarkable stride to face the challenge of imperialism, to face the aggressive trend of the USA. Even in the UN also, if they can call all the developing countries to come together and stand unitedly on the present occasion, they can make remarkable strides. So, this situation demands that India should stand on the occasion and not to succumb to the USA in any respect.

This agreement is totally against the nationally accepted policy. So, I object it and I express my deep concern. I also demand from the hon. Prime Minister to clarify everything. What is painful to me is this. While he was in the USA, why did he go to the extent of making such a joint statement? Why did he not take this Parliament into confidence? Mr. Prime Minister, why have you not put the matter in Parliament? Why did you not take any opinion of this Parliament? I think the hon. Prime Minister will explain everything.

With these words, I come to the end of my speech. I must end my speech by saying that once again I thank the Chair, thank the hon. Deputy-Speaker as you have permitted me to speak on this occasion, to complete my speech.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (CHANDIGARH): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at the outset, I would like to say that analysts have termed the recent visit of the hon. Prime Minister to the United States as very successful, path-breaking, historic and epochal. I am sure, historians would do likewise. It was beginning with Shri Rajiv Gandhi's visit to the United States some twenty years back that there has been a paradigm shift in our relations with the United States. Gradually, over the years, we have built upon that. In this context, I would not fail to acknowledge the role of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee as Prime Minister also. During his visit to the United States in 2001 and later while unveiling the next steps in strategic partnership in January 2004, he identified civilian nuclear activities, civilians space programmes and high technology trade as key areas of bilateral cooperation.

What saddens me today is this. Sir, I find a change in the attitudes with mere shifting of places, with mere swapping of sides. What saddened me further was that the hon. Prime Minister was still on the American soil when hon. Member Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee chose to criticise the Joint Statement. The Prime Minister in his suare manner could react to that only by saying that, perhaps, all the facts were not before the hon. leaders back home. I am surprised today that after seeing the Statement that is with us; after we knew the importance of it; after it had been universally acknowledged and acclaimed; we are still finding fault with it. At the same time, let me hasten to add that I must thank Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee that he has not let his back room boys to do the job for him. They did it earlier for him and he had to pay the price. Today, he has confined himself to only a few concerns. I think it is legitimate to express those concerns and it is for us to discuss those here. It would be my endeavour to try to refer to those. It may not be in that fine manner as he would articulate his feelings but I would certainly like to dwell on that. Before that, let me say, what really impelled us for this. What are the gains that we derived out of this visit and the Joint Statement and Agreement that the Prime Minister has entered into with President Bush?

It is a fact that today India is accepted as a global power and India's geo-political importance is recognised all over the world. We are on the threshold of making much bigger strides in our economic development. In that scenario if a country like the United States feels that it is mutually beneficial, it would synergise the efforts of the two countries if we get together and agree on certain things. What are those things? Are those detrimental to our interest? For once, we feel that keeping in view the amount of hydro carbons, the amount of fossil fuels that we have to import and the heavy import bills that we have to pay there, time has come for us to really rely more purposefully on nuclear energy.

I was referring to the NSSP unveiled by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee there. That was a major initiative, a step forward but that was again limited by the technology denial regime of the United States. It was way back in 1978 that they amended their law. The United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was amended by the Nuclear Non-proliferation Act of 1978 under which India was categorised as a non-nuclear weapon State and thus subject to "full scope safeguards". That was the limitation placed even when Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee unveiled the NSSP. Today, during this visit of the Prime Minister, the United States has agreed to amend its domestic laws. We have not accepted "full scope safeguards". I am sorry, the words being repeatedly used by the hon. Member from the other side were 'India has agreed to reduce itself to a junior partner'. Where does he infer this from the Joint Statement? Everywhere the emphasis is only on these words, 'on the basis of equality and reciprocity'.

It has been repeatedly said. Sir, a point was made out – not in the House today but outside – that, maybe, we are being bound in a trap. "We have agreed to certain things. The United States might as well back out of it". Where do they infer this from? Please look at the emphatic statement of the Prime Minister. Sir, I would only like to refer to one or two lines therefrom.

"We have ensured the principle of non-discrimination. I would like to make it very clear that our commitments would be conditional upon, and reciprocal to, the United States fulfilling its side of this understanding. The Joint Statement refers to our identifying, and separating Indian civilian and military nuclear facilities in a phased manner and taking a decision to place voluntarily civilian nuclear facilities under the IAEA safeguards. India will never accept discrimination."

Indian actions will be contingent at every stage on actions taken by the other side. Should we not be satisfied that our interests are fully secured? We shall not feel pressed to move ahead in a pre-determined manner. What more could we expect? Where is the question of junior partnership? There is no element, no streak of subsidiarity anywhere in this. India has entered into this agreement keeping in view our interests – to have unlimited access to nuclear fuel technology and all that we need to advance, enhance our nuclear power generation.

The hon. Atal Behari Vajpayee has expressed his serious concern about our agreement to separate civil and nuclear military facilities. Sir, I do not know what really makes him so pessimistic about it. It is again the refrain of the agreement. In fact, Sir, there was no discussion or whatever on NPT. We stand firm on our approach to NPT. There was no discussion about our installations as such. What we have simply agreed is this. The benefit that we derived is immense. Explicitly, it may not be that India has been recognised as a nuclear-weapon State. That was not the intent of the visit or the Joint Statement. Explicitly, the admission from the US is that India has been recognised as a responsible State with an advanced nuclear technology. What is implicit therein is that the benefit that would accrue to us would be more like as a nuclear-weapon State. What are those? They are the right to decide which facilities are of military significance, and thus outside the purview of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). It is for us to decide. The Prime Minister said that in a phased manner, we will declare as to what is there. I do not have to remind the House about that. A military facility can very well be used at any time for civil purposes. At the same time, it is our prerogative, it is our sovereign right, to take out any time any civilian facility out of the domain of civilian category and treat it as a military one. That is our right.

The other benefit, Sir, is that others have accepted the responsibility in a strictly non-discriminatory manner. That is the same as nuclear-weapon States. That would be the status of India thereafter. I suppose – if I am not mistaken – there was a reference to the Fissile Material Cut Off Treaty. It was said that we had immense stocks of thorium, and that was enough for us. That has not been denied. What has been said is the reiteration of our nuclear programme, that is, a three stage nuclear programme consisting of Pressurized Heavy Water Reactors in the first stage, Fast Breeder Reactors in the second stage and Thorium Reactors in the third stage.

Sir, it has been stated and an allegation has been levelled – that is what saddens me – that we compromised with our independent nuclear policy. Where do we infer that from the Joint Statement and the Statement made by the Prime Minister in this House? It will not do us good if we create such doubts in the minds of the people on this vital subject. We, keeping in view the interests of the country, have agreed to a specific thing, that is, inspections by IAEA. Placing ourselves under the guidance of the IAEA is only for our civilian facilities. We stand firm – and it has been reiterated by the Prime Minister in no uncertain words – that we have to decide as to what is our strategic need and how we go about it. There is no compromise on our minimum deterrent. Where do we infer that from? Rather that has been accepted by the US that India has reached that stage and that is our sovereign right.

Sir, a point was made that the Parliament and the country should have been taken into confidence before the Prime Minister ventured to talk to the US President. If this argument were to come from the other side six years back I could very well understand that. After having remained in Government for six long years I must honestly say I fail to appreciate this point from the other side. At the very first opportunity, the Prime Minister came to the House and made a statement that this is



the agreement that we entered into with the US and we are discussing it here now. Is it physically possible and desirable also that any negotiations that any Government wishes to enter into with any other Government must first be talked of in the House or in the country outside?

Sir, I do not want to refer to the past incidents. When Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was the External Affairs Minister, did the country know about our talks with Israel and the visits then? Nobody raised a finger about it and said that the country should know about it and the Parliament should have been told as to who is visiting which place. The country was not even taken into confidence when the External Affairs Minister of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee's Government escorted foulmouthed terrorists to Kandahar. We did not say anything when they have taken that decision.

Sir, a reference has been made by Shri Prabodh Panda to the clause on agriculture in the Joint Statement. He is entitled to do that, but he has rushed to the conclusion that we are subordinating our efforts in promoting our agriculture to the US. He is talking of "three agencies which are at work for 24 hours to see that the US is able to overpower us".

Sir, the Statement made by the hon. Prime Minister in the House says:

"We discussed the urgent need for modernization of India's infrastructure and our quest for greater investments in this sector, in view of its centrality for the continued growth of the Indian economy. Recognising the importance of the rural economy,..."

This is what the UPA is constantly laying emphasis on.

That is the central point of our CMP. He says, "Recognising the importance of our rural economy, we also agreed on agricultural initiative aimed at facilitating a new generation of research and agricultural practices to build on the Green Revolution". This is the purpose, this is the intent. What do we need? He goes further, 'appreciating the importance'. The Statement appreciates the importance of technology to India's economic and social development. Is that anathema to our friends here?

We have to work for our development. We have made major strides. We have to build up on that. Genetic engineering, bio-technology are the fields of future and if we cooperate with somebody else who is willing to do it on equal terms, should that be shut? In what world we want to live today? Is it the old mindset that would continue to haunt us always?

With due respect I would say that in a changing, moving dynamic world, India cannot afford to remain static. We have to move with the world. I remember, there was enough criticism 12-13 years back when we were talking of GATT and the move to WTO. Similar allegations were being levelled against us that we were pledging our sovereignty to people outside. And who was more keen to really then go ahead with the WTO agreement? Was it by removing all the quantitative restrictions in one go? We could have waited for some more time, Sir.

I do not want to digress from the subject, but I only want to say that when there are certain important matters of national concern, those are the matters on which we really must get together. Here was an occasion, this visit was an occasion, I must say, when we derived from this immense benefits. When we talk of benefits and when we claim benefits, as a responsible State, we have to accept some responsibilities as well.

What are those responsibilities? The responsibilities are : recognising our status, recognising our *de facto* position in the world today, if those powers wish to treat us as other nuclear weapon state, should we object to that? If 30 year long regime of technology denial is being shattered today – and it has been shattered by this visit of the hon. Prime Minister – do we not wish to move forward therefrom?

I would only urge that in such a situation all that we really expect is, if not applause, at least, recognition, understanding of the situation. It is their initiation, I said that to begin with. I acknowledge that. It is from there that we moved forward. I am only surprised why occasionally our friends on the BJP side use or bring in Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to issue occasional statements on matters. As a senior statesman of the country, he is entitled to do it. We would like to benefit therefrom, but when there are certain matters, which we touch and I said, when the Prime Minister was on American soil, a statement was made, that does not do good to his reputation as an elderly statesman of this country. Permit me to say that. I am not entitled to say that but I feel so.

We have to really appraise the entire visit of the Prime Minister in the parameters in which it is. Where has it taken India today? How does the world look at us today? There is a reference to terrorism. Certainly, that is our cause of concern. We stood firm. The Prime Minister said there also that Iraq was a mistake and we stand firm on our policy on cross-border terrorism or anything. We have stood firm on saying that no third-party is required to mediate between the two countries on our problem here. But at the same time, we also have to recognise that it is because of the intrinsic worth of India's policies today that the UPA has taken up -- some counselling for sobriety to our neighbours. Who is doing it? It is because of the position that India commands today. It is said that we have given the command of our policies to others, we have lent it in the hands of others. When the world recognises the pre-eminent position of India, our friends here talk like this. That would do no good to the country.

I do not want to take much of your time. I would only like to urge our hon. friends here on both sides that on matters like this, there is the need of a consensus.

### **15.00 hrs.**

Going by all that has been said elsewhere – as I said – the analysts have talked of it, and the historians will talk of it tomorrow. It is time for us to all join hands and march ahead. I am sure India would continue marching ahead. This is one such initiative, one such step, which will take us miles ahead.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGHLY): Mr. Deputy-Chairman, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister in his statement has welcomed constructive criticism. It will be in the fitness of things that Parliament debates all aspects of such a very important development.

### **15.01 hrs.**

(Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav *in the Chair*)

I shall begin with one thing. Both the hon. Prime Minister as also the hon. Defence Minister visited the United States a few weeks back and a framework, a Defence agreement – maybe reiteration of some old things – was reached. But, both of them have underscored the changes in the attitude of the United States. What are the changes? Is it so that the America has changed; or the US Administration has changed; or we have changed or the world has changed? As you know, we are ardent students of the philosophy of change. What does this change mean? Does it mean that there

is no unilateralism; or the American world view has changed; or there is no hegemonistic desire; or the axis of evil is forgotten; or Iraq is very happy; or Iran is not being threatened? What is the change? If there is no change in American world view then why the other day John Bolton has been placed as the Ambassador to the United Nations. Even the democrats are opposing it. Has America agreed to the minimum demands at the WTO-level in terms of the farm subsidy or whatever it is? In the name of multilateralism they are pursuing protectionism. In our issue of Mode-4, of free movement of natural persons, so many impediments have been created. I was just wondering when Pawan Kumar Bansalji was speaking as to how the world will look at it. We have been pursuing vigorously that this is the Asian Century. The 21<sup>st</sup> Century is for Asia.

We have been pursuing vigorously trilateralism. China, India and Russia can do wonders. The Shanghai understanding for multilateral, multi-polar world is there. How will they look at it? How will the G-90 countries or the G-20 countries look at it? I do not think it is surrender, but what appears is that it is a continuation of a trend of tilting towards strategic partnership with America. It has not happened overnight. It has been happening and it has reached a dramatic stage, to an apparently radical stage. Some admirers of the Government say that they are supporting it. There is personal admiration for the hon. Prime Minister. It is not a case of any individual success or failure; it relates to the Government policies. Is it built on national consensus? Is it in conformity with the independent foreign policy that was underscored in NCMP? That is the point before us. To make this experienced quotation in an ardent manner: "Has USA changed its views, its colour?" The answer is : "No."

It is not our experience. But certainly they are agreeable to accommodate us on issues which could not be settled for more than three decades. The sanctions have been continuing unilaterally. In four or five areas they have lifted the sanctions. That is very generous. Even the very next day, when the joint statement was made, the U.K., the closest partner of America, came out with a statement, "We will continue the sanctions." This is a big question. Why are they politically doing this? It is obviously to contain China, as a counter balance in Asia and to use India *vis-à-vis* China. China has not come out openly. No one has made any comment. But when we agree to the policing of the sea land, except Singapore who had agreed to the U.S. proposal? Malaysia was against it. All the littoral States were against it. How will they take it? Will they not take it that India is a big brother? We are trying to win over our neighbours diplomatically, through economic diplomacy and through various means. I compliment this Government that they are doing very well, they are trying to do their best to win over our neighbours. We have confidence in them. In such a situation, you may be euphoric. We are not against any just, equitable, and balanced relation with anyone. There is no American phobia. We do not say that. We have no phobia like that but it should be balanced, it should be equitable and it should be just. Is it going to be like that?

The Prime Minister made a point that wide range of issues have come up. Firstly, let us take up the initiative with regard to bilateral democracy with a country which does not have the least faith in any democracy, any sovereignty of the world? Till now, what is the fate of Iraq? What is the fate of Afghanistan? What is the fate of many countries? For decades the blockade is continuing on Cuba. We have to learn democracy from them and that too bilateral democracy. How will the people world-over take it? Had it been under the United Nations' banner? Yes, it can be done. It is a continuation of the community of democrats theory of the Clinton administration which the NDA Government had agreed to. It is a continuation. How do you demarcate yourself from the earlier

Government which had been surrendering to the American pressures? Every morning and every evening, secret deals were made. That secrecy was continuing. ... (*Interruptions*)

I shall come to that. We know how the earlier Government had been engaged in secret deals. At least they had the guts to come out with a *suo motu* statement. They had the guts, which had failed them. It was secret. They had not explained. We had demanded it. They are all national chauvinistic. They said: "In Pokhran we have done this and that." Is it not this national chauvinism isolated them? With a few bombs, you cannot win the hearts of the people in the world. India has always been committed to peaceful use of atomic energy from the days of Pandit Nehru. But unfortunately, without a full-fledged discussion with all the partners of UPA and with the supporters of the Government, we think that something has been done which has a serious implication.

Shri Rajiv Gandhi was for comprehensive disarmament. He was always speaking like that. He was saying, "We have a heritage. We have a legacy." I was going through the speeches of our late friend, Shri Madhavrao Scindia on this very floor.

I was reading our Prime Minister's speech which was made in the other House. What will happen to nuclear disarmament? I do not say that whatever is being done is wrong. But the Government must explain, convince that there is no deviation from our committed nuclear policy for peaceful means. We have an independent Nuclear Policy. We cannot be client to anyone. We cannot subjugate ourselves to any terms and conditions. The Government owes it to the nation to explain this categorically. I believe the Prime Minister has tried to do that by saying that it is conditional and it is based broadly on reciprocity, on the basis of mutual benefits. It will be done in a phased manner. If they do not act in the right manner, then we have the autonomy, the right to proceed independently according to our national interest. He has clarified that. I appreciate that clarification.

But I believe there are certain areas where more confusion has been created. Take for example anti-terrorism. The State, which has been practising day in and day out State terrorism, trampling the rights of sovereign States, is speaking about anti-terrorism. Till they started their programme of anti-terrorism campaign, what had happened? Has it died down? Has it been reduced? It is rearing its head in newer and newer places. It has come to London. Why? There is something wrong in their approach. People the world over do not believe them. They look into their national interest.

So long as I am not touched and I am not hurt, everything is all right; I will support this; I will support Iraq against Iran; I will support Iran against Iraq. I will create one Osama bin Laden but when he is not serving me, I will call him as a terrorist. Have they stopped this double standard, dichotomy and hypocrisy? This is the question which needs to be answered on the floor of this House. Have they changed their worldview? Have they changed their uni-lateralism? No, they have not changed.

Now, about our nuclear defence deal, we are proud of our scientists. From the days of Dr. Homi Bhabha, even in the face of hurdles, impediments, our scientists have done wonders. If it does not sound exaggeration, our scientists are capable of doing things which others will take generations to achieve. Those who have some idea about the level of our scientists would say that they should be given independence. Nothing should be done which may create some doubts in their minds about our independent atomic energy programme and about our independent nuclear programme.

I am not going deep into the cost of separation of military use from the civilian use or subjecting the civilians. We need our nuclear energy. But what about our independent programme? The nation needs to be assured categorically that whatever we have built up in the process, maybe, in different phases—first stage, second stage, thorium stage—should never be dismantled in the name of allowing ourselves to the scrutiny of the international authority. It is our independent programme. Those who do not believe in equity and those who want discriminatory and unequal NPT are doing these things.

What is happening? If you have oil, you are charged that you have also bomb because I want oil. If I have got oil and bomb, I will be threatened. It is happening in Iran. If you have bomb but no oil, they are proceeding. Why? It is not only the case of India. They want the energy market. The American military industrial complex wants the Indian energy, nuclear market.

Then again the conditions are there. What will happen? How the Congress will behave? He says that he will assure them; he will prevail on the nuclear suppliers group. If otherwise happens, will it be annual waiver on the Presidential authority subjecting to constant monitoring and subjugation, that if we do not behave properly like a good boy, next year the annual waiver is not going to be there. These are the issues which have happened with many other countries.

Now, the issues of nuclear deal and the annual waiver are there. Of course the Prime Minister has clarified all the conditions. If you do not proceed in the right track and right direction, we shall have the authority, the right, the autonomy and the independence to go out. It is for reciprocity. This is okay. The statement of the Prime Minister during the visit to USA is not to be seen in isolation. A few years back there was another very important visit of the Defence Minister of India. It goes by the name of framework agreement. It was nothing less than eyeing the Indian weapons market by the US Military Industrial Congress. What is our experience from the days of Pandit Nehru? Can we depend on them at the time of crisis? Has US any time been along with us, supporting us or standing by our side whether it is Bangladesh incidence or the case of any other conflict with any other in our neighbourhood? All along they have consistently been supporting our neighbours. They are waiving all sanctions and giving them billions and billions of economic aids to the neighbours. They are giving them F-16 and creating an atmosphere of arms race to fight with each other. Are we to believe such a country? Are we to believe the same people who have been behaving in the most hegemonistic manner? Here, we have some doubt.

I am just to put two things in contradiction. Ms. Condoleeza Rice openly stated that they are against the Iran-Pakistan-India Gas Pipeline. With what authority they have stated that. She has openly stated that they are against it because of some sanctions on Libya and Iran some time in 1996 and all these things. They do not want this Gas Pipeline project. I am a great admirer of the Petroleum Minister, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar. I admire the way he has been functioning. Really I praise him for all the things that he has been achieving. In such a situation, we are really disheartened when the Prime Minister made an observation to the Washington Post that the Pipeline involves risk. Then the Prime Minister should see that what international consortium would come to our aid. Then, there is an observation. I think the Prime Minister will not mind it. Iran is a friend of ours. Immediately, after this UPA Government came to power, they have been waxing eloquent on Iran but we made certain observations. How will Iran react to it? That is another way of losing friends. That is not the way of winning people and friends but losing friends. It should not happen. I apologize to the Prime Minister because I am a great admirer of Dr. Manmohan Singh. He made a comment. But I am

amazed to find that the BJP is criticizing the Congress. BJP has all along been engaged in secret deals. The discussion of Mr. Talbott and Shri Jaswant Singh had not been made public. Now, when they have been asked to sit down, they are crawling. They have to make it clear. Yes, there are secret deals. Now, they are criticizing the Congress.

The Congress Party, at least, has a history of anti-imperialism, great association with the freedom struggle and the foreign policy that was built up around non-alignment by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. We also remember Shri Rajiv Gandhi. ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Would you please yield for a moment? ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I am not yielding.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : You said two things. You spoke about two things: the Pokharan explosions which attracted sanctions and the NDA crawling before the United States. ... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : No interruptions please. Please take your seat, Mr. Swain.

... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : If we had dared the sanctions and gone ahead with the nuclear tests, why would we have crawled before the United States? So, tell us which one is correct? ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I am not yielding, Mr. Swain.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Swain, please sit down.

... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Rupchand Pal, please continue with your speech.

... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : He is taking my time. I have not yielded.

... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing would go on record except the speech of Shri Rupchand Pal.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : The hon. Prime Minister said that it was a great success but I am sorry to mention that it is not, if I use a litmus test about American recognition of our growing power as the largest economy and as a global power today. When the hon. Prime Minister proceeded to America, he said the he shall prevail on the American Administration for supporting our cause at the United Nations Security Council. Very unfortunately, even as the hon. Prime Minister was there, they openly supported Japan and isolated us. There was not a single word of recognition that India

should have a rightful place in the Security Council as a Permanent Member. It is dichotomy; it is hypocrisy; it is a case of applying double standards.

For gaining access to our energy market, they are saying many things. For gaining access to our weapons market, they are entering into many agreements. But India is not getting the due recognition, which is not required to be given at the mercy of others - when it comes to Permanent Membership of the UN Security Council. They have not said a word in recognition of India but supported Japan openly. If you still want to consider it a successful visit, I am sorry. I have great admiration for the hon. Prime Minister. It is not individual success or individual greatness but the policy of the Government which matters. The Government needs to do some introspection.

Coming to the agreement on science and technology, the United States is a country which has all along been, for the very wrong reasons, standing in our way of development. Our eminent scientists who have been acclaimed internationally have been blacklisted by them. So, you are not to visit this country; you are not to address the students of its universities. Till now, both in the UK and in the US,

there are long lists blacklisting our own scientists about whom we are proud. The ban has been lifted only in respect of five; there are hundreds of them more who are on the blacklists. In the universities of the UK and America, there are lists of these scientists. They are not allowed to do even innocent research, which has nothing to do with atomic energy or nuclear research. So, are we to believe them?

De-hydrocarbonisation is a welcome step. It is also proposed to increase the share of nuclear energy in energy generated from three per cent to 26 per cent. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Rupchand Pal, please conclude now.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, I am concluding.

Clean technology is okay; cheap and affordable technology is okay, we must have energy security – it is okay. But, on the one hand you are still prevailing upon saying ‘we will not allow Iran gas to be brought to India’ and on the other hand saying ‘yes, you proceed with your nuclear energy programme; you give it to us, let us scrutinise your civilian nuclear energy’. This is sheer hypocrisy. We are not against bilateral relations. I repeat that. But it must be balanced. It must be equitable. It must be fair. It must not be done in such a manner that we lose more friends, trusted friends who had stood by us in times of crisis, the ties that we are developing in the Asian century. If anyone thinks that everything America is doing is to counter-balance China trying to use India, it will send a wrong message. So, in the interest of multilateralism, in the interest of multi-polarity, in accordance with our legacy of non-alignment, we must be careful.

The hon. Prime Minister has cautioned that we are very careful, it will be conditional, it will be on the basis of reciprocity, it will be in a phased manner. But still I believe that this Government will send a right signal to our neighbours, to China, Russia, Iran and Iraq – our trusted friends – that we are not accommodating America at the cost of our old, trusted friendship. Such a signal is essential for our economic diplomacy, for WTO, for any other bilateral and multilateral activities that we are moving the nation towards the right goal.

With these words, with this caution once again, I believe that the hon. Prime Minister should not take it as a personal failure or a personal success. The Government is committed to its independent foreign policy and if there is any deviation, the clarification will have to be given on the floor of this House so that the nation may know that the UPA Government is a different Government and they have an independent foreign policy not like the NDA Government who, when told by America to crawl, they instantly did that.

With these words, I conclude and thank you very much.

प्रो. राम गोपाल यादव (सम्भल) : श्रीमन्, माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी ने जो अमेरिकी यात्रा के बाद यहां बयान दिया था, जिसके ऊपर यह चर्चा चल रही है। इस चर्चा में मैंने अपने कई मित्रों को यहां सुना। जब भी कोई राज्याध्यक्ष या कोई एग्जीक्यूटिव हेड कहीं जाता है, तो नेचुरली कुछ न कुछ संबंध बनते हैं, कभी ज्यादा और कभी कम बनते हैं। उन पर अलग-अलग किस्म की रियेक्शन्स भी होती हैं। जो कि स्वाभाविक भी है, ह्यूमन नेचर है। मैं जब अभी अपने सभी मित्रों को सुन रहा था, तो मुझे अल्बर्ट आइंस्टीन की थ्योरी आफ रिलेटिविटी याद आ गई। जब उन्होंने टाइम और स्पेस को भी रिलेटेड बताया था, तो लोगों को कुछ अजीब लगा था, लेकिन हम सब जानते हैं कि उनकी मास एनर्जी रिलेशन ने ही अंतोगत्वा न्यूक्लियर फ्यूजन के लिए रास्ता साफ किया और बाद में सारी दुनिया में एटम बम वगैरह जो भी न्यूक्लियर वैपन बने, वह उसका आधार था। इसलिए मैं यह कह रहा हूँ अध्यक्ष जी कि आप अभी यहां मेरे सामने बैठे हुए हैं, मैं आपको इस डॉयरेक्शन से देख रहा हूँ, तो आपका मुस्कराता हुआ चेहरा दिख रहा है, लेकिन इस तरफ से जो दृष्टि रख रहे हैं, उनको उस तरह से आप नहीं दिख रहे हैं। दूसरी तरफ से जो देख रहे हैं, उनको भी आप उस तरह से नहीं दिख रहे हैं। इसलिए स्वाभाविक है कि प्रधानमंत्री जी की यात्रा और उसके बाद का जो बयान है, उस पर भी अलग-अलग तरह की रियेक्शन्स होंगी। प्रेस में भी आई। हमने प्रेस में एक कार्टून देखा है जो मुझे अच्छे टेस्ट का नहीं लगा। एक एटम बना है, ऑरबिट्स बने हैं जिसे साइंस के स्टूडेंट्स जानते हैं। इलेक्ट्रॉन ऑरबिट में घूमता है। उसमें लिखा है कि यह बेचारा इलेक्ट्रॉन ऑरबिट में आना चाहता है, अपनी कक्षा में आना चाहता है और कहता है कि अपनी कक्षा में ले लो, उस इलेक्ट्रॉन को प्राइम मिनिस्टर के रूप में दिखाया जाता है, जो अच्छे टेस्ट का नहीं था लेकिन फिर भी मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि कुछ ऐसी बातें हैं जो विल्डह द्रष्टुः/दास्पद हैं जिन पर बहुत चर्चा चली है लेकिन मैं उस पर सबसे बाद में आऊंगा। लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री जी की कांग्रेस के सामने कही गई बात हो, चाहे प्रेस के सामने कुछ मुद्दों पर कही बात हो वह निश्चित रूप से उनकी जो सोच है, जिस की लोग तारीफ करते हैं, उसके मुताबिक है। जब उन्होंने प्रेस में यह कहा कि ईराक पर अमेरिका का हमला एक भूल थी। अद्भुत दृष्टुः/प सब जानते हैं कि इसी सदन में जब यह प्रस्ताव लाया गया कि अमेरिका की निन्दा की जाए तो कई दिन इस बात पर विवाद रहा। इधर के लोग उस समय सरकार में थे, कंडैम नहीं डिप्लोर शब्द का प्रयोग हुआ। कई दिन निन्दा शब्द पर झगड़ा चला। अन्तोगत्वा समझौता यह हुआ कि हिन्दी में निन्दा और अंग्रेजी में डिप्लोर शब्द का प्रयोग किया जाए क्योंकि हिन्दी वे लाः द्रष्टुः/ग जानते नहीं हैं, अंग्रेजी पढ़ेंगे तो ज्यादा बुरा न मानें। मैं प्रधान मंत्री को इस बात के लिए धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि अमेरिकन्स के सामने जाकर उन्होंने कहा कि ईराक पर जो हमला किया, वह आपकी गलती थी। यह मामूली बात नहीं है। इसी तरह से प्रेस में अमेरिकन कांग्रेस में टैरिज्म पर सिलैक्टिविटी की बात कही, यह भी बहुत अच्छी बात द्रष्टुः/ह है। क्या इसका यह अर्थ नहीं है कि अमेरिका का दोहरा मापदंड है। एक तरफ सारी दुनिया में टैरिस्ट्स भेजने वाले पाकिस्तान की मदद की जाती है और दूसरी तरफ टैरिज्म के खिलाफ लड़ने की बात होती है। इसका यही अर्थ हो सकता है या दूसरा अर्थ भी हो सकता है ? टैरिज्म पर कोई सिलैक्टिविटी न हो, इसका और क्या इंटरप्रिटेशन हो सकता है द्रष्टुः/इसका यही इंटरप्रिटेशन है। तो मैं यह कहूंगा कि यह बहुत साहसिक, सही कदम है और जिन पर यह लागू होता है, उनके सामने प्रधान मंत्री ने बात कही। मैं इसलिए प्रधान मंत्री की तारीफ करना चाहूंगा।

जहां तक सुरक्षा परिषद की सीट का सवाल है। सुरक्षा परिषद की सीट के लिए लगातार प्रयास किए गए हैं। आज अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में जो हिन्दुस्तान की स्थिति है, उसमें इस तरह की मांग करना आवश्यक भी है।

जहां तक वीटो पावर का सवाल है, हम जानते हैं कि इसका विरोध होगा लेकिन सुरक्षा परिषद की सदस्यता भी अपने आप में इसलिए महत्वपूर्ण हो जाती है कि अगर वह मिलती है तो हर वक्त, हर महत्वपूर्ण मसले पर अपनी बात कहने के लिए, अपना पक्ष रखने के लिए या दुनिया में कहीं भी अन्याय हो रहा है तो उसके खिलाफ अपनी बात कहने के लिए, हमारा दृष्टुः/प्रतिनिधि रहेगा। सुरक्षा परिषद में वीटो पावर के बाद भी अगर कोई प्रस्ताव गिर जाता है तो जो यूएन चार्टर है, सब जानते हैं कि उस प्रस्ताव को जब सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल टर्न डाउन कर देती है, वीटो की वजह से, तो जनरल असैम्बली दो तिहाई बहुमत से उस प्रस्ताव को पारित कर सकती है। इसलिए सुरक्षा परिषद में आगे क्या होता है लेकिन हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कई



जगह, जहां यात्रा पर गए, वहां यह मामला उठाया, विदेश मंत्री जहां गए, वहां यह मामला उठाया। उन्होंने बड़े पैमाने पर दुनिया भर में समर्थन जुटाने का काम किया जिससे देश संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की सुरक्षा परिषद का सदस्य बन सके जो एक अच्छी बात है।

जहां तक ईरान पाइप लाइन का सवाल है। मैं फिर से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि सिद्धान्त और व्यवहार में बहुत फर्क होता है। कई बार जो चीजें जैसी दिखायी देती हैं, वैसी होती नहीं हैं और जैसी होती हैं, वैसी दिखायी नहीं देती हैं।

अगर प्रधानमंत्री जी ने कहा जैसा मैंने कहीं पढ़ा है कि यह एक कठिन काम है, तो क्या गलत था? अगर पाकिस्तान गारंटी ले कि वहां से आने वाली पाईपलाईन सुरक्षित रहेगी, जनरल मुशरफ कहे कि सुरक्षित रहेगी तो क्या इसकी गारंटी है कि वह सुरक्षित रहेगी? अपने पड़ोसी देश के राष्ट्रपति के लगातार आश्वासनों और बयानों के बाद भी न वृहद्द्वन्द्व, नेवल हिंदुस्तान में बल्कि बाहर भी आतंकवादी जाकर क्या-क्या कर रहे हैं। हमारी पार्लियामेंट पर हमला हो गया, लालकिले पर हो गया, कश्मीर की विधान सभा पर हो गया और अब अयोध्या तक पहुंच गए हैं तो क्या पाकिस्तान में पाईपलाईन सुरक्षित रहेगी? अगर प्रधानमंत्री जी ने रिएलिस्टिक बात कही तो क्या इसकी आलोचना होगी? **It is a fact.** हजारों करोड़ रुपए बरबाद होने के बाद क्या एक दिन भी पाईपलाईन सुरक्षित रह सकती है? इसकी कौन गारंटी दे सकता है? अगर गारंटी ले तो क्या उस पर भरोसा किया जा सकता है कि पाकिस्तान गारंटी लेगा और पाईपलाईन सुरक्षित बनी रहेगी? वास्तविकता जो है उसके लिए सिद्धांतों पर तैरने की ज़रूरत नहीं है, वास्तविकता के धरातल पर देखकर ज़हद दृष्टि है उसे कहना चाहिए। इसलिए मैंने कहा कि यह अलग चीज़ है।

जहां तक विदेशनीति से डेविशन का सवाल है, इसके संबंध में बहुत लंबी बात नहीं कहूंगा लेकिन फिर भी यह कहना चाहता हूं कि नॉन-एलाइनमेंट क्या है। नॉन-एलाइनमेंट या असंलग्नता की नीति तब थी जब दुनिया दो बड़ी महाशक्तियों के बीच में विभाजित थी, एक सोवियत यूनियन और दूसरी यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स। तब यह कहा गया था कि दोनों महाशक्तियों के साथ जो कोई सैन्य संधि से नहीं जुड़ेगा वह नॉन एलाइन कंट्री होगा और इन नॉन एलाइन कंट्रीज़ का एक समूह होगा। नॉन-एलाइनमेंट मूवमेंट चला, बाडुंग सम्मेलन के बाद चला, नेहरू-नासिर-टीटो का एक गुट था, उस वक्त उसकी बहुत उपयोगिता थी। लेकिन जिस दिन से सोवियत यूनियन डिसइंटीग्रेट हो गया उस दिन के बाद यह बात एक दुर्घटनिक ज्यादा हो गई, रिएलिस्टिक कम रह गई है। अब कौन गुटनिरपेक्ष है और कौन-कौन सा गुट है? सोवियत यूनियन के डिसइंटीग्रेटेशन के बाद से कौन सा दूसरा गुट है कि इसमें जाएं और उसमें न जाएं? दुनिया में कभी एक दिन की कोई घटना विदेशनीति में कहीं न कहीं परिवर्तन कर देती है, किसी रीजन में परिवर्तन कर देती है, कहीं पर भी परिवर्तन इहदृष्टि कर देती है। जिस दिन हेनरी किसंजर गुपचुप तरीके से पाकिस्तान से चीन में गए, यह अनाउंस हुआ कि प्रेजीडेंट निक्सन अमेरिका की यात्रा करेंगे, क्या सारी दुनिया में नीतियों में परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ? क्या उसके बाद विदेशनीति में परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ? परिवर्तन हुआ और फिर एक बात मैंने इसी सदन में कही थी कि विदेशनीति का लिडरहद दृष्टि, उसका बेसिस देश का नेशनल इंटररेस्ट होता है। नेशनल इंटररेस्ट ही बेसिस है और जब राष्ट्रीय हित की बात आती है उस वक्त सिद्धांत और सारी चीज़ें सैकेंड्री हो जाती हैं। क्या यह सच नहीं है कि जब बांग्लादेश का लिब्रेशन, जो पूर्वी पाकिस्तान का मामला था उसमें तो एक मिलिट्री डिक्टेटर, जिसकी ज्यादातियाँ चल रही थीं, लाखों शरणार्थी हिंदुस्तान में आ रहे थे। तब जन आंदोलन का समर्थन हिंदुस्तान कर रहा था और जन आंदोलन के समर्थन के लिए जो प्रतिबद्ध साम्यवादी सिस्टम था उसका सबसे बड़ा देश चीन, उस मिलिट्री डिक्टेटर की हिंदुस्तान सुरक्षा परिषद में, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में मदद कर रहा था। सिद्धांत या नेशनल इंटररेस्ट कहां गया? इसलिए मैं कहता हूं कि नेशनल इंटररेस्ट सर्वोपरि है। नेशनल इंटररेस्ट में; फ़ैसले लिए जाते हैं, रिश्ते बनाए जाते हैं। हां, उसमें यह देखना आवश्यक है कि जिनसे आप रिश्ते बना रहे हैं, व्यक्ति से राष्ट्र तक उनका अतीत कैसा है।

यह सोचने की बात है कि जब जब भी हम दोस्त बनाते हैं, वे विश्वसनीय हों। जब कोई देश दूसरे देश से दोस्ती बढ़ाता है और रिश्ता बन जाता है तो उसकी पिछली आदत से जाना जा सकता है कि वह विश्वसनीय है या नहीं। वह हमारी वक्त पर मदद कर सकता है या नहीं? उससे मित्रता बढ़ाने से लाभ या हानि होगी? इस पर हमारी विदेश नीति की सफलता निर्भर करती है। इसी आधार पर हमारे शत्रु देश कम हों और हमारे मित्र देशों की संख्या बढ़े। यही राष्ट्र हित में है।

सभापति जी, अमरीका की बात चल रही है। मैं तीन घटनायें बताना चाहूंगा। एक हमदर्द देश में अच्छाइयां और बुराइयां दोनों हो सकती हैं। जब द्वितीय विश्व युद्ध में हिटलर बहुत अंदर तक रूस में घुस आया और रूस लगातार यह डिमांड कर रहा था कि अमरीका उसके विरुद्ध दूसरा फ्रंट खोले ताकि हिटलर की फौजों का डिवीजन हो और रूस पर दबाव कम हो लड़हद दृष्टि; किन अमरीका ने जानबूझकर दूसरा फ्रंट नहीं खोला क्योंकि वह चाहता था कि साम्यवादी देश रूस इतना बरबाद हो जाये कि वह खड़ा न हो सके। हालांकि मित्र देश उसके साथ थे लेकिन मित्रता के बावजूद अमरीका ने रूस को कमजोर करने की कोशिश की। इतिहास इस बात का गवाह है कि यदि कोई मित्र देश अच्छा काम नहीं करेगा तो लोग हमेशा उसकी न इहदृष्टि; निन्दा करेंगे।



यह अवश्य कहूँगा कि सारे देश में और खास तौर से साइंटिस्ट्स में यह गलत संदेश जा रहा है कि हम पर पाबंदी जैसी कोई चीज हो सकती है और यदि यह होता है तो माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी उससे लाभ होने की बजाय नुकसान होगा। इसलिए जो हमारा न्यूक्लियर प्रोग्राम है, उसके बारे में न्यूक्लियर साइंटिस्ट्स को कान्फिडेंस में लिये बिना हम यह नहीं समझ सकते कि उसका क्या परिणाम हो सकता है। मैंने अटल जी का बयान पढ़ा था और मैं उनसे सहमत हूँ। उन्होंने कहा था कि स्ट्रेटेजिक और नॉन-स्ट्रेटेजिक प्रोग्राम को अलग-अलग करना बहुत मुश्किल होगा। इन्हें आप कैसे अलग-अलग करेंगे। मैं स्वयं इसे समझ पाने में असमर्थ हूँ। मैं साइंस का स्टूडेंट रहा हूँ, मैंने फिजिक्स से एम.एस.सी. की थी। लेकिन यह बहुत अज्ञान काम नहीं है। यदि कहीं इसका निगेटिव इफैक्ट हुआ तो लाभ होने की बजाय उससे नुकसान हो सकता है।

इसलिए यह जो बात है जिस पर सारा सदन चिन्ता कर रहा है, इस पर बहुत सावधानी बरतने की जरूरत है। यदि कोई देश सोवरेन स्टेट होता है तो ऐसा नहीं होता है कि कोई देश उसकी गारंटी ले ले और वह गारंटी न रहे तो उसके खिलाफ मुकदमा कायम करें। सोवरेनिटी का मतलब क्या होता है? जॉ बोदा ने सोवरेनिटी की पहली परिभाषा दी थी: **"Sovereignty is the supreme power over subjects and citizens unrestrained by law"**. देश अगर सोवरेन है तो उसके ऊपर किसी का कानून नहीं चल सकता। इसलिए इस गलतफहमी में न रहें कि किसी ने गारंटी दी तो ऐसा होगा ही। अगर हमारे आणविक प्रतिष्ठानों को देखने की इजाजत दूसरों को होगी तो हमारे गांव में एक कहावत है कि - 'जानो गुइयां फूस बराबर'। कल्याण सिंह जी इस कहावत का अर्थ अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। इसका मतलब है कि जो मित्र होता है वह सब जानता है कि कहां हमारी मजबूती है और कहां कमजोरी है। यह नौबत मत आने दीजिए। ऐपेरेन्टली कुछ मामले ऐसे हैं जो साहसिक ढंग से आपने कहे, उसका हम स्वागत करते हैं, लेकिन देश के हित में न्यूक्लियर प्रोग्राम पर कहीं किसी तरह का कंप्रोमाइज़ नहीं होना चाहिए।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि इस महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर बोलने के लिए आपने मुझे बहुत समय दिया।

MAJ. GEN. (RETD) B. C. KHANDURI (GARHWAL): Sir, we are discussing hon. Prime Ministers' statement made on the 29<sup>th</sup> of July, 2005 on his recent visit to the USA. The statement basically relates to the Joint Statement between India and the USA, which is signed during his visit. I shall therefore try to give some views on the statement and then point out some areas where we feel a cause of concern in the Joint Statement. Before I do that, I am sorry to say, Mr. Prime Minister, that in the second para of your first sentence, what you have talked about is not very nice. In the first paragraph, you have talked about the "reception" that you have got. In the second paragraph, the very first line appears to be an act of "deception". You said that - "the purpose of my visit was to sensitise the US Government about the full extent of the changes that have taken place in India since 1991. Are you saying that between 1991 and till date nothing has been done and America does not know what is happening in India? It was for you to go there, then educate them, and tell them what we are. I think, this sentence does not go very well. It casts aspersion on everybody who is concerned with the Indian Government. You have not mentioned subsequently about the Clinton-Vajpayee Vision Document of 2000, the NSSP and various other things. It is amusing to hear Shri Rupchand Pal when he mentioned that you are following whatever the NDA Government did. On the other hand, I would say that you have taken very good care to ensure that whatever good the NDA Government did does not come near your Joint Statement or in your statement in Parliament. I do not think that it is a very generous way of dealing.

Foreign policy, as we all know, is a continuing process. I do not have to tell you that the Government accepts and appreciates whatever the past Government had done. This message does not come out of the Joint Statement or in your statement in Parliament.

The next thing which I desire but I will not mention it here is this. Previous speakers, and particularly, Prof. Ram Gopal Yadav has elaborated and deliberated on it that everything we do ought to be in the national interest. I am quite sure that you have been trying to do that but with a

different perspective. Therefore, I agree with Ram Gopalji that the message that is coming out of this Joint Statement is, to say the least, that we have not been the gainers.

**15.55 hrs.**

(Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan *in the Chair*)

राम गोपाल जी ने कहा कि पाबंदी लग गई है। यह पाबंदी ज्वायंट स्टेटमेंट के द्वारा प्रकट होती है। The Prime Minister has, of course, said many things in his statement. But, unfortunately, those things are not reflected in the Joint Statement.

Sir, he has used in his statement words like 'ensured', 'possibility', 'conditional', 'reciprocal', 'understanding' and 'protected'. The word 'reciprocal' has been used in a manner, very effectively. There are too many imponderables in the written Joint Statement Agreement which ought to have specifics and should not talk vaguely about this thing and that thing.

As far as the term 'understanding' is concerned, I am very chary and weary about it. We remember this. You are all very senior persons and you would also be knowing about it. Shri Natwar Singh might have been in the External Affairs Ministry then. We have heard about the so-called 'understanding' between Mr. Bhutto and late Shrimati Indira Gandhi after the 1971 war. We had a decisive victory in the 1971 war. About 91,000 prisoners were there. We were all expecting that this sort of a victory would certainly be able to solve our mutual problems and J&K was one of the main problems which we have been fighting. I do not know how far it is true. So, the term 'understanding' was circulated at that time also. What happened to that 'understanding'? It was lying in shambles within three months. Therefore, I do not know if we can trust any 'understanding' or any such terminology.

The second thing that has been stated -- Shri Rupchand Pal has also said on this and I agree with him on this one issue -- is that we must seek the equality in our dealings with other countries. In India, we have reached a stage with our own efforts, where we can stand up and tell the world that we want such and such thing. I think, the world today listens to us. After Pokhran-II and also liberalisation which has been taking place -- which he started in 1991 and the NDA Government followed it up very effectively and efficiently -- we have today, both in the field of strategic power and in the field of economic growth, reached a stage where we can, in a manner, in the national interest dictate terms. Unfortunately, that thing has not happened. Shri Pal has said amazingly about Pokhran-II that we were asked to bend but we crawled to USA. I think, his memory is very very short. In 1998, after Pokhran-II, the way we were threatened by all major powers including USA that they would impose all sorts of restrictions on us, but this country, NDA Government withstood those pressures. Therefore, such terms do no justice to anybody at all.

I may also remind that during the Kargil War when President Clinton asked our Prime Minister, hon. Shri Vajpayeeji to come to USA for discussion, the Prime Minister of Pakistan was already there. The Prime Minister at that time could tell, "I will not be coming now; I will come after I have driven out all the Pakistanis from Kargil and India." We had that sort of strength. In this Joint Statement, what we get is a lot of goodwill, lot of nice-sounding terms. But that does not bind them. Someone has just now raised it and I am repeating it, that if there is non-adherence to those terms then what can we do? In fact, they are not even guarantees; they are not even commitments. They are just 'understanding' as has been mentioned. Nowhere has it been said, in the entire Joint Statement, that USA is bound by such and such thing, whereas we have made lot of commitments. Therefore, the overall message that is coming out of this is not very good.

**16.00 hrs.**

Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, in para (6) of your statement, you have said:

"Accordingly, a central element of my interaction with President Bush was the resumption of bilateral civilian nuclear cooperation between India and the United States, which had been frozen for decades. "

I do not know, whether it is related specifically in only some civil cooperation or in other fields.

Similarly, you have stated:

"The US side undertook to adjust its laws and policies domestically and to work with its friends and allies to adjust relevant international regimes. "

I mean, we are committing and they are only undertaking to adjust their laws and policies, to work with friends and allies and encourage partners to whatever we want them to do! On the contrary whatever commitments we have taken, we have stated them in no uncertain terms.

Similarly, Sir, you have said:

"The US agreed to consult other participants with a view towards India's inclusion in the Generation IV International Forum. "

Them, similarly, Sir, at para (4) you have talked of our modest uranium resources and vast reserves of thorium, and these are, as per the other parts of the Agreement, are to be put under inspection. In this context, when we are trying to put our mines under inspection, obviously, the raw material gets limited, controlled and inspected, then we do not have the raw material. In that case, how do we have the finished product? Therefore, on this aspect even if we may have enough of mines and mettles, unless we have freedom to exploit them, I think, it is going to cause a lot of problems.

Mr. Prime Minister, in para (9) of your Statement, it is mentioned:

"The Joint Statement recognizes that as a responsible State with advanced nuclear technology, India should acquire the same benefits and advantages as other such States which have advanced nuclear technology. "

Subsequently, somewhere, it also says: "the same benefits as US has."

Now, with which country we are going to reckon with, as far as the benefits or whatever services we are going to take? Is it the USA? Or, is it one of the other countries, which have also got the capability – not at the same level as we have, as some other Members have brought out earlier. So, this again needs clarification. When you make commitment, what type of benefits are you going to get? Are you going to get all the benefits which USA has today, with all the powers and authorities on various issues? Or, are you going to be given only the crumbs?

Then, Sir, in your statement in para (7), you have also mentioned:

"...I would like to make it very clear that our commitments would be conditional upon and reciprocal to... "

You have used the term 'reciprocal' at number of places. But nowhere in the Joint Statement, we can find this.

Then, Sir, you have also said about various assurances that we are given and the commitments that we are given. You have also stated that what the USA is undertaking in terms of just their attempts or efforts, will also be discussed in future. The timeframe that comes out of this whole Joint Statement, somewhere is mentioned by using the term "in next few months" wherever at some other places it is stated like: "When the President of USA visits", which we understand may be early 2006. Are we going to complete all our commitments in this timeframe? Or, are we going to have any progress in this timeframe? Is America going to complete all its commitments including, consulting the allies, taking Congress' sanction for various things during this timeframe? Or, is this progress reporting going to be one-sided?

Mr. Prime Minister, similarly, in para (9), you have talked about 'reciprocity'. It is also mentioned there that: "Indian actions will be contingent at every stage on actions taken by the other side." It is very good. But if it was in the Joint Statement, then we would have been much more comfortable that you would take action only after they have completed; or at least, simultaneously. But nowhere does this message come in the Joint Statement.

In the statement in para (12), you have also said:

"..Before voluntary placing our civilian facilities under IAEA safeguards, we will ensure that all restrictions on India have been lifted. "

But how do you ensure this? Where is it in the Joint Statement? As somebody said, if even accepted things are not done, then you have, at least, a growse.

When nothing is being committed, when they have not made any effort or made any commitment, how do you say that you will not accept your commitments unless they have done this thing? I have talked to the Congress people but I have not been able to understand these things. In such a case, will you withhold your commitments? This needs to be clarified.

Now, I come to civil and military facilities. Prof. Ram Gopal Yadav has also talked on it. First of all comes the separation. How much is it possible? How will it be done? What are the implications as far as India is concerned? What is the timeframe? What will be the cost implication? What will be the implications on all other areas of development? These are the things that need to be clarified in greater detail.

In that context and also about Fissile Material Control Treaty, I would say that there appears to be a danger that we are trying to control the raw material or, at least, US is trying to ensure that we do not produce more than a certain quantity of raw material. If we accept that sort of conjecture, then how do you ensure that your strategic nuclear weaponry is available as per your requirement and not what America thinks is your requirement? This is causing a lot of concern.

In one of the paragraphs of the Statement, you have talked about commercial linkages. This is not clear. You may kindly explain to us namely what does this term 'commercial linkages' mean?

One of the paragraphs of the Statement deals with full civil nuclear energy cooperation. I do not know as to how this will be applicable because first NPT would come in. Then, we are not a Member of the NSG. Therefore, how will it get activated into action? It is not clear. You may kindly clarify that. Then what will be the consequences of non-adherence to the commitment? You may kindly clarify that also.

One major issue, I am again repeating it, is that what we are going to discuss and act on the progress when the President of United States visits here early next year.

Then you have talked about additional protocol. What would be its contents? How will we be affected by it? It is not clear in the Joint Statement or the other statement. You may clarify it.

Another aspect is this. Earlier, the country was talking, we said it voluntarily on our own, about nuclear moratorium. Now the term used is nuclear testing. I would like you to clarify whether this would imply for not doing any sub-critical testing. If it does, then it is going beyond CTBT.

As far as Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty is concerned, it appears that we have accepted this in a hurry. This has been talked about earlier also. The Clinton-Vajpayee Vision document had also talked about this. But there is a little difference. It was to be done in different stages. Earlier the term used was 'working together' and not, as has been stated, 'with US'. The first stage was to be the announcement of the initiatives. Then the second stage was the end of production of shell material before implementing it. Now, what we have stated is: "working with US for the conclusion of a multi-lateral FMCT." It appears to me that there is a bit of hurry in this. It is not in our long-term interests.

As far as the Joint Statement is concerned, I have a few observations to make. It is here that it talks about 'commercial linkages'. It pertains to agriculture. It says:

"Launch a US-India Knowledge Initiative on Agriculture focussed on promoting teaching, research, service and commercial linkages."

You may kindly clarify as to what does these 'commercial linkages' mean.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Your time is over. Please conclude.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : Have I taken too much time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. There are a number of Members to speak.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : I will conclude.

As far as nuclear aspect is concerned, that has been the cause of worry of all the Members all around. It talks about 'full civil nuclear energy cooperation'. We are not a member of NPT, how will it work? We are not a member of NPT. Will we be forced to follow the NPT without being a member?

Further, in the Joint Statement, it is said:

"The Prime Minister conveyed that for his part, India would reciprocally agree that it would be ready to assume the same responsibilities and practices and acquire the same

benefits and advantages as other leading countries with advanced nuclear technology, such as the United States."

This again looks a little diversionary sentence and the Prime Minister may kindly clarify.

At one place, it talks about adherence to Missile Technology Control Regime, MTCR and Nuclear Suppliers Group Guidelines. These 'Guidelines' should be clarified.

In one of the last paragraphs, it talks that the President would be visiting India and would be discussing various commitments. What is worrying is that it says: "The two leaders agreed to establish a working group to undertake, on a phased basis, in the months ahead, the necessary actions mentioned above to fulfil these commitments. The President and the Prime Minister also agreed that they would review this progress when the President visits India in 2006."

In conclusion, I would say that the main concern is about various assurances versus commitments. Everything hinges on the agreement by the Congress. Suppose it does not happen, where do we stand in this? I am sure, THE Hon. Prime Minister would have taken precautions, but we have our own reservations on this. Therefore, it should also be clarified.

Before concluding, I just want to bring to your notice what the US Under Secretary for Political Affairs said. He was on record, after your visit, to say that there were discussions on India's relations with Pakistan, and also on the wider issue of South Asia, Nepal, etc. But the Prime Minister has not mentioned anything about that in his statement. He may kindly clarify that also.

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव (झंझारपुर) : महोदय, माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी के हाल के अमरीका के दौरे के बाद जो वक्तव्य आया है, आज उस पर चर्चा हो रही है। यह चर्चा राष्ट्रीय महत्व की है। मैं सबसे पहले प्रधानमंत्री जी को इस महत्वपूर्ण दौरे के लिए अपने दल की ओर से बधाई देना चाहता हूँ। व्यापार, उद्योग, सेवा, अर्थव्यवस्था, खासकर ग्रामीण अर्थव्यवस्था, अंतरिक्ष में खोज, राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा, आतंकवाद में भेदभाव नहीं -- इन सब पर जो सरकार की द्विपक्षीय वार्ता हुई है, उसका हम समर्थन करते हैं। माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी ने विश्व में सर्वशक्तिमान राष्ट्र अमरीका की कांग्रेस में जिस मजबूती से अपनी बात को रखने का काम किया है, जिस साहस का परिचय दिया है और जिस दक्षता और क्षमता को दशाःःःःः देखा है, मैं उसके लिए भी उन्हें धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ।

उन्होंने देश के स्वाभिमान को बढ़ाया है। अभी बहुत चर्चा चल रही थी। यह राष्ट्रीय मुद्दा है, इस पर पक्ष का सवाल नहीं है, राष्ट्र के व्यापक हित का मामला है। यह दुर्लभ संयोग है कि आज जहाँ भारत में इस समझौते की आलोचना हो रही है, वहीं अमरीकी लोग भी इस समझौते की आलोचना कर रहे हैं। भारत में भी आलोचना और अमरीका में भी अज़ूह दृष्टिःःःःः, यह दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण स्थिति है। अमरीका को क्या संशय हो गया। भारत का कुछ संशय अतीत से है।... (व्यवधान) मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अतीत के कुछ ऐसे घटनाक्रम हैं जो आलोचना के तथ्य हैं। लेकिन अमरीका भी आलोचना कर रहा है। इस समझौते से भारत के विकास में क्या सहयोग होगा, क्या लाभ मिलेगा, क्योंकि हम तीसराःःःःः दुनिया के विकासशील देश हैं। विकसित और विकासशील देश में मैत्री, सद्भावना, सौहार्दपूर्ण वातावरण के निर्माण की परिस्थिति हुई है। मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ, एनडीए शासनकाल में अमरीका के साथ परमाणु विस्फोट पदार्थों के उत्पादन में कठौती संबंधी फिसाइल मैटीरियल्स प्रोडक्शन कट ऑफ ट्रीटी के प्रावधानों के मुताबिक अमरीका को सहयोग देने के लिए हमारा देश तैयार था। उसकी सोच थी कि इस संदर्भ में अमरीका के साथ सहयोग करने से भारत के सैन्य, नाभिकीय परमाणु कार्यक्रम के मार्ग में बाधा नहीं आएगी। एनडीए सरकार के शासनकाल में यह जो सोच थी, क्या उसमें कोई बदलाव हुआ है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अब जो सोच है, क्या उसमें कोई तब्दीलःःःःः हुई है? अब आप सत्ता से अलग हो गए हैं, अब सत्ता आपके हाथ में नहीं रही, आप इस पर अमल कर देते क्योंकि यह राष्ट्रीय हित का सवाल था। अब सत्ता यूपीए के हाथ में आ गई है, तो आज आप उस दृष्टिकोण पर भी आलोचना कर रहे हैं। मुझे इस बात का बहुत आश्चर्य है कि देश के लार्जर इंटरैस्ट में आपका जो एप्रोच ऑफ थिंकिंग था अब आपका आलोचना



का दृष्टिकोण कैसे ऋद्ध हृद्ध;न रहा है। आपकी भूमिका सराहनीय रही है। क्या बेंच बदल जाने से राष्ट्रीय हित भी बदल जाता है? आपकी सीट उधर हो गई, लेकिन राष्ट्रीय हित तो वही है। चाहे कोई भी सरकार आए, राष्ट्र का व्यापक हित तो नहीं बदलेगा। मैं इस बात को कहना नहीं चाहता था, लेकिन इसलिए कहना चाहता हूं कि आज कुछ शंकाएं हमारे सामने हैं। शंका इस बात से भी होगी कि ईरान न पाइपलाइन की सफलता से कई चीजें निकलेंगी। यह अमरीका से हमारे संबंधों का टैस्ट होगा। हमारी मित्रता कितनी है, इस द्विपक्षीय वार्ता का यह मॉडल टैस्ट होगा। ठीक है, इन प्रिंसिपल, अभी हमें उनकी सहमति नहीं है, लेकिन ईरान पाइपलाइन की सफलता भी इस समझौते के वातावरण को और सौहार्दपूर्ण बनाने या बिगाड़ने में एक मील का पत्थर साबित होगी, डैस्ट्रक्शन की ओर जाएगी या और अच्छी बनेगी। इसका एक माइलस्टोन ईरान पाइपलाइन प्रोजेक्ट से भी शुरू होगा।

अभी भारत का ज्ञान आधारित उद्योगों और सेवाओं पर केन्द्र के रूप में उभरने का वातावरण बनाया जा रहा है। इसलिए मैं इस बात का जिक्र कर रहा हूं। 1990-1991 में अमरीका और सोवियत संघ के साथ लिबरलाइजेशन के संबंध में कई समझौते हुए। स्ट्रैटजिक मामले में भी कई समझौते हुए, परन्तु हैंडलिंग ठीक ढंग से नहीं होने से सोवियत संघ पर काफी अस्-ऋद्ध हृद्ध;र पड़ा और सोवियत संघ टूट गया।

उसके दूरगामी परिणाम हुए। जो समझौता हुआ था, उस रेशियो से अमेरिका ने अपने अस्त्र-शस्त्र को नहीं घटाया जिसका खामियाजा सोवियत संघ को भुगतना पड़ा। हम दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ा रहे हैं, यह अच्छी बात है लेकिन हमें पूरी सतर्कता से दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाना पड़ेगा।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उस सदन में जो बयान दिया, उसमें उन्होंने कहा कि परमाणु समझौते से यदि हमारा राष्ट्रीय हित पूरी तरह से सुरक्षित नहीं रहता तो भारत इस समझौते से अलग हो जायेगा। इससे बड़ी बात और क्या हो सकती है कि शंका निर्मूल करने के लिए प्रधान मंत्री जी ने स्वयं संकेत दे दिया कि जब भी हमको लगेगा कि हमारा राष्ट्रऋद्ध हृद्ध;य हित पूरी तरह से सुरक्षित नहीं है, तो हम इस समझौते से अलग भी हो सकते हैं। इसलिए इस मुद्दे पर ज्यादा बहस की जरूरत नहीं है। कुछ मामलों में बहस की जरूरत है जैसे कृषि।

जहां तक परमाणु ऊर्जा का सवाल है, तो ऊर्जा कई प्रकार की होती हैं जैसे ईरान गैस पाइप लाइन ऊर्जा, परमाणु ऊर्जा। हम परमाणु ऊर्जा की बात कर रहे हैं। यह वैकल्पिक व्यवस्था है। यूएसए और भारत के बीच जो परमाणु समझौता है, उसमें हमें कुछ कन्सेशन मिला है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि वह हमें कन्सेशन किस कीमत पर देगा, यह भी स्पष्ट होना चाहिए। इसकऋद्ध हृद्ध; खुलासा आज सदन में होना चाहिए क्योंकि हमेशा हमारी स्वतंत्र भूमिका रही है। हमारी जो विदेश नीति है, ठीक ही कहा है कि हमारी जो गुट निरपेक्ष नीति है, परमाणु ऊर्जा नीति में हमारा जो एप्रोच होनी चाहिए, वह आटोनमस होनी चाहिए। जो वक्तव्य आया है, उसमें आटोनॉमी की बात की गयी है। उसमें कहा गया है कि इसमें हमारी स्वायत्तऋद्ध हृद्ध; रहेगी। मैंने इस बात का जिक्र इसलिए आपके सामने किया कि यूएसए, इजराइल और भारत, तीनों के स्ट्रैटजिक पार्टनरशिप की बात हो रही थी। उस समय हम लोग साथ नहीं थे और सीएमपी के कार्यक्रम में इसका विरोध है। आज कुछ मित्रों द्वारा यह संदेह उठ रहा है खासकर वामपंथियों के जरिये कि हम पूरे विश्व में परमाणु निश्चिन्ता चाहते हैं। सवऋद्ध हृद्ध;ल यह है कि क्या अमेरिका पूरे विश्व में परमाणु निश्चिन्ता के पक्ष में कभी हो सकता है। इसलिए मैं इस बात का ज्यादा जिक्र नहीं करना चाहता।

चूंकि हमारे पास थोरियम का विशाल भंडार है। हमारे पास थोरियम इतना ज्यादा है कि हम दुनिया में कहीं भी संयंत्र लगा सकते हैं। हम सर्वप्रभुत्व देश हैं। हमारी सोवरेनिटी है। इसलिए इसमें किसी तरह की शर्त नहीं होनी चाहिए। इस पर कोई शर्त नहीं होनी चाहिए, यह सावधानी बरतने की जरूरत है। हमारी जो कूटनीति है, जो वार्ता हो रही है उसऋद्ध हृद्ध; सावधानी बरतने की जरूरत है।

जहां तक आतंकवाद की बात है तो कहा जाता है कि वैश्विक आतंकवाद से निपटने में परस्पर सहयोग होगा। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या परस्पर सहयोग होगा ? इस पर हमें आपत्ति है। ग्लोबल आतंकवाद के खिलाफ एक संघर्ष होगा, यह केवल बोलने की बात है। सरकार की तरफ से कहा गया है कि कोई भेदभाव नहीं होगा। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या इराकऋद्ध हृद्ध; में आज आतंकवाद खत्म हो गया है। जिस मुद्दे को लेकर, जैविक हथियार रखने के सवाल पर इराक को ध्वस्त किया गया। इराक के ध्वस्त होने के बाद क्या वहां आतंकवाद खत्म हो गया ? क्या इराक में आतंकवाद की गतिविधि नहीं चल रही है ? आतंकवाद का उद्गम स्रोत क्या है ? ... (व्यवधान) बड़े आतंकवाद से छोटे आतंकवाद को खत्म नहीं किया जा सकता। इस संबंध में मेरा यह कहना है कि आतंकवाद का कॉमन ग्राउंड क्या बन रहा है ?



MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, I will have to inform the House that as many as 18 hon. Members have given their names to speak and more or less, most important points have been covered. So, all the Members are requested to please cooperate and limit their speeches and conclude within five minutes.

Now, I would call Shri Kirip Chaliha to speak.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): How can we conclude within five minutes? It is better not to allow us to speak at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What can I do? I am only calling out the names given to me.

SHRI KIRIP CHALIHA (GUWAHATI): Sir, the visit of the Prime Minister to the United States of America has evoked considerable interest both within the country and abroad. Britain, in fact, has welcomed the agreements made during the visit and our traditional ally, Russia has also welcomed the outcome of the visit.

Within the country, the general expressed opinion has been vastly in favour of the achievements made during the visit by the Prime Minister. Of course, we have to ignore the Opposition, the BJP, who opposes for Opposition sake because I have been hearing what they have been telling till now and even the assertions made by our former Prime Minister hardly amounted to anything except on the question of nuclear deterrent. And what Major General Khanduri said seems to be an attempt for credit sharing on what they have been doing than making any serious criticism because he was referring to a number of terminologies and seeking clarifications of the terminologies of the agreements. It is good to see that the initial cynicism that was there melted to a more mature understanding of the events which took place during our Prime Minister's visit.

The statement has rightly started with warm reception which the Prime Minister and his wife was given in America. It was not the question of individuals because the warmth that was shown to him was, in reality, a recognition to the country and to the country's leader, the country which was not always in favour of US. As many of my friends in the Leftists block have pointed out, the visit of the Prime Minister has taken place at a very crucial time when we had to take a number of 'make or break' decisions.

These decisions were of important nature. Earlier, we had hardly any hope of getting any positive response from the USA. But this time we have got a number of positive responses and a number of assurances. We could enter into some agreements and could make certain pronouncements. That itself is a recognition of our hon. Prime Minister's diplomacy, his growing international stature and his pragmatism. I must congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for achieving this. As hon. Prime Minister has pointed out in his statement, the purpose of his visit was to sensitise the US Government about the changes that have taken place in India since 1991. Shri Khanduri was objecting to this.

The whole world knows and we all know that 1990-91 had been a turning point in India's modernisation process, in India's emerging as a new power in the world. Much of the credit to that new policy goes to our present Prime Minister. It need not be overemphasized. It is a fact that even in 1991 when reforms and liberalisation took place in this country, there was a lot of skepticism about it. Skepticism, I think, was the initial response to some of the major steps that our hon. Prime Minister took then. Although there was skepticism in 1991, there is enough proof that Dr.

Manmohan Singh's Manmohanomics has succeeded like nothing else in this country. He has brought this country to the present position of honour. This has been acknowledged by all today.

We will not say that hon. Prime Minister's visit to the USA is the end of everything. It is only a beginning of a process. But we have to acknowledge that some breakthroughs have been made in this visit. I know it will have a very lasting and beneficial impact on India.

Foreign policy of a country cannot remain static. It is because the world has been changing rapidly and the world has been changing very radically. Everyday it is a new world. I do not dispute what my friends from the Left have been speaking about the Indo-US relations. I cannot forget the tremendous impact our foreign policy had under Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, especially on our Non-Alignment Policy. But as Shri Rajiv Gandhi had pointed out, the world has changed and the country has to respond to changes. We cannot remain static and India's foreign policy cannot remain static. To remain static in a changed world will be foolishness.

I would request my friends on the other side to understand this. Adapting to changes does not mean that we are surrendering to something. It means we are taking steps to survive and respond to the new world order and new situations. India has done it wonderfully over a period of time. Since Independence, when there were two power blocks, India pursued its own independent policy. Today also when we have a new unipolar world, we have an independent policy. Even though we had a bitter and, at various times, controversial relationship with the USA, it is the USA which has responded to the growing stature of India, in a way it recognised that India today, in the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, has its own potentialities and has its own values. There is a new evaluation of India in the international arena today.

I had occasions to visit and take part in many international forums. Recently, I visited Germany. I was surprised to see the kind of admiration people have for India. Even Western countries are looking towards India today. They say that in many respects India has a better future than China. When the West thinks that India has a better future than China, when they think that we have better potentialities to develop, and when they consider India will be the future giant and future power, should we suffer from complexes?

Should we suffer from complexes that we would become appendage of some super power, that we would become junior partner of America? Is it proper? Is it proper that we should think that we would, in any way, compromise our national interest? ... (*Interruptions*) Definitely not, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Brajesh Pathak.

SHRI KIRIP CHALIHA : One minute, Sir. This is the last point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already taken 10 minutes.

SHRI KIRIP CHALIHA : I think, it is very unkind to doubt, to raise questions of India's national concerns before a Congress Prime Minister. Sir, the Congress Party has shaped India's foreign policy, has made India independent, and has brought India to today's shape. The Prime Minister of a country who himself, in his own right, is a man whose stature is recognized all over the world today and whose stature and patriotism cannot be doubted under any circumstances by anyone, it is very unkind to cast doubts on his intentions and on the agreements signed by him. I say, it is unpatriotic.

Sir, we have to look to the future. I am not saying that we have to surrender our interest to somebody. But we have to look today to the future, to the creation of a human race which is determined to see that development takes place everywhere among richer nations and the poor nations. It is true that we have not yet got the concrete, written agreement with the United States that they will support us in an expanded or reformed United Nations, but the fact is that they are gradually conceding and recognizing our demand. Every step, every agreement, and every point that US conceded to our Prime Minister, is a feather in his cap. It is a success story. It is a new beginning from which much more will come in future. It is in this optimistic note that I would like to conclude because of paucity of time. Once again, I warmly congratulate the Prime Minister for his successful visit to United States of America.

SHRI B. MAHTAB (CUTTACK): Sir, I would like to draw your attention that it is very unfair ...\* to restrict a number of Regional Parties only to 5 minutes. It is very unfair. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. You cannot cast any aspersion on the Chair.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB : You cannot say, Sir. ... (*Interruptions*) I am not participating in the debate. I am only drawing your attention that it is very unfair ... to decide and restrict all Regional Parties only to 5 minutes.... (*Interruptions*) Every Regional Party has something to say relating to the international relations. You cannot restrict. A number of Members in their own right have spoken. From National Parties, more than 3 Members have spoken. If you want to restrict this discussion only to the National Parties, then you can do that. But we have to register our resentment to this decision. This is not fair ... to restrict all Regional Parties to speak only for 5 minutes. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, the time is decided by the Business Advisory Committee. I have not taken any decision.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB : It was not decided in the Business Advisory Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am strictly following that the time allotted by BAC, that will be followed.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I do concede that there were concessions because of the gravity of the topic.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB : We have not been consulted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hereafter, there will be no concessions. We will restrict to the BAC's time allotment.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक (उन्नाव) : माननीय सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्यों की राय से मैं भी सहमत हूँ कि सदस्य चाहे छोटी पार्टी का हो या बड़ी पार्टी का, सभी को समान अवसर अपना मत रखने के लिए दिया जाना चाहिए। हिंदुस्तान का हर व्यक्ति इससे प्रभावित होता है। हमारी राय है कि सबकी बात सुनी जानी चाहिए। आपने माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ज: नरेंद्र मोदी; की अमरीका यात्रा पर बहुजन समाजवादी पार्टी की तरफ से मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद ज्ञापित करता हूँ। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी को भी धन्यवाद ज्ञापित करता हूँ कि उन्होंने भारत की तस्वीर विश्व के लोगों तक पहुंचाई और वह सब अमरीका में नहीं हुआ जो पिछली सरकार के दौरान हुआ था।

माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी के साथ जो लोग गए थे, उनके साथ जो दुर्व्यवहार किया गया था। कम से कम भारत की छवि विश्व के पटल पर माननीय प्रधानमंत्री मनमोहन जी ने मजबूती के साथ इज्जत और प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ाने में जो योगदान किया है, उसके लिए हम सब उनको धन्यवाद ज्ञापित करते हैं। हमने टेलीविजन पर प्रसारण देखा था। माननीय प्रधान नरेंद्र मोदी; मंत्री जी का जिस ढंग से स्वागत हुआ, उससे हमें लगा कि भारत आज विश्व महाशक्ति को बराबरी पर टक्कर देने में सक्षम साबित हो रहा है और अपनी बात मजबूती से रख रहा है। हमें अपनी बातों को जिस ढंग से रखना चाहिए था, मजबूती से रखा। हम धन्यवाद देने के साथ-साथ अपनी पार्टी की तरफ से और सदन की तरफ से चिंता व्यक्त करना चाहते हैं। सबसे ज्यादा : नरेंद्र मोदी; चिन्ता का विषय हमारे सामने परमाणु कार्यक्रम है।

जहां तक परमाणु कार्यक्रम का सवाल है, अगर हम परमाणु शक्ति न होते तो यह मानकर चलिए कि हमारे पड़ोसी देश, बगल में रहने वाले लोग हमको यहां पर शान्ति से बैठने नहीं देते। जब हमारे पास आज परमाणु शक्ति है, तब जम्मू-कश्मीर का क्या हाल है, वह किसी से छिपा नहीं है। पंजाब का क्या हाल है, किसी से छिपा नहीं है। लाल किले पर हमल्लाह दहशत; हुआ, संसद पर हमला हुआ, यहां तक कि आम जनजीवन में, हमारे फैजाबाद जनपद के अयोध्या में हमला हुआ, यह किसी से छिपा नहीं है। हमले कहां से हो रहे हैं, यह भी किसी से छिपा नहीं है। हमें परमाणु शक्ति सम्पन्न देश बनना है। हमको परमाणु शक्ति को सामरिक उपयोग में लाना है। यह निर्विवाद है। इस बात का सदन सर्वसम्मति से हमारे पक्ष में, सामरिक शक्ति के उपयोग के पक्ष में फैसला लेगा, ऐसा मेरा सदन के प्रति विश्वास है। मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी, आपने भारत की जो छवि विश्व में और अमेरिका में स्थापित की है, उसके लिए हम सभी आपको बधाई देना चाहते हैं, लेकिन हमें अमेरिका के साथ सोच-समझकर हर कदम को उठाना पड़ेगा। हमारा: नरेंद्र मोदी; दशा कहीं छोड़े और घास की दोस्ती की तरह न हो जाए। अमेरिका ने जो-जो काम विश्व में किए हैं, वे किसी से छिपे नहीं हैं। इराक में जो कुछ हुआ, यह भी किसी से छिपा नहीं है। इराक में किसकी गलती थी और किसकी नहीं, इस पर मैं जाना नहीं चाहता हूँ, लेकिन इराक में लड़ाई परमाणु कार्यक्रम की नहीं थी, इराक में लड़ाई तेल की थी। अमेरिका अपनी दादागिरी विश्व में स्थापित करना चाहता था, तेल पर कब्जा करना चाहता था, विश्व बाजार पर कब्जा करना चाहता था, विश्व के लोगों पर कब्जा करना चाहता था, इसी के तहत उसने इराक को नेस्तनाबूद कर दिया। हम अमेरिका की दादागिरी से चिन्तित हैं, लेकिन भारत के लोग अमेरिका को दादागिरी नहीं करने देंगे। भारत के लोगों ने हमेशा मजबूती से लड़ाई लड़ी है, वह लड़ाई चाहे जब भी लड़ी गयी हो। भारत कभी भी अपने मान-सम्मान से पीछे नहीं हटा है।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ। माननीय सभापति जी से हमने वादा किया था कि पांच मिनट से ज्यादा समय नहीं लेंगे। सभी सदस्यों को दो-दो मिनट का मौका देना है, लेकिन एक बात मैं अन्त में कहना चाहता हूँ कि विश्व बाजार में हमारी उपस्थिति कम हो रही है। हमको इस तथ्य पर भी विचार करना चाहिए कि चीन की तरफ; हमारा बाजार भी विश्व में खुले, हमारा माल भी विश्व में बिके। जब तक हम अपनी आर्थिक व्यवस्था को सुदृढ़ नहीं करेंगे, हम अपने देश को मजबूती नहीं दे सकते हैं। जय भीम, जय भारत ।

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU (RAJAPUR): Sir, the recent visit of the hon. Prime Minister to the United States is one of the most important developments in our foreign relationship in recent times. Therefore, it is really very important for us to look at the visit very closely and very carefully, look at the short-term gains and the long-term implications and to study it from India's perception as to how much we have gained and how much more we could have gained.

India started a close relationship with the United States particularly in the year 1999. About 9-10 months ago, there was a statement which was made by one of the senior functionaries in this Government saying that the United States is not our natural ally; the relationship with the United States should not be considered as if the United States is our natural ally. Now, the hon. Prime Minister's statement has said that both sides agreed that our relationship was based on shared values and shared interests that included strengthening of democratic capacities.

So, that means that we have taken a mid-term course correction probably to put the relationship in the right perspective, in realising that United States has to be considered as one of the most important allies of India for a simple reason that the United States is the largest economy of the world. It is the biggest military power of the world and India's interest lies in ensuring that we also have good relations with such large country and with such large economy. As I said, how much we have gained through this visit of the hon. Prime Minister should be looked into the perspective of how much we were expecting from this visit. In the build up to this visit of the Prime Minister to the United States, the various think-tanks in the United States were debating this issue. For a long time, the foreign policy of the United States is also influenced by these various think-tanks that operate in and around Washington D.C. as well as in various universities of the United States. Some of the think-tanks were saying that now we need a counter weight to China's growing economic and military strength. The think-tanks were saying that China is a growing power, they are acquiring so much of economic wealth that part of it will be ultimately used to militarise the capability of China which China already has. Probably one day it could pose threat to the whole world and, particularly, to the United States also. Therefore, there was a growing feeling in the United States and that influenced the White House that we should try to build up closer relations with India. It is because it is in the interest of the United States. Therefore, this visit should be looked into at the backdrop of that predominant thinking that was in the United States. So, when we are going to look at this visit and the outcome of that, we should look at it from this perspective that there was already a conducive atmosphere in the United States to do something good with India. It is because that is in the interest of the United States. Now, what is important is how much we gained from that background. Did we gain more than what we expected or we expected less to begin with? That is why we are happy now that we gained a lot because we did not expect much. That is the question that we really need to answer. The foreign policy preoccupation for the last several years is India's

entry into expanded Security Council with full rights of Veto which are enjoyed by the present Permanent Members of the Security Council. In fact, whenever India has made or received any Special Head of State or Head of the Government from other party, we have made it a point to emphasise this point. We are trying to secure an agreement with all our allies that they should support India's bid into the Security Council Permanent Membership. This is what we have been doing and, therefore, this has been a major preoccupation. In this backdrop, I would like to know that whether we succeeded or the United States tried to prevail, not only on us but on other countries, not to place India's claim of claiming its membership by going in for a vote. It was felt that it is premature to go in for a vote. We did not go in for a vote. This has been a major preoccupation of a policy for last several years that whether we have gained something on that count or we have not is a question that really needs to be answered.

The second point is on Kyoto Protocol. Sir, seven years ago, India secured as one of the champions of G-77 in China, the Group which spearheads the developing world's cause throughout the world. We said that we need this Kyoto Protocol to be implemented and in fact we actually secured a Kyoto Protocol in Japan. Now, the United States has refused to ratify the Protocol on the ground that it does not show its interest. India has been saying very strongly that we need this Kyoto Protocol and the Prime Minister went to G-8 Summit in UK where he also made a strong point saying that the United States should ratify the Protocol. Now, we see that in declaration or in any talks and the Prime Minister Statement there is no mention about it. Do we think that it is not such an important issue that it should not find place in the agreement that we secured or in the discussion that we initiated or in the Statement that hon. Prime Minister has made? I would like to know that whether we consider it an important issue any more or not. This is something which I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister on the basis of the Statement.

Sir, the third issue – a very important issue – is the nuclear issue. It is true that we have suffered a lot in the last 31 years after the 1974 blast. Our nuclear supplies have virtually not been there or which were there have suffered from high cost and low quality availability within the country. Therefore, we really need to augment the supplies and have a proper supply line. But, in the process of doing that, what we really agreed to is one issue and that is the separation of military and civilian capabilities. Sir, I can understand if there is a political divergent view on this subject. The Prime Minister has stated in his statement that Parliament is the forum on which we reconcile such political differences. But, on this issue of separation, there is a huge amount of divergent opinion expressed by the experts themselves. On the nuclear issue, there is one school of thought which says that separation is not going to be in India's interest. There are some others who said that it is possible and it is not very costly to do this. It is not a political issue really; it is an issue of technicality in which many experts have expressed their opinion quite opposite to one another. Therefore, I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether before his visit the experts have been consulted on this subject, whether a meeting of nuclear experts has been called, whether they were called in a Seminar, whether they were consulted and asked that if at all the Government of India goes in for a Pact like this with the United States, whether it will be in the interest of India or not; I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether there was a consultation like this. Probably, this did not happen because there was a news item in *New York Times* on the day when the Prime Minister was going to visit the White House for a Banquet that probably the Prime Minister of India will have to go empty-handed because not much is going to be done. The whole world was surprised that we could secure a deal with the United States. Probably, we were not prepared because we ourselves never expected that something like this would happen. As the Prime Minister



has said the other day that whenever we go in for disinvestment, the Government is willing to go in for a Parliamentary Resolution, I would like to know, though it may not be required by Convention, because the Executive is empowered to enter into agreements with foreign countries, whether a new Convention will be set wherein the Parliament will be taken into confidence about the separation issue as well as all the implications of that.

However, my concern is that when you separate what you are really going to do is that one part of nuclear capability reactors will be put in for civilian power generation and other civilian programmes and something else will be put into the military programme. Sir, once you do that, is it possible that we can shift some of our civilian programmes into military programmes later on? If you feel that our nuclear challenge from our enemies have increased, is it really possible to do that? I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether that type of versatility, that type of flexibility will be available to Indian system or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU : Sir, I have not even started and you are asking me to conclude.

Sir, energy security pre-supposes that whatever energy resources India needs, the sources of that is available within the country. That is why, we are going in for hydro-potential, we are going in for coal and we are saying that we should also develop other sources of energy. When we are talking about energy security and its relationship with nuclear energy, we must be clear about two things. The first one is that today, we are using uranium to fire a plant. Later on, when we go into the third stage, thorium can be used for fast breeder technology reactor. At that time, it will be fully realised. Of course, it is true that we cannot do that unless we pass the bridge and to cross the bridge, we probably need this present arrangement that has been entered into. But, Sir, we should not confuse this arrangement with nuclear security because since 1974, our nuclear security has been compromised because we were not having fuel supplies to our nuclear plants. Therefore, this is something which I would like to really emphasise that energy security should be looked into from the perspective of availability of resources which are not available in India. We are going to be dependent on them. It is welcomed that we really need that today. I am a strong champion of nuclear energy. So, I support it. Sir, we have got competent nuclear scientists in India. Dr. Kakodar is one of them who heads the Nuclear Energy Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU : Please give me some time. All the time you are asking me to conclude. Please include my speech also I am just quoting. Please give me some more time.

Sir, we are saying this and I would rather feel that this should be done. The other issue which the Prime Minister said is that this agreement is based on knowledge sector. Sir, I do not find any mention about how India's knowledge economy sector will be leveraged to India's benefit by way of entering into an agreement.

**17.00 hrs.**

So, there is no mention of renewable energy. This is something which we should have done. This has not been done. Therefore, I would request the Prime Minister to just clarify this point as to how India is going to benefit from energy security particularly from the point of view of knowledge sector besides nuclear power, which, of course, is welcome. But besides that, how we are going to benefit from addressing our energy security is something I would like to know from the Prime Minister.

Sir, terrorism is something which is of great concern about which the Prime Minister has just made a passing reference. The United States thinks that terrorism in the world started with 9/11. We have suffered from it for the last two decades or more. It is not that the history of terrorism can be written from 9/11, it is not the starting point, it is not the day on which terrorism started in the world. Therefore, the United States should understand India's position and so we should have prevailed on them to help fight terrorism both internally as well as from external sources which are causing serious disturbances to India's peace in the country.

Sir, recently, after the visit of the Prime Minister, there has been an agreement signed in Laos and it was signed by India, China, Korea, Japan, United States of America and Australia for clean development of technology. Australia and America have refused to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. They are outside it. We are signing an agreement with them and we are claiming that it is, in fact, an extension of the Kyoto Protocol. These two countries have refused to accept the existence of the Kyoto Protocol and refused to ratify it, but we claim on our side, as a fellow signatory to the Kyoto Protocol, that it is an extension of the Kyoto Protocol. I do not really understand this and I hope the Prime Minister will clarify this point because since this agreement has been made, no statement has been made in this House by the Government. So, I would really request that the Prime Minister to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU (RAJAPUR): Sir, I am coming to my last point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your last point is over. Please conclude now.

SHRI B. MAHTAB (CUTTACK): Sir, his last point is over. He is on a new point now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a new point! But there shall be an end of the matter.

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU : Sir, there is a mention that India and the United States are now committing to spread democracies worldwide. This concept needs to be explained properly because, in fact, President Bush went to war and he was trying to justify the war to his own countrymen saying that this war is going to help fight not only terrorism in the world, but it is also going to help spread democracy in that part where it does not exist. Are we going to be a party to such an endeavour in spreading democracy and in the name of that going to fight war with somebody? I hope not and, therefore, I hope the Prime Minister, who is a peace-loving man, will not join in an effort to fight war with somebody. If at all we need to fight war, we need to fight poverty at home. For that there is no mention in that agreement, I hope it had.

**श्री ब्रज किशोर त्रिपाठी (पुरी):** सभापति जी, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री अमरीका गये। उन्हें अमरीका ने जिस तरह से समर्थन दिया और स्वागत किया, उससे सारे भारत के लोग गर्वित हुये। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी जिस तरह से अपनी विजिट को सक्सैसफुल बता रहे हैं, वैसी नहीं है। वह अमरीका से क्या लेकर आये हैं? यह तो 1998-2002 तक वही उस समय की एन.डी.ए. सरकार की न्युक्लीयर पौलिसी थी जिसका फल आज प्रधान मंत्री जी अमरीका से लेकर आये हैं। आज अमरीका को भी यह स्वीकार करना पड़ा कि भारत एक बड़ी न्युक्लीयर पावर है। जब एन.डी. ए. सरकार ने 1998 में पोखरण में दूसरा न्युक्लीयर एक्पैरिमेंट किया, उस समय कांग्रेस पार्टी अपोजीशन में थी और उन्होंने इस परीक्षण व न समर्थन न करके एन.डी.ए. सरकार का विरोध ही किया था। अमरीका ने कई अड़चनें लगाई थी कि भारत यह परीक्षण न कर सके लेकिन भारत फिर भी न्युक्लीयर पावर बना। आज हम सब गर्वित हैं कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का स्वागत किया गया। भारत को न्युक्लीयर पावर देने के लिये अमरीका बाधित हुआ। इसके पहले भारत का कुछ भी नहीं बिगड़ा थड्डहड्ड हड्ड; और न भारत डरा था।

अमरीका ने हमारे देश के ऊपर बहुत जोर-जबर्दस्ती करनी चाही, लेकिन उस समय की हमारी सरकार ने वह नहीं होने दी और भारत न्युक्लियर पावर बन गया। इससे सारे देशवासी गर्वित हुए। अमरीका ने स्वीकार किया कि भारत एक शांतिपूर्ण न्युक्लियर पावर है। हमने कभी न्युक्लियर पावर का गलत इस्तेमाल नहीं किया। एक शांतिपूर्ण देश न्युक्लिड हड्डहड्ड;नलयर पावर का शांतिपूर्ण कार्यों के लिए इस्तेमाल कर रहा है, यह भी अमरीका ने स्वीकार किया। देश के इतिहास में हमने कभी न्युक्लियर पावर का गलत इस्तेमाल नहीं किया। देश की मांग थी और हमें आशा थी कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का वहां इतना स्वागत हुआ है तो हमें यू.एन.सिक्युरिटी काउंसिल की परमानैन्ट मैम्बरशिप मिल ङड्डहड्ड हड्ड;ायेगी और वोटिंग का हमें अधिकार मिल जायेगा, लेकिन अमरीका ने हमारा समर्थन नहीं किया। प्रधान मंत्री जी क्या यह आपकी सफल यात्रा है। यह आपकी सक्सैसफुल विजिट नहीं है। हमें वहां क्या मिला। जो न्युक्लियर इनर्जी हमने बनाई थी, बहुत दुख

**17.07 hrs.**

**(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair)**

के साथ माननीय सदस्य बता रहे थे, देश के न्युक्लियर एक्सपर्ट्स बता रहे हैं कि जो हमारे देश का स्वाभिमान और स्वाबलम्बन था, उसे खत्म कर दिया गया है। आप सिविलियन और मिलिट्री को सैपरेट करने के लिए राजी हो गये। मिलिट्री में आप कितनी न्युक्लियर इनर्जी यूज करते हैं - बहुत मिनिमम यूज करते हैं। आप इसे कैसे सैफ हड्डहड्ड;रेट करेंगे। इसमें जो एडीशनल इन वैस्टमैन्ट होगा और मिलिट्री को सैपरेट करने के बाद जो न्युक्लियर इनर्जी यूज की जायेगी, उसके लिए सैपरेट इस्टैब्लिशमैन्ट रहेगा, जो एडीशनल इनवैस्टमैन्ट होगा, वह कितना होगा। क्या वह हमारे देश के लिए ठीक है। यह इनवैस्टमैन्ट हमें अमरीका को खुश करने के लिए करना पड़ेगा। अमरीका हमारी सब चीजों के ऊपर काउंटरवेलिंग एंटी डम्पिंग ड्यूटी लगा रहा है। हमारे देश से जो चीजें एक्सपोर्ट हो रही हैं, चाहे वह स्टील हो या अन्य कोई चीज हो, वह अपने देश का इंटरैस्ट सेव करने के लिए उन पर ड्यूटी लगा रहा है। डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में हारने के बाद भी वह भारत के साथ दादागिरी कर रहा है और भारत से जो स्टील एक्सपोर्ट हो रहा है, उसके ऊपर एंटी डम्पिंग काउंटरवेलिंग ड्यूटी लगा रहा है। हम लोग सिविल हड्डहड्ड;लियन और मिलिट्री को सैपरेट करने के लिए राजी हो गये। प्रधान मंत्री जी यह देश के स्वाबलम्बन के लिए अच्छा नहीं है। देश के वैज्ञानिकों ने इतना परिश्रम करके देश को इतना बड़ा सौभाग्य दिलाया, लेकिन आपने उन्हें कान्फिडेंस में नहीं लिया। हमें इसके बारे में सोचना पड़ेगा। उ पाध्यक्ष महोदय, अमरीका जो कभी हमारा परमानैन्ट मित्र नहीं था, ङड्डहड्ड;भी किसी भी क्राइसेज में उसने हमारी मदद नहीं की। यह बात ठीक है कि हमें सबके साथ बंधुत्व रखना चाहिए, लेकिन जो हमारी कान्टीन्युअस फॉरेन पालिसी थी, भारत नॉन-एलाइन्ड मूवमैन्ट का लीडर था, आज उसकी क्या दशा हुई। जो नॉन-एलाइन्ड कंट्रीज हैं, वे भारत को क्या समझेंगे। प्रधान मंत्री जी आप रिस्ट्रिक्शंस लेकर आ गये। सारी रिस्ट्रिक्शंस हमारे हिस्से में आ गईं। हम जो न्युक्लियर पावर यूज करेंगे, वह सैपरेटली यूज करेंगे। हम सिविलियन और मिलिट्री के लिए अलग-अलग यूज करेंगे - क्या यह आपकी सफल यात्रा है। नॉन-एलाइन्ड मूवमैन्ट के जो देश हमारी सपोर्ट में थे, उनकी हमारे देश के प्रति क्या राय होगी। आपने हमारी कान्टीन्युअस फॉरेन पालिसी का डी वएशन कड्ड हड्डहड्ड;र दिया। अभी तक जो हमारी फॉरेन पालिसी थी, उसका कभी भी डीविएशन नहीं किया गया था।

आपने पहली बार ऐसा डीवियेशन किया। आप हाउस को कॉन्फिडेंस में नहीं लेकर ऐसा करते हैं तो वह ठीक नहीं है। अमेरिका के साथ ऐसा समझौता करने से पहले आपने सदन को नहीं बताया, हमारे न्युक्लियर साइंटीस्ट्स से आपने कंसल्ट नहीं किया। उनके ऊपर क्या मजबूरी आएगी, देश के ऊपर भविष्य में क्या तकलीफ आएगी, इसकी चिन्ता आपने नहीं की। जो न्युक्लियर वैपन्स हैं, उनको रिस्ट्रिक्ट करने के लिए आप राजी हो गए लेकिन अमेरिका के जो न्युक्लियर वैपन्स हैं, उनको रिस्ट्रिक्ट करने के लिए आपने कुछ नहीं कहा। अमेरिका जो न्युक्लियर वैपन्स बना रहा है, उनको रिस्ट्रिक्ट करने के लिए आपने भारत की तरफ से क्या विचार प्रकट किये? वे खुद तो परमाणु अस्त्र बनाएंगे लेकिन दूसरे देशों को इसकी अनुमति नहीं देंगे। हमें यूएस से क्या मदद मिल रही है? क्यों हम राजी होंगे उनके कहने पर? आप इस विषय पर जिस प्रकार से वहां राजी हो गए, वह

देश के भविष्य के लिए अच्छा नहीं होगा। हमारा पड़ोसी देश ऑटोमैटिक न्यूक्लियर वैपन्स बना रहा है लेकिन हम राज़ी हो गए कि हम न्यूक्लियर वैपन्स को रिस्ट्रिक्ट करेंगे। यह देश के लिए अच्छा नहीं होगा।

महोदय, हमारा प्रधान मंत्री जी से अनुरोध है कि देश को स्वावलंबी बनाने के लिए आपकी जो जिम्मेदारी है, प्रधान मंत्री होने के नाते आप देश की सौ करोड़ जनता के नेता हैं और आपके नेतृत्व में देश चलता है। देशवासियों के मनोबल को कम करना ठीक नहीं है। सेना में लड़ने वालों का मनोबल कम करना ठीक नहीं है। उनका मनोबल उच्च रह सकता है जब उन्हें महसूस होगा कि हमारे पास सेना में लड़ने के लिए अस्त्र-शस्त्र हैं। अगर आप उनसे कहें कि आपके पास वैपन्स नहीं रहेंगे तो उनका मनोबल कम होगा क्योंकि बॉर्डर पर तो उनको ही लड़ना है। अभी तक न्यूक्लियर वैपन्स को रिस्ट्रिक्ट करने के लिए इंटरनेशनल ट्रीटी नहीं हुई, तो प्रधान मंत्री जी को बाइलेट्रल एग्रीमेंट करने का इच्छुक क्या ज़रूरत थी? जब इंटरनेशनल ट्रीटी होगी और सब रिस्ट्रिक्ट करेंगे, तब भारत को राज़ी होना चाहिए था। भारत तो चाहता है कि सारी दुनिया में किसी को न्यूक्लियर वैपन नहीं बनाना चाहिए, यह हमेशा से भारत की नीति रही है, लेकिन इंटरनेशनल ट्रीटी हुए बिना आप अमेरिका के साथ ट्रीटी करके आ गए, इसलिए वह विज़िट बहुत सक्सैसफुल न्यूक्लियर साइंटिस्ट्स और रिसर्चर्स को कॉन्फिडेंस में लीजिए। सभी एक्सपर्ट्स बता रहे हैं कि इससे भारत का स्वाभिमान और स्वावलंबन नष्ट हो गया। उनको जो भविष्य की चिन्ता है, उसके लिए आप सबको कॉन्फिडेंस में लेकर, सदन को कॉन्फिडेंस में लेकर भविष्य में काम करेंगे, यही आशा करते हुए मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया।

SHRI P.A. SANGMA (TURA): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I consider this debate very very important in our national interest. International relations are never static. They have their own dynamics driven by the national and international changes in politics, economy and technology. It is everybody's knowledge that today's China is not Mao's China.

The United States and China are very much engaged with each other. Today, Putin's Russian Federation is no more the erstwhile USSR. U.S.A. and Russian Federation are very much engaged with each other on bilateral and global issues. In that scenario, what should India do? The world is changing, and the world will change. India, in our own national interest, will have to change. It is time that we have to get over the cold war syndrome. We cannot afford to blow hot and cold between non-aligned theology and liberal diplomacy. In our own national interest we must be pragmatic.

The Prime Minister's visit to the United States, the joint statement and the statement of the Prime Minister on the floor of the House are very significant. The Prime Minister's talk with President Bush covered a lot of issues, bilateral and global, which have already been pointed out by the former Prime Minister, Shri Vajpayee. I do not like to go into all these aspects. Perhaps the main focus of the debate is on nuclear agreement. Let me also confine to that.

But before that, let me say about the visit of the Prime Minister to the United States and the joint statement. I do not know whether I should quote Shri Jyoti Basu. He says, "It was generally all right." But I personally feel that it is much beyond that. I think, it is a very successful visit from India's point of view.

On the nuclear aspect – I think, Shri Vajpayee, Maj. Gen. Khanduri and also Shri Suresh Prabhu have referred to it – what is that separation of civil nuclear and military nuclear energy? Is it possible? If it is possible, is it in the interest of the nation? I think, that is the focus of the debate today.

I would like to quote Shri K. Subrahmanyam, who is an expert on our defence strategy, and everybody knows him. I think, what he says will be very clear to all our minds. He said:

"It is surprising that there are objections to separating civil and military nuclear facilities. The original suggestion for this came from Dr. Raja Ramanna, the designer of the first Pokhran bomb. Ramanna's logic can't be challenged. If civilian and military facilities are not separated .....

This is the most important point. If they are not separated, then what happens? He said:

"If civilian and military facilities are not separated, it would mean all reactors in India support our military programme. "

That is the most important point. Without segregation, without separation, it would mean that all our nuclear inputs would go for military purposes.

That was precisely the reason why America refused to supply uranium to our Tarapur plant. Now, I am surprised why our former Prime Minister had put this question today. It is because it was the NDA Government which approached the United States to segregate this, by saying that we, in India, are going to segregate the civilian energy and the military energy, and, therefore, you should not hesitate to supply us uranium. That was the beginning of India pursuing with the United States of America. I am sorry I could not find the exact words. Anyway these technical words are very, very difficult for us. We call this as Next Step in Strategic Partnership. This is the word I was looking for. It was on the basis of the NDA Government's initiative that the Prime Minister, Shri Manmohan Singh has been able to carry on further and got the agreement with the United States. Therefore, there is no need to be worried about that.

Mr. Suresh Prabhu had asked a question whether the conversion of civil energy and the military energy can take place with that kind of a material. I do not think we should be asking those questions. We should leave it to the scientists to decide about that and we should not be doing that.

Now, Mr. Vajpayee had also referred whether the Prime Minister had consulted the scientists before signing this agreement. He had asked whether the scientists were taken into confidence. What is the reaction of the scientists? I have already quoted what Mr. Subrahmaniyam has said. I would like to quote Prof. U.R. Rao. What did he say? He says: "Yes, it is a positive step. Of course, India has not fully depended on US for all technologies, but it opens up new areas of co-operation, specially in terms of global positioning system technology." This is how Prof. Rao has said.

What did Dr. Kasturirangan, who is also the former Chairman of the ISRO, say? What has he said? He said and I quote: "I believe this is a milestone in Indo-US relations. Our Prime Minister and the US President must be congratulated. What they had achieved will have repercussions for years to come." Therefore, I think the scientists in our country, who are engaged in our defence strategy, who have been involved themselves, are so concerned about this. This is the opinion of our scientists. Therefore, I think we, as laymen, should not be worried about that.

I do not believe it if anybody is saying that we are surrendering to another country or it is a sell out to another country. Are we not an independent country? Are we not capable of deciding for ourselves? Why should we surrender to anybody? Which Prime Minister of any country in this world would like to sell his own country? So, I do not understand this. I think these are allegations which are very, very unfair. Mr. Rupchand Pal is looking at me very intensely. The other day I was



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

मैं भी महसूस करता हूँ कि जब आपको इतना बड़ा रिसैप्शन मिला, जो लोग कभी सोच नहीं सकते थे तो सभी भारतीयों का सिर गर्व से ऊंचा हुआ, इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हैं। आपसे बहुत बड़ी उम्मीदें भी थीं।

जब आपका एग्रीमेंट हुआ और ज्वॉयंट स्टेटमेंट आई तो यहां पर कुछ किंतु-परंतु जरूर प्रकट किए गए। आपने अपनी स्टेटमेंट में कुछ शंकाएं दूर करने की कोशिश भी की है। मैं उन बातों को नहीं दोहराऊंगा जो माननीय अटल जी एवं अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने कही हैं। आप अपने जवाब में उनकी शंकाओं को अवश्य दूर करेंगे। आप बहुत बड़े अर्थशास्त्री हैं। हमें बहुत खुशी और गर्व है कि हमारा देश आईटी और अन्य सेक्टर्स में आगे बढ़ता जा रहा है।... (व्यवधान)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The House was to take up the Half-an-hour Discussion at 5.30 p.m. but we shall postpone it now. I am sure, Dr. Chinta Mohan would also agree if we decide to take it up on Monday.

**DR. CHINTA MOHAN (TIRUPATI):** It is all right, Sir.

**श्री सुखदेव सिंह ढींडसां :** कई माननीय सदस्यों ने ग्रीन रिव्यूलेशन की बात कही है, कृषि में रिसर्च की बात कही है, लेकिन ग्रीन रिव्यूलेशन तो बहुत पहले ही हो चुका है। मेरी सबसे बड़ी चिन्ता है कि अंतरराष्ट्रीय मार्किट में भारत के किसान को मुकाबले में जाना है, लेकिन यूरोपियन देश, अमरीका, जापान, आस्ट्रेलिया अडवहद्व दृष्टि; पने किसानों को सब्सिडी दे रहे हैं, जबकि हमारा देश नहीं दे सकता। जब जी-8 देशों की कांफ्रेंस होने जा रही थी, तब राष्ट्रपति बुश ने एक स्टेटमेंट दिया था कि मैं जी-8 के देशों से निवेदन करूंगा कि इस सब्सिडी में एकरूपता लाई जाए, लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हो पाया। दुनिया के देश अपने किसानों को एक बिलियन यूएस डालर की सब्सिडी देते हैं, उनके मुकाबले में ; हमारा किसान कहां खड़ा हो सकेगा। आपके उस एग्रीमेंट में और इस स्टेटमेंट में कृषि को बहुत पीछे रखा गया है। आज हम बेशक बहुत आगे बढ़ चुके हैं, लेकिन आज भी हमारी अर्थव्यवस्था कृषि पर आधारित है। हमारे देश की 60 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा आबादी कृषि पर आधारित है। स्पीकर साहब की कृपा से मैं यूरोपियन पार्लियामेंट में गया था और मैंने वहा:ए न्दृष्टि; के सभी माननीय सदस्यों से बात की थी। मैंने सभी बैठकों में यह मुद्दा भी उठाया था। वहां की पार्लियामेंट में भारतीय मूल की एक लड़की नीना गिल एमपी है। वह साउथ-एशियन कमेटी की चेयरपर्सन भी है। उसने एग्रीकल्चर कमेटी के चेयरमैन को हमसे मिलवाया था और जब मैंने उनसे यह सवाल किया कि आप लेवल प्लेइंग फिल्ड क्कदृष्टि; नहीं मानते हैं तो उन्होंने ब्लंटली रिफ्यूज कर दिया कि हम अपने किसानों को उतनी ही सब्सिडी देंगे जितनी कि अब दे रहे हैं। सब्सिडी के मुद्दे पर आपका और अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति का कोई संयुक्त बयान नहीं आया। मेरी आपसे अपील है कि आप कृषि को इतना पीछे न छोड़ें। दूसरे सेक्टर्स बहुत आगे जा रहे हैं, लेकिन कृषि हमारा बेस है।

अगर आप एग्रीकल्चर को इंटरनैशनल मार्किट में ले जाना चाहते हैं तो उसे लैवल प्लेइंग फील्ड देना चाहिए। ठीक है, मंत्री जी दिसम्बर में वहां जा रहे हैं। पहले भी एनडीए की सरकार में चाहे श्री मारन थे या श्री जेटली, जब वे वहां गए तब उन्होंने इस बात पर स्ट्रेस किया कि जितनी देर लैवल प्लेइंग फील्ड क्रिएट नहीं करते, उतनी देर हम एग्रीमेंट नहीं कर सकते। अडवहद्व दृष्टि; वे कंट्रीज़ इस बात पर पूरा जोर दे रही हैं कि जो उनके हक की बात है, हम उस पर दस्तखत कर दें लेकिन जो हमारे हक में है, उसे पीछे कर दें। आपको एग्रीकल्चर के बारे में खास ध्यान रखना होगा।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब आप जवाब दें तो उसमें इस बारे में जरूर बताएं।

**MR. SPEAKER :** We have got 25 minutes before the hon. Prime Minister replies when the four hours' time is going to be over. I have got still about 10 names. So, each hon. Member may take four minutes. Shri Manvendra Singh to speak now. You are very articulate.

**SHRI MANVENDRA SINGH (BARMER):** Sir, you are very kind.

Thank you for giving me the time. I welcome the hon. Prime Minister's statement in the House only for the reason that there is such a marked departure from the joint statement that was

published from Washington. I welcome the hon. Prime Minister's interest in this debate, in this discussion and his wisdom is of great benefit to us, specially the first-timers. I wish the same wisdom and the same attention had been given in the House when the House discussed the IMDT Act because, after all, the hon. Prime Minister is an MP from Assam and his responsibility towards Assam could have been shared with us. The House was very structured as you saw.

MR. SPEAKER : You are encroaching upon your four minutes by going to Assam.

SHRI MANVENDRA SINGH : Thank you, Sir. I will keep that in mind.

The hon. Prime Minister's statement devoted roughly ten paragraphs to the nuclear issue whereas the joint statement had only three paragraphs on the nuclear issue. I wonder whether the Indo-U.S. relations are determined only by the nuclear issue or there are other aspects to it. What was astonishing was that in the joint statement there is one sentence of Indo-U.S. knowledge initiative and agriculture and there is a passing reference to that in the statement in the House. It was astonishing because I thought this was the *sarkar* of the *aam aadmi* and the *aam aadmi* is dependent on agriculture and if agriculture is something that this Government is committed to developing as an industry, then the benefits of the *aam aadmi* certainly deserve more than one sentence and not ten paragraphs towards nuclear issue as the hon. Prime Minister did devote. However, that is the hon. Prime Minister's prerogative.

The stressing on the democracy initiative is, of course, a continuation of the joint vision document of President Clinton and former Prime Minister Vajpayeeji and hearing it in the House it was deeply ironical because democratic evangelism is very welcome and I think it is more required in Bihar than it is required anywhere else in the world. The anti-democratic tendencies of this Government were pronounced for the last six months in Bihar and I think more pronounced, as you saw, yesterday in this House and I could not miss the irony of that. I wish the hon. Prime Minister would explain some of that to us.

Most of the speakers have talked about civilian energy separation from military. I will not stress on that What I find more intriguing is both the joint statement and the statement in the House talked about the nuclear initiative as India's requirement for energies.

Today in the year 2005, India's installed nuclear power capacity is, as I am told, 2,800 megawatts and installed capacity of wind power generation is 2,400 megawatts. If the Prime Minister would explain to me which is cleaner source of energy - wind energy or nuclear energy - I would benefit because nuclear power generation involves waste whereas wind power generation does not. That is the simplest difference I can come across.

Then, there was much talk about India being recognised as a nuclear power. After his joint-statement, there was a US State Department statement on the record briefing which said :

"By taking this decision, we are not recognising India as a nuclear weapon State."

That is an on-the-record statement by the US State Department. Whatever we may tom-tom here in the House or outside, that is the US statement.

For the benefit of the Marxists colleagues who have frequent memory dysfunctions on who is accountable and who is responsible for bowing down or crawling before the US, I am again quoting



from the statement of US State Department issued on 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2005. It reads :

"What was significant about yesterday's agreement is that India has committed itself in public very specifically to a series of actions to which it has not previously committed itself."

I think, that is a fairly simple and straight forward sentence in English language.

MR. SPEAKER: You would prefer the US version to the Prime Minister's version!

SHRI MANVENDRA SINGH : I am just reading out what the US State Department has given officially. It is an agreement between the Government of India and the Government of US. This is what they have declared.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt you. You are speaking very well.

SHRI MANVENDRA SINGH : Can I just finish my last point?

MR. SPEAKER: Please carry on.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Do not dictate to me.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You sit down please.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I will not allow. You just cannot rise.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I am very fair. I know it.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: It is not to be recorded. Nothing will be recorded except the speech of Shri Manvendra Singh.

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will be recorded, Mr. Swain. Please sit down. You are not my advisor. You sit down.

(*Interruptions*) ... \*

MR. SPEAKER: You have to take your seat. You are only disturbing him.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You are not being allowed to speak. Nothing is being recorded. You are unnecessarily wasting the time of the House.

*(Interruptions) ... \**

MR. SPEAKER: I know my duty. I think, I can claim that I am more affectionate towards him than you are.

*... (Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: That is your party's wisdom to make you the Whip. That does not mean that you can apply it to me.

*... (Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I am also asking. Will you please sit down?

*... (Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

*... (Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Leave it. Nothing is being recorded.

*(Interruptions) ... \**

MR. SPEAKER: I can claim, I think, with confidence that I am more affectionate towards him than you are, but the question is that I have to regulate the proceedings of the House. I had very apologetically told him that I can only give him four minutes' time. Even then, it has been nine minutes, but for your interruption, probably he would have finished. Please keep quiet.

Shri Singh, you complete your speech.

MR. SPEAKER: You sit down.

*... (Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

*... (Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: There are too many advisors to the Speaker on both sides of the House!

*... (Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

*... (Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know the reason for you all behaving like this.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Are you interested in having this serious debate in the House?

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You are a very senior Member of the House. Please sit down.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Do you know that you should set standard for others? You should not instigate others, but set standard for others.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: This is a very serious matter, which is being discussed. The hon. Prime Minister is waiting for four hours, and everyone else is also waiting for hours together to take part in the discussion.

... (*Interruptions*)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप क्यों बात करते हैं ?

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI MANVENDRA SINGH : Sir, I will just add one more point. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): It seems that the CPI (M) party has come and sat there. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down, and do not show allergy. Mr. Manvendra Singh, please continue your speech.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, I am requesting that my party Member should be allowed to speak, and they are shouting at me. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I will take it that you do not want the discussion to continue. Mr. Swain, do you want further discussion on this very serious matter? Otherwise, I will adjourn the House and go away.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : No, Sir. If you do not want me here, then I am prepared to withdraw from the House right now. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I know it. But you need not withdraw. You kindly cooperative by sitting there.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. I am requesting you to sit down and hear the discussion, which is going on right now.

... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

... (Interruptions)

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत (अजमेर) : मान्यवर, वे लोग क्यों कहते हैं ? Sir, you have the right to say whatever you want to say. आप कह सकते हैं। आपको कहने का अधिकार है।... (ब्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Thummar, you will be in trouble. Do you want to go outside?

... (Interruptions)

SHRI V.K. THUMMAR (AMRELI): No, Sir. I will hang in here.

MR. SPEAKER: You are on mercy here because any day it will happen to you.

... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Manvendra Singh, you are speaking well, but I am sorry that I cannot give you much more time to speak. You are speaking very well, and I compliment you for the same.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI MANVENDRA SINGH : Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: You have interrupted his thought process.

SHRI MANVENDRA SINGH : The most significant aspect in my mind about the Indo-US Joint Statement, and, specifically, about the nuclear aspect of it is the fact that the Government of India has entered into a bilateral agreement with the US to prolong what was earlier a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude your speech. I am sorry that I have to cut the number of speakers who are to speak on this issue.

SHRI MANVENDRA SINGH : The unilateral moratorium was a commitment made by India to the world. The former Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee made it in this House. This unilateral moratorium has been converted into a bilateral agreement between the Government of India and the United States. This is deeply disturbing for two reasons. Firstly, the technology is not static. What will happen to any future option, which we might want to exercise if you make your moratorium a bilateral agreement and make it permanent?

Secondly, the fact remains that we have entered into this agreement with the US by *de facto* recognising US as a unipolar power centre whereas our foreign policy has always revolved around multipolar power centres. This aspect of the agreement is deeply dangerous for India's security as well as India's foreign policy.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much. I wish that Mr. Swain had given your name a little higher up in the party list. I hope you will get more opportunities, and I will also give you opportunities in

the future. Kindly send your name for the same.

SHRI MANVENDRA SINGH : Thank you, Sir,

श्री अजय माकन (नई दिल्ली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के यू.एस. विजिट और उनका भाण दोनों का स्वागत करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं अपने आपको को चार-पांच मिनट में कंफाइन करके ही अपनी बात कहूँगा। मैं अपनी बात को सीमित रखना चाहता हूँ। पॉवर सैक्टर में मेरा अपना कुछ अनुभव रहा है और उसके सन ड्रहड्रहड्रथ जोड़ते हुए मैं कहूँगा कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी का यू.एस. विजिट एक मील का पत्थर है और उससे ज्यादा अच्छी बात भारत के लिए नहीं हो सकती है।

महोदय, आज के समय हमारे देश में कुल पावर प्रोडक्शन एक लाख मेगावाट के करीब है, जिसमें से न्युक्लियर पावर का योगदान केवल 3.2 प्रतिशत है। अगर आप विश्व को देखें, दूसरे विकसित देशों को देखें, जैसे फ्रांस में 78 प्रतिशत, स्वीडन में 50 प्रतिशत, जर्मनी में 28 प्रतिशत, जापान में 25 प्रतिशत, यूएसए में 20 प्रतिशत और भारत में, आज जबकि हम लोग अपने देश को इन्डस्ट्रियलाइज्ड और डेवलप्ड कन्ट्री बनाना चाहते हैं, न्युक्लियर पावर का उत्पादन मात्र 3.2 प्रतिशत है। वर्ष 2020 तक न्युक्लियर पावर जेनरेशन की हमारी जो प्रोजेक्शन्स की गयी हैं, और हमने तीन फेज में न्युक्लियर पावर जेनरेशन की जो प्लानिंग की है, जिसमें सबसे पहले प्रेशराइज्ड हैवी वाटर रिएक्टर, उसके बाद फास्ट ब्रीडर रिएक्टर और फिर रेडियोटेड थो: ड्रड्रड्रथम रिएक्टर से हमने पावर प्रोडक्शन की बात कही है, उसमें हम लोग वर्ष 2020 तक केवल 20 हजार मेगावाट बिजली का ही उत्पादन कर पाएँगे, जबकि उस समय तक हमारी जरूरत 3.50 लाख मेगावाट बिजली की होगी। इस जरूरत के मुकाबले हम लोग आज की तकनीक के हिसाब से वर्ष 2020 तक केवल 5.5 प्रतिशत ही एचीव कर पाएँगे। इसलिए मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी को धन्यवाद करना चाहता हूँ कि वह भारत को एक लीप-फ्रॉग की स्थिति में ले आए हैं। आज भारत और दुनिया एक ऐसी स्थिति में हैं जहां पर केवल न्युक्लियर फिजन से बिजली पैदा करने की नहीं बल्कि न्युक्लियर फ्यूजन से भी बिजली पैदा करने की बात की जा रही है। आज हममें से बहुत से लोगों को शायद यह नहीं मालूम होगा कि छः देशों ने मिलाकर एक कंसोर्टियम बनाया है, जिसके तहत इन्टरनेशनल थर्मो-न्युक्लियर एक्सपेरिमेंट रिएक्टर की स्थापना 6.5 बिलियन यूरो से फ्रांस में की जा रही है, लेकिन भारत उसमें अभी तक शामिल नहीं है। इसी तरह जेनरेशन-4 न्युक्लियर फिजन टेक्नोलॉजी में दस देशों का एक कंसोर्टियम बना है। ये देश उसमें अपना पैसा और टेक्नोलॉजी इन्वेस्ट कर रहे हैं लेकिन भारत उसमें कहीं भी दूर-दूर तक शामिल नहीं है। दुनिया आज लीप-फ्रॉग कर रही है लेकिन हम अभी भी पुराने तरीके पर चलकर ही आगे जाना चाहते हैं। इसलिए मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने जो एग्रीमेंट यूएसए के साथ किया है, उससे आने वाले समय में न केवल हम टेक्नोलॉजी तक एक्सेस कर पाएँगे बल्कि हम इसके रॉ-ड्रड्रड्रथोटेरियल तक भी एक्सेस कर पाएँगे और हम ITER और जेनरेशन-4 न्युक्लियर टेक्नोलॉजी में भी भागीदार हो सकेंगे। इसके लिए मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ।

इतना ही नहीं, अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज जब हम लोग पढ़ते हैं और देखते हैं कि हमारे देश का प्रधानमंत्री, भारत का नुमाइन्दा बन करके विदेश में जाता है और उनका वहां स्वागत होता है, लोग तारीफ करते हैं, तो एक आम हिन्दुस्तानी की तरह हमारा सीना गर्व से चौड़ा हो जाता है। लेकिन उसी समय हमें अखबारों में यह पढ़ने और देखने को मिलता है कि जब हमारा प्रधानमंत्री जी वहां पर हैं, उसी समय हमारे पूर्व प्रधानमंत्री जी उनके ज्वाइंट स्टेटमेंट को क्रिटिसाइज कर रहे हैं, तो उसी वक्त हमारा सिर शर्म से झुक जाता है, क्योंकि वह प्रधानमंत्री जब हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर हैं तब वह किसी पार्टी के नेता नहीं हैं, वह पूरे देश के नेता हैं और चाहे कोई भी व्यक्ति हो, किसी भी पार्टी का हो, उसे प्रधानमंत्री को पूरा बल प्रदान्ड्रड्रथ करना चाहिए ताकि वह प्रधानमंत्री अपनी बात पूरी ताकत के साथ विश्व के पटल पर रख सके और भारत के लिए कुछ कर पाए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया।

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज़ (मुजफ्फरपुर) : अध्यक्ष जी, प्रधानमंत्री जी ने जो बयान सदन में दिया था, अगर उसमें पूरे तौर पर सच्चाई हो, तो फिर हमें उसका समर्थन करना होगा।

लेकिन यह स्पष्ट नहीं हो रहा है कि न्युक्लियर मामलों में किस प्रकार के निर्णय हुए हैं। आने वाले दिनों में उसके नतीजे हम लोगों को किस तरह से भोगने होंगे, इस पर विचार करना चाहिए। विश्व के सामने जो सौदा हुआ है, हम लोगों ने जो बातें उसमें स्वीकार की हैं, उनमें सबसे पहली बात मैं बताना चाहता हूँ। Identifying and separating civilian and military nuclear facilities and programmes in a phased manner. अब यह समझ में नहीं आता कि फेज्ड मैनर

क्या चीज है, क्योंकि जहां सुरक्षा का मामला आता है, वहां फेज्ड मैनर की बात करने लगेंगे, तो उसका अर्थ समझने में तकलीफ होगी। बात वहीं नहीं रुकती है। यह भी तय हुआ है कि इंटरनेशनल एटोमिक एनर्जी एजेंसी (आईएईए) के माध्यम से जो काम होता है, भारत की जहां तक बात आती है, न्यूक्लियर पावर के तौर पर इन्हें हमें उसके द्वारा वह स्वीकृति नहीं मिल रही है।

यहां पर यह बात बताई गई, अनेक साथियों ने इसका स्वागत भी किया कि हमें मिलिटरी पावर के तौर पर स्वीकृति मिली है। लेकिन जहां तक न्यूक्लियर पावर का मामला है, तो न्यूक्लियर पावर के तौर पर जो आपके हाथों में शक्ति है, वह आपको मिलिटरी पावर के तौर पर मिलने वाली नहीं है। यहां हमने यह बात भी कबूल की है कि **to voluntarily place all civil nuclear sites under IAEA inspections.** इसके जो नतीजे होंगे, वह समय बताएगा। आज तक दूसरे किसी भी देश में ऐसे कोई निर्णय नहीं लिए गए हैं।

आज दुनिया में पांच ऐसे राष्ट्र हैं, जो अपने को न्यूक्लियर पावर मानते हैं। उनका एक निर्णय यह भी है कि वे और किसी को इस क्लब में नहीं आने देंगे। अगर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस बात पर बल दिया होता कि न्यूक्लियर पावर स्टेटस व्यवहार में तो हमारा है, लेकिन दुनिया के वे पांच राष्ट्र उसे मानने को तैयार नहीं हैं। अगर उन्होंने मजबूती से बात रखी होती, तो हो सकता है कि अमेरिका के साथ जो इतने समझौते हो रहे हैं, इससे उस पर कुछ तो दबाव पड़ता।

### **18.00 hrs.**

हम लोग एक न्यूक्लियर पावर के तौर पर दुनिया में अपनी बात को रख सकते थे। एक और बात हम लोगों ने स्वीकार की है कि हम तो आईएईए तक एडीशनल प्रोटोकॉल हैं, इस पर हस्ताक्षर करेंगे। यह प्रोटोकॉल हमें फिर सिविल न्यूक्लियर फ्यूल साईकिलिंग जो है उसको इंटरनेशनल मॉनिटरिंग में हमको पहुंचा देगा और एक बार इंटरनेशनल एटोमिक एनर्जी एजेंसी मॉनिटरिंग में हम लोग जाएंगे तो उनकी तरफ से जो हमारे ऊपर यूरेनियम माइन्स की मॉनिटरिंग, फ्यूल साईकिलिंग की मॉनिटरिंग, उनके हाथों में देने का काम हो जाएगा और हो चुका है।

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time of the House is extended till the end of this debate. That does not mean that the time has been extended indefinitely.

**श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज़ :** दूसरी तरफ अमरीका के साथ जो भी अभी सौदे हुए हैं, उनमें अमरीका के साथ शस्त्र खरीदने का एक संकल्प हो चुका है और इस संकल्प के जरिये आने वाले सालों में अमरीका भारत का सबसे नजदीकी मित्र बने, ऐसा काम ही नहीं होगा बल्कि हमारी सुरक्षा की सारी बातों में अमरीका को ही केन्द्र-बिंदु बनाने का वाक्य होने वाला है। हम मानते हैं कि सारी बातों पर प्रधान मंत्री जी की तरफ से स्पष्ट खुलासा होना जरूरी है और जो अमरीका हमारे देश की सुरक्षा के मामलों में अपना पांव मजबूती के साथ रखने का काम कर रहा है, इससे भी हम लोगों को बचे रहना चाहिए। इस अवसर पर मैं और कोई विशेष बात नहीं कहना चाहूंगा। बाद में जब कभी समय मिलेगा तो मैं बोलूंगा। सुबह से हम यहां बैठे रहे कि हमें जल्दी बोलने का मौका मिलेगा। अब मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आपका नाम बहुत बाद में आया है, otherwise, I would have given you more time.

**PROF. M. RAMADASS (PONDICHERY):** Hon. Speaker, Sir, I rise to appreciate the *suo motu* Statement of the Hon. Prime Minister. I see in the Statement more merits than demerits. This Statement consists of two parts – one is about the visit of the Prime Minister *per se* and the second one is the outcome of the visit. As far as the visit is concerned, the hon. Prime Minister has gone to USA with a vision and mission and to a very large extent, he has succeeded in his mission. He wanted to raise the image and prestige of this country in the comity of nations and by joining one of the greatest global players, he has shown to the world that India has become a major power-house. He has also convinced the US that India is the centre of knowledge industry and it is equally concerned about terrorism at the global level. To that extent, the visit was successful.

On the outcome of the visit and the impact of the Indo-US Treaty, a number of views have been expressed in this House expressing a lot of pessimism, and scepticism about it. But, I would only like to impress upon the critics of this Indo-US Agreement that we must look at the environment in which this Accord has been made and the conditions under which it has been made.

We should also think that we have not lost our sovereignty, we have not lost our Independence, and we have not lost our dignity in entering into this Agreement. On the other hand, we have gained a lot through this or we are going to gain a lot from this visit as well as the Indo-US Agreement.

Today, India is on the threshold of a virtual transformation. Indian economy has achieved one of the highest growth rates in the world today. It is no longer a closed economy as it was in 1951 or 1961 or in 1971. Today, it is an open economy. It has now become an integral part of the global economy and we will have to take a number of decisions which were traditional in yesteryears but modern today. Therefore, looked at from that point of view, our Agreement with the US can give us greater strength and resilience to the development of the Indian economy. Although, the economy is on the right path, yet we require a large amount of support from others. We will have to provide support to others. This is only reciprocity – what we can give to USA and what USA can give to us. It is this reciprocity that characterises this Agreement.

Today, India needs a lot of infrastructure. If India has to develop and has to come at the top of the world, it must have the world class infrastructure for which we require investment. And this investment will be forthcoming from the USA after this Accord. Secondly, there will be greater boost to agricultural development because this Agreement gives place for a lot of research activities as well as extension activities.

One of the Members said that there was no mention about subsidy to agriculture. One cannot expect an Accord to give everything to Indian economy as well as to Indian agriculture. We wanted the research efforts to disseminate to India so that we can carry forward the Green Revolution.

The Member who initiated this debate brought a strange correlation between the Green Revolution in Punjab and terrorism. I do not know how it is. He said that it was imposed on India by the US. I would like to remind the Member that the Green Revolution was an indigenous effort of Indian scientists and Indian political leaders. He must remember that it was Dr. M.S. Swaminathan and Shri C. Subramaniam who in a combined way brought Green Revolution to this country which brought self-sufficiency in food production and dispensed our necessity to have a 'Mouth to Ship Situation' which existed long time back. Therefore, this Agreement would help us to build our strength and resilience in the matter of higher and higher Green Revolution which we characterise as Second Green Revolution. There is scope for greater technological diffusion between India and US as a result of this Accord. The nuclear power is now assuming greater importance because nuclear power alone can bring us energy security.

Therefore, in this respect, the Accord and its impact will have greater strength on Indian economy. We hope that we would be able to achieve eight per cent growth as envisaged by the UPA. Therefore, this House must unanimously applaud and appreciate the hon. Prime Minister whose vision has been appreciated by the world leaders.

Therefore, I would only conclude by stating what Mr. Bush has said while welcoming the Hon. Prime Minister at USA has said. He said:

"I am proud to stand here today with the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, the leader of one of the world's great democracies. Mr. Prime Minister, welcome to America. I applaud your vision and applaud your leadership. You are a man who is committed to

peace and liberty. I look forward to working with you Prime Minister. I thank you for coming. "

Sir, there can be no better assessment of the Prime Minister and his ability to arrive at negotiations and to bring benefits to this country. Those are the words of Mr. Bush I hope that under his dedicated leadership and under the able guidance of Madam Sonia Gandhi, this country is poised for a greater growth. This Accord will definitely bring power and prosperity to this country.

SHRI DUSHYANT SINGH (JHALAWAR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank Shri Prabodh Panda and Shri C.K. Chandrappan for initiating this debate on the hon. Prime Minister's recent visit to the United States.

The year 1998 was a very decisive year for Indo-US relationship. At this juncture, I must mention that a Nuclear Test was conducted by India on 11<sup>th</sup> May, 1998. To us and to a large section of the Indian community, it was a *Bharat Gaurav Diwas*. All sections were very happy. So, we are all proud of our former Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

Here, I must mention that India did not violate any international treaty or obligation. Since that Nuclear Test, the US imposed sanctioned on us. But later on, it was only the initiative of our former Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee that the consultations were held and Indo-US foreign office level talks were held, and we had a successful meeting with them.

About this recent trip of the hon. Prime Minister to the United States, we must understand that the initiative had been taken by our former Prime Minister. We must appreciate that the recent visit of our hon. Prime Minister was the result of the initiative taken by our former Prime Minister.

At this stage, I must also mention about the Indo-US Joint Statement made in New Delhi by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and Mr. Bill Clinton, where two largest democracies of the world came closer. It was the understanding of our hon. former Prime Minister and the then President of the US, Bill Clinton that this Joint Statement was made in New Delhi. That Joint Statement included the subjects: to promote democratic values and peace; to combat terrorism; to work together for making strategic alliances; and to reaffirm commitment to forgo further nuclear explosion or test. We went a step further in the strategic partnership when the NSSP was announced on 29<sup>th</sup> July, 2004. It was primarily aimed at increasing cooperation of civil-nuclear activities; civil-space programmes, high technology trade and Defence.

In this view, we must understand our Prime Minister's trip to the United States. His trip mainly embarked on strengthening democratic capacities, combating terrorism, economic launch of CO programme, infrastructure development, and science and technology framework agreement. I must add to that and discuss it further. At this stage, in the debate, I must also mention that all the works that our hon. Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh carried out in the USA, was the result of the initiative taken by our former Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. But in his Statement made on the floor of the House on 29<sup>th</sup> July, 2005, the hon. Prime Minister did not mention anything relating to our hon. former Prime Minister's initiative and goals; and as to what he had done earlier in improving ties with the US.



I must say, at this stage, that "the Indian economy" – he has mentioned it when he says this, "is stronger than it has ever been." I must say that you began economic liberalisation, we commend you for that. We must commend our Prime Minister for taking the initiatives in his talks and initiating the talks through NSSP. It was done in 2004. You have mentioned here that the purpose of your visit was to sensitise the US Government about the full extent of the changes that have taken place since 1991. There were successive Governments, in my partners on the Left and other Members who were part of the Government, which have since then done a lot of good work. You must commend other successive Governments for doing good work.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt you. I am very unhappy to interrupt the young Members who deliver such a beautiful and instructive speeches. But time is limited.

SHRI DUSHYANT SINGH : I will just conclude.

Sir, the Indian economy is primarily dependent on its rural economy. The '*Aam admi*' is what the Congress and the UPA speak for. Seventy per cent of the voters who elect Members of Parliament are from rural India. You have asked for a knowledge mission – a knowledge initiative – for the rural or the agriculture sector. Suppose we talk about Gorgian peanuts. If it floods the Indian market, what will happen to our peanuts here? I have been elected from a rural constituency. We produce soyabean. Suppose soyabean comes in from US; then what will happens to us!

You also talk about combating terrorism. When did US help us when our plane was hijacked? I was in Kandhar. You must see that they really started working since 9/11.

You talk about modern vision and infrastructure development. Our former Prime Minister initiated various programmes for rural linkages, river linkages and infrastructure development. You have mentioned about high-technology development. I must go on emphasising that high-technology development should be seen as the removal of the five entities from the list that we see under NSSP on the initiative taken by our former Prime Minister.

Sir, at this stage, I would like to mention about nuclear energy. A lot has been talked about it. You have only worked on for nuclear energy for Tarapur project. We have other projects also. There are many projects in Rajasthan and many other parts of India. You should consider them also.

Sir, I would like to conclude by saying that there are responsibilities. In the Statement, the Prime Minister has mentioned:

"Our inheritance gives us confidence; our experience gives us courage."

I must say that your inheritance was from the NDA Government. We gave you confidence; we gave you experience. On that, you are building nuclear power or energy sector. So, I would commend our Prime Minister, our former Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, for this.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much. I am sorry to interrupt you.

Next speaker is Shri Milind Deora. You also have a limited time.

SHRI MILIND DEORA (MUMBAI-SOUTH): Sir, I do not think there is any doubt in the House that the Prime Minister's recent visit to America was a great success for India not just in terms of the recognition it received from the US but in terms of recognition it received from the international community.

Sir, there is a banner in Mumbai city. This banner tries to capture the sentiments of the people of the city to local, domestic, national and international issues. I can say that the banner – the people who place that banner – do not always write good things about the Congress Party. But today, while the city is reeling under this flooded situation, that banner reads: "India conquers the US without firing a single shot." I think that is the sentiment held across the country by the people who are informed, who have taken the time to understand what the Joint Statement is all about, what the Prime Minister's visit is about and not only that, the deal was a manifestation of where India is globally today in terms of its economic power and its strong democratic systems. But, I think, it is truly the testimony to the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi and Dr. Manmohan Singh.

He actually managed to gain so much interest from around the world which will help India strengthen (a) its energy security needs, (b) mark India's role as a responsible global nuclear power and (c) give us the option or the choice, without even having signed the NPT, to participate in this global framework whereby we can access certain fuels, infrastructure, technology, equipment, that will lead to and enable us to build a domestic capacity for nuclear power which right now is under three per cent of our total energy supply and reduce our reliance on oil, gas, coal, when the oil prices are rising.

The oil price has even touched 60 dollars per barrel and a lot of people have touched upon it. I do not want to go into the details of IAEA and the safeguards. But the fact is that there is plenty of flexibility provided to us before we place any of our civilian nuclear capabilities before IAEA. We have enough time to identify those to separate them and to debate them in India, inside the Parliament and outside.

What is shocking and which is clearly evident today is the fact that the NDA leaders have nothing to say about this. Whatever they spoke about and whatever they have been talking about, in the Media as also inside and outside Parliament, clearly does not hold true today. The BJP today is criticising this and the people in Washington and Capitol Hill are completely shocked to see this because they are the ones who started this process. I think, at least in foreign policy, we should not discriminate on party lines and we should not discriminate on Government lines and we all should come together on what is in the country's interest.

There is one little point that I want to make before I conclude my speech. I know that we are running short of time. I will make that point very quickly. I have the Indo-US Vision Statement of 2000. In the UPA Government, not once have we seen our External Affairs Minister talking to anybody less than his counterpart, Ms. Condoleezza Rice, the Secretary of State. But the Indo-US Vision Document says: "The two countries also consider the on-going dialogue between our



MR. SPEAKER: I am thankful to the hon. Members on all sides. We had a very constructive debate on a very important issue for four-and-a-half hours. Now, the Prime Minister.

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO (KALAHANDI): Sir, can I seek a clarification?

MR. SPEAKER: You can seek clarifications after the speech only if he allows. I cannot compel him.

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): I will answer all the queries.

MR. SPEAKER: Please give up this habit of always questioning the Chair.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You cannot speak every day.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, I would like to bring one point to your notice....  
(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You may speak later on, not now.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, I am the Deputy Chief Whip of  
my Party. My name was at number three \*

MR. SPEAKER: It does not affect me at all. I would have been affected by his compliment.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (CHANDIGARH): Sir, you may expunge the statement he has  
made.... (*Interruptions*)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप लोग बैठ जाइये। If he is making an allegation against the Chair, I treat his abject  
remarks the way they should be treated. I am very-very sorry. I have called so many Members of  
your Party. Your name was not at number three in the list before me. And, you cannot dictate to the  
Chair.

(*Interruptions*) ...\*

MR. SPEAKER: There is a limit to everything.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing is being recorded. Remove everything. Please sit down. I said that it is an  
important debate. I have requested the hon. Prime Minister to respond.

(*Interruptions*) ...\*

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI (HYDERABAD): I had given my name in the afternoon...  
(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: So what? You please take your seat. I have decided not to call you. Will you please take your seat or not?

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will be recorded. You go on shouting. This is not the way to do it. Please take your seat.

*(Interruptions)*... \*

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I will adjourn the House because of you. If I adjourn the House, you will not have the benefit of the Prime Minister's speech.

... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I am staging a walk out... *(Interruptions)*

**18.31 hrs.**

*(At this stage, Shri Kharbela Swain left the House.)*

... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI : Sir, I also represent a political party... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You will be duly recognised. You are recognised. You need not bother. This is becoming a habit all round to question the Chair and throw challenges to the Chair. By doing this, you are not enhancing the prestige of either yourself or of this institution.

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I take this opportunity to thank all the hon. Members who have taken part in this debate on the outcome of my visit to the United States. I thank hon. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, in particular, for having done me the honour by participating in the debate. The level of the debate does credit to our House and I am very grateful that I have this opportunity to clarify some of the issues arising out of a statement that I made before this august House.

Sir, after I presented the Budget of 1991, this visit to the United States was in some way the most challenging task that I faced. But I was sustained by the powerful legacy of our freedom struggle by Pandit Nehru who made India the knowledge power that we are today; Shrimati Indira Gandhi who made us the nuclear power that we are today; and Shri Rajiv Gandhi who made us the IT power that we are today.

India stands tall today in the comity of nations. We are a country today with the second highest rate of growth in the world. The world marvels and respects us for being a democracy. People ask this question and marvel how a country of a billion persons with such great diversities

and with such great complexities, with all the religions of the world represented in its population yet manages to flourish as a functioning democracy. People also marvel that we have probably the second or the third largest Muslim population among our citizens and not one of them has been found to have joined the ranks of Al Qaeda and such other groups.

The world respects India for what we are. Therefore, it was for me a great privilege to represent India in talking to the various dignitaries right from President Bush downwards and, in my address to the Joint Session, of the US Congress.

Sir, issues have been raised about the basic orientation of our foreign policy. The foreign policy of our country, ever since we became an independent nation, has been designed to promote our enlightened national interest. That orientation has not changed. There is, of course, a strong civilizational influence which also guides our attitude to the world as we see it today, or the world that we would like to shape. That is as it should be. But as Panditji used to say, 'we live in a dynamic world; in a fast changing world. Therefore, our approach should reflect the flexibilities which are necessary in managing the complex polity in a dynamic world, but there can be no compromise on basic fundamentals'.

Sir, I can assure you, in my visit I was cautious of this great responsibility that as the Prime Minister of this great country that I should not do, or say anything which anyway reflects adversely on ourselves.

Sir, two types of comments have been made on what we have done in this visit. There is one set of comments from our Left colleagues, whose comments I greatly value and respect, that we are continuing the same policies as those of the previous Government of getting closer and closer to the United States and that we are in danger of being submerged in that orbit under the influence of the United States. There is however, another stream coming from the benches opposite that somehow we have compromised India's strategic nuclear autonomy. So, I will deal with both these issues in some details.

The United States is a super power today. We want to move towards a multi-polar world. But how do you become part of a multi-polar world? I would like that a strong India should grow fast enough to become a powerful pole of the evolving global economy. So, it is no use merely saying that we want to get away from this uni-polar world. The practical strategies have to lay emphasis on building the economic strength and cohesion of our country. If India grows in the next ten years at the rate of eight to ten per cent per annum, then we will probably become the third or the fourth largest economy in the world and the world will respect us. Therefore, while we know where we want to go, our objective is a multi-polar world. Our objective is to work together with other like-minded countries to manage and promote equitable management of the global inter-dependence of nations, which cannot be avoided in this one world that we are living in today. That is not something that is going to happen overnight. Step by step we have to move in that direction and relations with the United States are of great importance in achieving that objective. Of course, in doing so, we must not compromise on our national honour, on our national interest. But engagement with the United States is essential in the world that we live in. This is not an alliance; this is not a military alliance. This is not an alliance against any other country.

Since our Government came into office, we have entered into strategic partnership with Russia. We have very close relations with Russia. Recently, our Chairperson, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi visited

Russia. She was received with utmost warmth by President Putin himself. A few months back, I was in Europe. We signed a strategic partnership agreement with the European Union. A few weeks ago, the Prime Minister of Japan came here and I venture to think that we have broken fresh ground in our relations with Japan during that visit.

Then we have had the privilege of welcoming the Prime Minister of China. After a great deal of efforts, we have broken new ground in promoting closer relations with that great neighbour of ours in the North. We have successfully concluded the agreement on the basic fundamental principles which should guide the solution of the complicated border problem between India and China. Therefore, I wish to dispel this illusion and I do say so with respect because it is an illusion. We are not part of any military alliance and we are not ganging up against any other country, least of all against China. And I am being absolutely truthful. In my public discussions and in the Press Conferences that I addressed, in my meetings with US dignitaries, I made it quite clear that we are engaged and we want to remain engaged with China, our great neighbour. Our economic relations are greatly expanding and I see new horizons in our economic relations with that great country and it is our wish and desire to work together to strengthen the forces of peace and prosperity in Asia and Europe. Therefore, I wish to dispel this opinion which may exist that what we have done with the United States is at the cost of China or any other country.

What we are seeking is that we need an international environment which is supportive of our development efforts. India's principal concern is to get rid of chronic poverty, ignorance and diseases which still afflict millions and millions of our population. Great things have been done since India became independent but that journey to get rid of poverty is still unfinished and we will make all efforts domestically to reach that goal. In the world that we live in, no nation today can prosper independently. I recall what Pandit Nehru himself said and that was a prophetic vision. In 1947, he said that in this world that we live in, peace, prosperity and perhaps disasters are also indivisible. So, in this interdependent world that we live in, we need a supportive environment. And right or wrong, the United States influences that international environment. Therefore, I do not think that there is anything wrong for us to seek close cordial relations with the US while doing nothing which will affect India's dignity and honour as a sovereign independent country. So, I submit to you that I have faithfully carried out that responsibility.

As regards various issues that have been discussed, I will come to them subsequently. But the main issue coming from the main Opposition Party has been on whether we compromised, in any way, on our strategic autonomy in the management of our nuclear weapon programme.

Before I deal with that, I should like to mention that before going to the United States I had the honour of meeting Leaders of the Opposition, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Shri L.K. Advani and Shri Jaswant Singh. I had the privilege of explaining to them what I would seek to achieve. I also briefed our colleagues of the Left parties. I gave them a broad indication of what was at stake. I was not sure of the outcome, so I could not state all the things that subsequently are reflected in the Joint Statement. What was my concern? My objective was, other than to widen our development options, to acquire for India a larger space to achieve our national goals and to do specifically two things. Firstly, never to compromise our autonomy in the management of India's nuclear programme, the strategic programme. Secondly, I had to recognise, as the Minister of Atomic Energy, that India's nuclear power programme had lagged behind. When I was a civil servant, I was a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, way back in the seventies. At that time, the Atomic Energy

Commission had set for us a target of 10,000 megawatts of generating capacity. Today we are in 2005. Our capacity is less than 3,000 megawatts. We have run into some problems. I pay compliments to our nuclear scientists. They have performed admirably under very difficult conditions of this nuclear apartheid with which we have had to live for 35 years. But energy security is the key to India's emergence as a strong and powerful nation in the years to come. We have problems. Coal is plentiful. But greater use of coal can result in environmental hazards, like CO2 emissions, though clean coal technology can help manage that situation.

We are dependent on hydrocarbon imports for meeting seventy per cent of our requirements. That is too large a dependence. Therefore, in our quest for energy security, we must widen the options that are open to us and nuclear energy is one such option. There, I was being faithful to the vision of Panditji. You look at the Resolution which was adopted by the Government of India when the Atomic Energy Commission was set up. The Atomic Energy Programme of India was brought into being with an eye to create new avenues for us to generate power. That programme has got into difficulties. This is no fault of our scientists. They have done exceedingly well under very difficult conditions. But we have to recognise the realities. Therefore, I felt that if we have to find ways and means to create an environment in which this nuclear apartheid, all these restrictive regimes which have been erected in the last 35 years, which have blocked our capacity to leap frog in the race for social and economic development through the use of high technology, if somehow we could get rid of these restrictive regimes, then we would have widened development option in the area of energy security that India badly needs if it is to realise its economic and social destiny. Therefore, before going to the US, I said to myself that on the one hand we should do nothing to surrender our strategic autonomy in the management of our strategic assets. On the other hand, we should find an honourable way to persuade the United States and other interlocutors to lift this nuclear blockade which has restricted our options during the last 35 years.

Sir, I say in all sincerity that we have succeeded in the objective. There is nothing in the Joint Statement which conveys the impression, or which should convey the impression, to anyone that we have in any way compromised our autonomy, our sovereign will-power, in managing our nuclear assets. That subject was never discussed. My concern in Washington was to impress upon the United States that if the United States genuinely felt that it had a change of heart with regard to India, then it must do something to lift these 35 years of restrictions which have hampered our quest for a faster access to nuclear energy.

I am glad to say that we have succeeded in achieving that objective. But, a question has been raised – and Shri Atalji raised this question. He said: "You are going to separate the civilian and the nuclear components of our Atomic Energy programme. Did you consult the scientists? Is this feasible?" I say, in all sincerity, that this is a question which has engaged my personal attention for quite some time. I am not a nuclear scientist but I had the advice of our nuclear establishment, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission was a part of my delegation. I hope I am not revealing a secret. I think, when the final draft came to me from the US side, I made it quite clear to them that I will not sign on any document which did not have the support of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. It held up our negotiations for about 12-15 hours. But ultimately, we succeeded. We had a draft which had the full approval of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Therefore, there should be no doubt whatsoever in anybody's mind that the nuclear establishment of our country, of which we are very proud, that was not fully on board.



After coming back, I talked to a large number of other nuclear scientists and other scientists and I am convinced that what we have done is in the best interest of our country. This separation that we have committed - and, let me say, all our commitments are reciprocal commitments. We will not do anything unless the United States' side honours its commitment - what are those commitments? Those are the profound commitments which the US has committed, in the words of their own President, to give India the benefit of full civilian nuclear cooperation with all the benefits that other nuclear powers enjoy. Therefore, if that statement is translated into concrete realities, I think, that will mean a new era for the growth of civilian nuclear energy sector in our country. My own vision is that in the next 15-20 years we should add about 30,000-40,000 megawatts of nuclear capacities. I have a vision that will open up new vistas of opportunity in the field of high technology. Today, we have only a few hi-tech firms like Bharat Heavy Electricals, Larsen and Toubro. If we have a large nuclear power programme and auxiliarisation, around that, it will grow a very large number of hi-tech firms which would enable us to leapfrog in the race for social and economic development. Separation is feasible. There should be no doubt about it that our Atomic Energy establishment agrees with that .

Furthermore, I would also like to say that this separation is not imposed. This separation will be decided voluntarily, solely on the basis of our own judgement. Nobody can, from outside, say: "Well, this is civilian, this is nuclear." That determination will be made by the people of India, by our Government, by our Atomic Energy Establishment...(Interruptions)

Also, it will be a phased identification. I know these things cannot be done in one go. If we are to separate the civilian and the military components of our programme, it will take time. And that is why we have ensured that this would be a purely voluntary decision, secondly it will be a phased programme, it will be so phased – and, you have my assurance, Sir, it will be so phased – that our strategic programme is fully safeguarded. Therefore, there should be no doubt whatsoever that we have done anything which compromises our strategic autonomy in the management of India's strategic nuclear assets.

Atal ji also asked this question about the negotiation of Fissile Material Production Cut-off Treaty. In this case, I should like to point out that we have taken on no more additional commitments than the commitments that were taken on board by the previous Government. And, what is our commitment? We have said that we would work with the USA in the negotiations of a multilateral agreement. This is not a bilateral deal between India and the United States. This is a deal which will be negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Several years have passed when these matters have been discussed. There is no agreement in sight. It will take quite some time and in any case if the stage comes to take a decision, we will never be a party to any discriminatory treatment. Therefore, if what other nuclear weapon powers say are their rights, we would insist on the same rights. So, by merely agreeing to work with the United States in negotiating a multilateral treaty, we have not surrendered, in any way, the effectiveness of our strategic asset programme.

Sir, I should also like to assure this House that the three cycles, the fuel cycles that we have been working out are: one, Pressurized Heavy Water Reactors; two, the Fast Breeder Programme and, three, Thorium-based Reactors. We will not allow our research programme to suffer in any way in the process of separation of the civilian and the nuclear programme. So, our research scientists should have the fullest confidence that India's research potential in this vital area of national

knowledge promotion will not suffer in any way. That is the commitment that I give on behalf of the Government of India.

Atal ji asked that we have not been given the status of a nuclear weapon State. Shri Fernandes also asked that question. It is true. Because, in the international parlance, the Nuclear Weapon States are the ones which are identified in the NPT Treaty. We are not a party to that Treaty. Let us face it. That Treaty cannot be changed overnight. What we have done with the United States is that we have virtually got all the benefits that go with being a Nuclear Weapon State without having the *de jure* status of a Nuclear Weapon State.

### **19.00 hrs.**

I think that is something which is of comfort to us. So, the fact that we are not recognised *de jure* as a Nuclear Weapon State, this was not on my agenda also because I knew that much that international treaties cannot be re-written overnight. But we have now the commitment of the United States that not only will it dismantle its own restrictive regimes but that it will use its influence with its allies and friends to dismantle these restrictive regimes, which have in the past hampered the growth of India's civilian nuclear programme. I was very clear in my mind that there may be uncertainties in the US Congress. Although the President was gracious enough to say that he will use all his influence to ensure that the Congress legislates as we want but there are uncertainties. I cannot predict what the Congress will do. Therefore, I insisted that it is not enough that the United States should commit itself to get its own domestic legislation modified but that it must use its influence with other countries, its allies and supporters to do the same. Even if the Congress of the United States does not pass, well we have, I think, the commitment of the US Government and that itself means something.

We have been wanting more Uranium for our nuclear plants. We have gone to other countries and everybody says, 'yes', they sympathise with us but that we must get the Americans on board. Now that the Americans on board, I think the fuel question for our reactors would be a thing of the past. I very much hope so. So, what we have got through this Joint Statement is something tangible. Atalji also asked this question. We have not been recognised as a nuclear weapon state. We have been merely recognised as a nuclear power with advanced nuclear technologies but there are other countries like Brazil and others. Will we get a treatment like Brazil? I think, if you read the Statement carefully, we have got enough better treatment. We have, I think, an explicit commitment from the United States that India should get the same benefits of civilian cooperation as advanced country like the United States enjoys. So, I think, that itself should provide an effective answer to the extent of opportunities and possibilities that are now on the horizons.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe that I have tackled both sets of comments, one coming from our colleagues from the Left and the other coming mainly from the main Opposition. There were some questions raised with regard to the role of agriculture. Let me say, Sir, I was very conscious. In fact, the first thing that I said to my officials before going to Washington is, 'Is there anything that we can do jointly with the United States to promote food security and agricultural security in our country?' It then occurred to me that agricultural research, the state of agricultural universities, the state of extension work in our country is not up to the mark. Dhindsa Saheb referred to the Punjab agriculture. I was at one time associated with the founding of the Punjab Agricultural University when Sardar Pratap Singh Khairon was the Chief Minister. I know, for example, the role that was

played by Indo-US cooperation in giving rise to first grade agricultural university whether Pantnagar or Ludhiana. But one has to recognise that in many of these universities, their research work has reached a flat. Therefore, through the knowledge initiative in agriculture we have, I think, opened up a new era of research cooperation which I hope will lead us to the frontiers of human knowledge in all sciences which have a bearing on our agricultural prosperity.

There is nothing in this Joint Statement which says that we will open up our borders to an unlimited flow of American goods. Those issues will be dealt with separately in the WTO. Those issues were not discussed in my discussions with President Bush. This is something which the Chairperson reminds me everyday. Our first commitment is to India's farmers – small and marginal farmers – who need a food security. Preserving the livelihood strategies of our farmers is our utmost concern, and we will do nothing which compromises the livelihood security of India's farmers.

Sir, questions were raised about the membership of the Security Council. It is certainly true that the United States has a different viewpoint. They are not supporting our Resolution. This was known to us before I went. I did raise this matter with the President and also raised this matter in my Address to the Joint Session of the Congress, and I was very surprised with the amount of applause I got from the Congressmen and the Members of the Senate on that particular point. I do not want to divulge what the President told me but I have not given up the hope that when ultimately some concrete action is taken, India's claims will not be ignored. In this Joint Statement, you have a statement attributed to the President himself that the international system must adapt itself to the rise of India's growing power. So, I think, we are not there right now and it is wrong on my part to claim that we have the US' support but I think when the time comes, I have reasons to believe India's claim can no longer be ignored.

The other thing that was raised was the question of the Iran-Pakistan-India pipeline. Sir, on this point, I have been quite clear. On my onward journey when I was going to Washington, I was asked this question by our correspondents and I had explicitly stated that this is a matter for us, Pakistan and Iran period; the United States has no role in it. I can assure you that nowhere in my discussion this question cropped up nor did I give any promise to anyone in the United States that we will not work to make this project a reality. I did say when the *Washington Post* Editorial Board interviewed me, they asked me this question: "You are on the one hand wanting nuclear power, you are also asking for this gas pipeline, why did you need both these things?" And I said: "There is uncertainty about this gas pipeline. We are still in a preliminary stage." But I did say: "We need that gas desperately." The House has my assurance that our Government is committed to make the gas pipeline a reality. But it would be wrong on my part to convey the impression that we are there. There are problems; we will have to look at the feasibility; we will have to look at the financing of these things. We will make sincere efforts to resolve those issues. At the National Press Club, I did say that we have civilizational links with Iran, and I said: "We have the second largest Shia Muslim community in our country." and that we can claim to be a bridge in reconciling these various differences that have arisen between Iran and other country. I did not act as a representative of a supplicant State. I was not there to sell India. I stood by what our national policies are, as approved by this august House, and I believe, Sir, that, by and large, I have carried out the mandate that was given to me.

Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGHLY): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to seek a clarification from the hon. Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: It is entirely for the Prime Minister to respond. I cannot compel him.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, while participating in the debate I had mentioned some other points. I am not going into them now. I had asked about the Indo-US bilateral democracy initiative. On that point, the nation needs some clarification and the hon. Prime Minister may clarify that.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Sir, I am very grateful to Dr. Rupchand Pal for having raised that point because this matter has figured in the Press and I am very glad that I have this opportunity to clarify the position.

Sir, it is certainly true that there is a great support and respect for India not only in the United States, but elsewhere in the world because we are a functional democracy; wherever I went, whether to the Congress, to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the House of Representatives International Relations Committee, people applauded the fact that we are a functional democracy with all our complexities, with all our diversities. What is it that we have agreed? We have agreed that the United States and India would, in their respective spheres, help those countries which want that help. There is no imposition, there is no question of our, for example, being forced to be a partner in any act of aggression against any other country and there is no question that we will ever entertain even that sort of thought. But we have the ITEC programme of our own. Sir, our Election Commission is respected all over the world. If some countries want our help in managing our help in managing their elections, in voter registration, in setting up an audit office in which we have great expertise, we would be providing that. The only commitment that we have is that we would be making a small contribution of \$10 million to the UN Democracy Fund to be administered by the United Nations and not by any other mechanism.

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO (KALAHANDI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to ask a question to the Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: It is entirely for the hon. Prime Minister to respond.

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : Sir, when the hon. Prime Minister was speaking, he mentioned about uranium supply to our nuclear power reactors in the country. As you know, we have got large deposits of uranium in the State of Meghalaya and in the State of Jharkhand. So, we could come up with our own reserves and develop them. What steps is the Government taking in this direction so that we can become self-sufficient in uranium and we can build our nuclear power reactors as we have already got the technology for that.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Sir, we are doing all we can to exploit the resources that we have. There are some difficulties, I do not want to go into these difficulties. But I entirely agree with the hon. Member that we should do all that we can to exploit our resources. Only yesterday I said to my Minister of State that, for example, in Jharkhand there are some problems and we are not exploiting those resources. So, you have my assurance that whether it is in Meghalaya, whether it in Andhra Pradesh or in Jharkhand, wherever we have uranium resources, we are actively engaged in seeing that these resources can be exploited to the maximum.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the emphasis in the Joint Statement is on the availability of U-37 for our atomic reactors. But given the hegemonistic attitude and the thrust of the American policy, what do they get from us in reciprocation as it has been stated that it is a reciprocal thing? Is it a change of heart or is it just a goodwill mission and the Joint Statement emerged out of that?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Sir, all I can say is that I have not done anything which is not reflected in this Joint Statement. There is no secret tag, there is no secret understanding, I have truthfully stated at great length of whatever was agreed. So now I do not want to be accused of being a reader of what is in people's mind. But, I think, the United States Government recognises that it is in their interest that a country of one billion people, a functional democracy, should grow. We can be and we will be a factor for peace, progress and stability not only in Asia, but in the rest of the world.

MAJ. GEN. RETD. B. C. KHANDURI (GARHWAL): Sir, I have only two clarifications. One is, and if I understood him correctly, he said that even if the US Congress does not accept what is being stated, the US Government will still be on board. Is my understanding correct?

Secondly, I have made a comment on this issue in my speech also and he has again stated that the building of present India, strong India starts from 1947 and ends up in 1991. Has nothing happened between 1991 and 2004?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Again Sir, that is not the presumption, which I would like him to carry. I think, as a country, our effort has been to manage change with continuity. So, I am not saying that everything that has happened today is because of what I have done or what our Government has done. But who can deny the contributions of Panditji, Indiraji, Rajivji? I also say that there were some good things done in the NDA regime also... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No please. It is not fair. He has spoken for 40 minutes.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He has very exhaustively dealt with the issue and has spoken for 40 minutes. Please take your seats now.

-----

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, are you interested in raising the urgent matters which are to be taken up at the end of the day?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. Shri Lonappan Nambadan please.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mention your matter Shri Nambadan. Do you remember what is your subject?