

Title: Further discussion on the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on 27th May,1998 on the recent nuclear tests in Pokhran raised by Shri Indrajit Gupta on the 27th May,98. The motion was adopted.

1432 hours

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Vaiko

DR. SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (MADURAI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, are you permitting me or not?

सभापति महोदय (श्री बेनी प्रसाद वर्मा): नियम १९३ में डिस्कशन चल रहा है। ... (व्यवधान)

DR. SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (MADURAI): Sir, I am on point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under what rule are you raising your point of order?

DR. SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (MADURAI): Sir, the rule is 376. The point is very simple. Today's papers say that Trinamool Congress has suspended its support to the Government. Now I hear that the Biju Janata Dal has withdrawn support. Does this Government enjoy majority or not? They should clarify at least that. Such reports of withdrawal of support have come. We would like to know from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs does the Government have majority support or not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. Shri Vaiko to speak.

श्री मोतीलाल वोरा (राजनांदगांव): पार्लियामेंटी अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर मौजूद है और मंत्री भी मौजूद है।

... (व्यवधान)

DR. SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (MADURAI): Maybe, they are having a Cabinet meeting for that.

सभापति महोदय : पार्लियामेंटी अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर मौजूद हैं और एक मंत्री भी मौजूद हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

डा. शफीकुर्रहमान बर्क (मुरादाबाद) : आप मंत्री जी से जवाब दिलवा दीजिए। ... (व्यवधान)

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री तथा पर्यटन मंत्री (श्री मदन लाल खुराना): कोई सवाल नहीं है, स्वामी जी आपकी इच्छा पूरी होने वाली नहीं है

... (व्यवधान)

आप फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर बनने वाले नहीं हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

इस देश के अंदर एक यह स्वामी हैं और एक बाहर स्वामी हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

डा. सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी (मदुरै): आप दोनों को नमस्कार करते रहिये, नहीं तो आपकी हालत खराब हो जायेगी।

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (AMRAVATI): Sir, I want to raise a point of order under Rule 376 (2), which says that :

"A point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House at the moment:"

Yesterday, at the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition, it was decided that both the Motions should be taken up together.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): How can you speak when I have been asked to speak? Mr. Chairman asked me to speak.

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (AMRAVATI): I am not speaking. I am only seeking a ruling over my point of order.

सभापति महोदय (श्री बेनी प्रसाद वर्मा) : अब डिस्कशन शुरू हो गयी है और डिस्कशन के बीच में प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर नहीं होता।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : जब डिस्कशन बंद हो जाये या ईलड करे तब आप बोल सकते हैं। ... अभी डिस्कशन शुरू हो गयी है।

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (AMRAVATI): Sir, he is on his legs and he is yet to start his speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under what rule are you raising this point of order?

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Mr. Chairman, Sir (Interruptions)

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (AMRAVATI): Sir, if he is making his speech, then what about my point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (AMRAVATI): Please bear with me and you may give your ruling either in favour of it or against it. According to Rule 376 (2) :

"A point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House at the moment:"

Item No. 23 says :

"Further discussion on the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 27th May, 1998 regarding recent nuclear tests in Pokhran raised by Shri Indrajit Gupta on the 27th May, 1998."

Yesterday, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised the issue of tests conducted by Pakistan. Now, the discussion on both these things should be tagged together, that is, the tests conducted by India and Pakistan. The Motion should be on these lines, otherwise it will be an unilateral Motion. As per the conscious decision taken by the House yesterday, at the end of this Motion, we can add the words "and the nuclear tests conducted by Pakistan". It was decided in the House that these two Motions will be taken up together, but as it is, it is an isolated Motion.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Sir, there is no point of order because there is no other Motion before the House.

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री तथा पर्यटन मंत्री (श्री मदन लाल खुराना): सदन के सामने कोई मोशन नहीं है।

... (व्यवधान)

केवल प्राइम मिनिस्टर के स्टेटमेंट के ऊपर यहां चर्चा हो रही है।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : नियम १९३ पर कल चर्चा चल रही थी कि तभी सूचना आई कि पाकिस्तान ने भी परीक्षण किया है। यह बहस कल ही समाप्त होनी थी लेकिन अब एक दिन और बढ़ा दिया गया है। अब जो वक्ता रह गये हैं, वे इन नई परिस्थितियों में अपने विचार रखेंगे।

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (AMRAVATI): Sir, the subject matter of this Motion is about the recent nuclear tests in Pokhran. What about the discussion on the after-effects of the tests conducted by Pakistan? It is very relevant here.

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री तथा पर्यटन मंत्री (श्री मदन लाल खुराना): उसी संदर्भ में यह बहस चल रही है।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : जब आप बोलें तो उस वक्त आप अपनी स्पीच में इसे मेशन कर सकते हैं। यह नई परिस्थितियां हैं और उन्हीं के लिए एक दिन और बढ़ाया गया है।

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): You have made your point.

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (AMRAVATI): You start your speech and I will make my speech after that.

1439 hours

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, thank you very much for the opportunity given to me. The nuclear tests conducted by Pakistan at Chagai region in the province of Baluchistan at 1546 hours yesterday and the subsequent action and attitude of the Pakistani Government, particularly the aggressive speech or the statement of the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Shri Nawaz Sharif, vindicated and justified the nuclear tests that India conducted at Pokhran on 11th and 13th May.

Yesterday at odd hours at 2.10 a.m. our High Commissioner in Islamabad, Shri Satish Chandra was woken up and called to Foreign Office and he was told that India had a plan to attack the nuclear installations. Our High Commissioner correctly dismissed it as absurd and malicious.

Our hon. President of India also expressed the same opinion calling it absurd and malicious.

The tests were conducted and the President of Pakistan, Shri Rafiq Tarar declared a state of emergency under the pretext of a threat of external aggression to the security of Pakistan.

Things take very fast turn and the Pakistan officials, Army officials and Foreign Ministry spokesmen informed that the long range Ghauri missile is already being capped with nuclear warheads to give a befitting reply to the adventures by the enemy. So, the Ghauri missile is being capped with nuclear warheads.

When you take into account all these things together, one thing is very clear that they could not have manufactured a bomb overnight. They have been at it for years. Shri Nawaz Sharif himself has stated that from the year, 1974 they are at it.

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members of this House to the statement of Dr. Abdul Qadir Khan, who is called the father of Islamic bomb. He gave an interview on 1st March, 1987 to foreign journalists who happened to be India. In that interview which was published in The Indian Express at that time, I do remember a debate took place in both the Houses of Parliament over that. In that statement, he said " America knows it and that what the CIA is saying about our possession of bomb is correct." So, for years they have been manufacturing and they have been at it. They were planning to have nuclear bombs. They were making all the preparations and yesterday after the tests were conducted, the Prime Minister of Pakistan had all praise for

China. He has said that China is the time-tested friend of Pakistan and has also stated that they are proud of China. It seems they have communicated to China prior to the conducting of the test.

Sir, even after all these things, all these inflammatory and aggressive speeches of the Prime Minister rousing passions, he offers for talk. India has all along been trying to negotiate with them, to prepare for talks. But we should not forget one thing that the Pakistan Government is prepared for talks on one condition that the Kashmir question should be settled first and then only other things should be discussed. They are not prepared for talks even about the sponsored terrorism through the ISI in our country; their diabolical attempts to destabilise our country. Are we prepared to hand over Kashmir on a platter?

Yesterday, our hon. Home Minister was referring to the report of the Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare of the U.S. Congress, the report prepared by Mr. Youssef Bodansky, who is the Editor of the Jane's Defence Weekly. He has produced many books also. I do not want to repeat what Shri Advani stated. But I would like to quote from this document which is very relevant at this point of time. I quote:

"This clearly indicates that the Pakistani Government has bravely displayed its nuclear capability... Pakistan is really in a position to strike a heavy blow against India through its nuclear capability... The strategic logic of using the nuclear factor to offset any deficiencies in conventional military power has been the corner-stone of Pakistan's nuclear strategy."

Again, the question of Kashmir comes here. Qazi Hussain Ahmad, the Chief Senator, urged the Pakistan Government to declare a Jihad on India to get back Kashmir. He said:

"Let us wage Jihad for Kashmir. A nuclear-armed Pakistan would deter India from a wider conflict."

Now, we know what Pakistan's Agenda is. When they declared that they should wage a Jihad, that was supported by all sections in the Parliament in the debate in Pakistan. Today, all the political parties in Pakistan are supporting the line taken by the Nawaz Sharif Government on this. They are united in that in their Parliament. But we are not united. I do not want to find fault with our hon. Members. Even Shri Chidambaram pointed this out that we are divided. Of course, Parliament may be divided. Political parties may be divided. But here in India the people are not divided over the issue. They are with the Government. That is the fact. We cannot bury the fact. The people of this country throughout the length and breadth of this great country are overwhelmed with a sense of pride. They are overwhelmed with a sense of joy, with a sense of confidence, and with a sense of pride. That is the fact. But that has not been reflected in this Parliament. At this hour, we have to stand as one. We have to express our view.

Sir, I will be failing in my duty if I do not pay tributes and express my vast congratulations from the core of my heart, convey my greetings and applause to our scientists and engineers.

MR. CHAIRMAN (SHRI BENI PRASAD VERMA): Please conclude.

SHRI VAIKO: I have started just now and you are ringing the bell.

सभापति महोदय (श्री बेनी प्रसाद वर्मा): २० मिनट हो गए हैं।

SHRI VAIKO: Our scientists deserve all honour for their spectacular achievement. This is the finest hour in this country, this is not an hour of concern because history is going to pay the glowing tribute to Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee for his correct, courageous, foresighted and commendable decision to give the green signal to our scientists. Our scientists have used our own indigenous technology for this nuclear test.

I will quote Dr. Chidambaram from his interview to the Frontline dated 5th June where he said, "What we have done now is a test, a whole series of explosive devices. One can say, almost of all possible types which includes a fission device of advance design, a thermo-nuclear device..." I do not think, Pakistan has used this device.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI VAIKO: I have to speak from the Government side. I have to hit many of the questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Many Members have to participate in this discussion.

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री तथा पर्यटन मंत्री (श्री मदन लाल खुराना): जितने सदस्य अभी तक बोले हैं, आपने उनको आधे घंटे से लेकर पचास मिनट तक दिए हैं।

सभापति महोदय: इसे आज ही समाप्त करना है।

श्री मदन लाल खुराना: ठीक है आज ही समाप्त करना है, इन्हें थोड़ा समय और दे दें।

SHRI VAIKO: Our technology is an indigenous technology. The political analyst and the former Director of the CIA stated yesterday that Pakistan's devices are of Chinese technology. Hon. Members from the other side mentioned in their speeches that there was no threat to India from China. Particularly, hon. Shri Chidambaram said, "there is no threat from China and the Government has made Shri George Fernandes, the Defence Minister, a pawn to invent a threat." He referred to the Fifth, the Seventh and the Eighth Reports of the Standing Committee on Defence for the year 1995-96. I want to quote from the Fifth Report. It says:

"China is likely to remain a primary security challenge to India in the medium and long term. The enhancement of missile capabilities are an immense help to Pakistan's missile programmes and are serious security concerns to India."

Hon. Shri Indrajit Gupta was the Chairman of the Committee which presented the Fifth Report. All these reports indicate that there is a threat, a primary security challenge from China.

Hon. Shri Natwar Singh referred to 1962 conflict. He said: "All these 2000 years, there was only one conflict and no indepth study has been done as to why it happened." Hon. Shri Chidambaram also stated about the circumstances under which the war broke out and the circumstances are still surrounded in controversy. We should not forget the fact that Pandit Nehru, the apostle of peace, was for peace with China.

He advocated the slogan of Panchsheel at Bandung. We were not for militarisation. We were not for weaponisation. All our resources were meant for developing industry, agriculture and to bring prosperity in India.' But what happened? In 1962, when they crossed our border in Cannon Road, Nehru's words crumbled. He was the most disappointed man. All his dreams shattered. On the floor of this very House, on the 8th of November, 1962 in his speech, he said: "China had betrayed us and we were not at all prepared for that". Sir, had we prepared ourselves at that time, they would not have crossed our border.

Sir, likewise, manufacturing a bomb or possession of nuclear weapons is not meant for any aggression, is not meant for any striking. But it will be used as a deterrent. Take for example, wars. All the wars were fought in the world after the dropping of bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. No two nuclear powers fought with each other. Nuclear powers are only against the non-nuclear powers. So, it will be a deterrent.

We have got a bitter experience in 1962 with one of our neighbouring countries. We are for better relationship with China even today. But at the same time, you should not forget that unless we prove our might, unless we prove our strength, peace is not possible.

Sir, you take the case of Ashoka. He was the Apostle of peace only after the Kalinga War. After the Kalinga War, there was no rebel in the country. Nobody dared to touch the country. He proved the might in the Kalinga War. Likewise, we have to prepare ourselves. That will be a deterrent. One country is an overt Nuclear Power State and the other country is a covert Nuclear Power State. That was the communication given to Mr. Bill Clinton by the Government of India. There is nothing wrong in it. That is the fact. We have to accept the fact. We cannot follow an astrict policy. So, when they are very strong and when their intentions are malicious, we have to be strong and we have to prove our might.

We are for global peace. It is we, who took the initiative in 1954 for total disarmament; again in 1965 and in 1988 to ban the nuclear weapons. It is we who had taken the steps in this direction and not Pakistan. We have taken the steps for total disarmament. So, let us take the initiative here. We had already ratified the Biological Weapons Convention and Chemical Weapons Convention. We are for that. At the same time, we have to keep our Army powerful. Sir, I would quote a kural of Tiruvalluvar about the kingdom of the country. It says:

"Padai Kudi Koozh Amaitohu Natpu

Arana Aarum Udayam Arasaroul Er"

He describes about the kingdom of the country, the Army, wealth, people, Council of Ministers, friends and foes. If a king possesses all these things, he is the lion amongst the kings. So, the first requirement is the 'Army'. So, you have to prove your strength. Unless you are strong, you cannot bring peace.

Sir, people are talking about Vietnam. Yes, of course, for twelve years, Vietnam fought. But they had got the umbrella of China and USSR. Had they got a bomb, even the United States would not have fought with them even for 20 seconds.

Therefore, we have also to equip ourselves with this potential weapon. This is not meant for any aggression. The fact is that the nuclear threat is there. Our neighbour is already equipped with nuclear weapons. Have you forgotten that they have supplied all the technologies to Pakistan? Their 'Ghauri' missile was launched on April 6. That was the warning signal. And again, they are going in for 'Ghaznavi' missile. You see, they have named these missiles as 'Ghauri' and 'Ghaznavi'. They already had the bomb. They were in possession of bombs. Just now they have tested them.

Now, we have proved to the world that we are also a Nuclear Power, Nuclear Weapon State. But that does not mean that we are going in for arms race and people are tempted to say that we have started arms race.

We should not echo what is stated in Islamabad. We should not reflect what is stated in Pakistan. We have not started it. Already they are possessing the weapons. We are safeguarding ourselves against any eventuality. Now our position is very clear. Therefore, we have clearly stated it in the paper given by the Government. The NAM Ministerial meeting held at Cartagena has reiterated their call on the Conference of Disarmament...

SHRI P.C. THOMAS (MUVATTUPUZHA): I am on a point of order, Sir. The smaller parties do not get time at the end of the discussion.

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI M. THAMBI DURAI): Shri Vaiko is from one of the smaller parties.

SHRI P.C. THOMAS (MUVATTUPUZHA): Shri Vaiko's party is much bigger than mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN (SHRI BENI PRASAD VERMA): What is your point of order?

SHRI P.C. THOMAS (MUVATTUPUZHA): The smaller parties do not get time at the end of the discussion to ventilate their feelings. Shri Vaiko's party has been given about half-an-hour. I am very grateful for that. My point is that when he is given half-an-hour, my party, which is one-third of his party's size, may be given one-third of that time. Because, otherwise I do not get time at the fag end. I spoke last time for two minutes in a very hectic manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. This is no point of order. It is left to the decision of the Chair.

SHRI P.M. SAYEED (LAKSHADWEEP): He has made a suggestion. His suggestion may be taken note of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: His suggestion has been noted down. It is in the records.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): India was one of the countries that appealed to the International Court of Justice on the issue that there existed an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): I will take only two more minutes. The so called five nuclear powers are not prepared to destroy their stockpile of nuclear arms. That is the point. All the stockpiles are to be destroyed under the international supervision. For that, let us take the initiative in the United Nations. We have got all the moral right. From a position of strength let us say that all the nuclear arms be destroyed, all the arsenal be destroyed. For that let us take the initiative.

At the same time, taking the threat scenario or the challenge scenario for our security from our neighbours, we have to equip ourselves with the strength and might. At this hour let us all stand together. I would like to appeal to our hon. Members, to the leaders of political parties to come out of the political barriers, to come out of the parochial considerations to support the Government. I did go through all the debates held in the year 1984 in both the Houses of Parliament. There was no dissenting voice. There was not even a sarcastic word against Madam Gandhi. All the parties gave support to Madam Gandhi. In the year 1971, when there was a controversy about Bangladesh war, when the foreign countries were accusing us of meddling in the internal affairs of Pakistan, it was Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee who greeted Madam Gandhi as the Durga of India. Of course, he was fighting a political battle at that time. This is the approach we have been having.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude. You have taken more than thirty minutes.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): I would like to ask whether you tried it in 1983. Shri Venkataraman, former Defence Minister who later became the President of India, has written in a letter - it is public knowledge - that they were for a test and they were pressurised not to undertake it. Is it a fact that when Shri Narasimha Rao was the Prime Minister of the country, Government of India tried to conduct a test? Again due to the interference of America, because their spy satellite detected that something was going on in Pokhran and expressed their dissent, they developed a cold feet and back out.

Is it a fact? So far, there is no denial from their side. Why did you try it in 1983 and again in 1995? For what reasons have you kept the nuclear options open? The scientists, they say, have collected the data. The knowledge of the first generation scientists should go to the next generation. For that purpose, Shri Vajpayee has given the clearance. That was the point. They have collected the data. With the indigenous technology, we have conducted our tests. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN (SHRI BENI PRASAD VERMA): Please conclude.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): At this juncture, I would appeal to all the hon. Members here and all the political parties to support the Government. We stand as one with one voice to express solidarity and support. I commend the decision taken by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. Thank you. (ends)

1506 hours

">SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the 11th, the 13th and the 28th May, 1998 will go down in the history of the sub-continent as sad days. By thoughtless and competitive nuclear testings India and Pakistan, in their Golden Jubilee Year of Independence, have landed themselves in a tragic arms race.

The reasons and the timings of the Pokhran tests have been questioned by previous speakers from this side. So far, no convincing answer has come. For the last fifty years, India has followed a well-established nuclear policy which was based on national consensus and the policy was to keep the nuclear option open. Therefore, the choice before us was restraint or exercising that option. Till the 11th of this month since Independence, all the

successive Governments and successive Prime Ministers have exercised restraint. If it is a choice between restraint and exercising the option, to exercise restraint is much more difficult. According to me, credit goes to those Governments, credit goes to those Prime Ministers who have opted for the much more difficult choice of restraint. To indulge in adventurism is a very easy job. I do not know what is great about this. I do not know where is the credit for that and why that restraint was exercised by the previous Prime Ministers. After all, we have the capability!

As far back as 1964, Dr. Homi Bhaba declared that India could make a nuclear bomb in just eighteen months. In any case, I am happy that in spite of all the euphoria among a section of the ruling party, the Prime Minister Shri Vajpayee was gracious enough to admit that whatever they have achieved 'was not the result of the fifty days of BJP-led Government; it was, in fact, the achievement as a result of the policy followed by the successive Governments'.

The Prime Minister, in his statement, has said:

"In 1974 we demonstrated our nuclear capability. Successive Governments thereafter have taken all necessary steps in keeping with that resolve and national will to safeguard India's nuclear option."

I must compliment the Prime Minister. In spite of the fact that some people have claimed this as 'Hindu bomb', in spite of the fact that some people have celebrated this as 'gaurav diwas', in spite of the fact that some people have described the previous Prime Ministers as ... (Expunged as ordered by the Chair), though I do not want to use this word, I am constrained to use this word, Shri Vajpayee was good enough to admit that this was not the result of the efforts of the fifty-day Government but because of the fifty years of hard work.

In this respect, I would like to join the whole House in offering my salutations to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Indira Gandhi, Rajiv Gandhi, our scientists, computer specialists, engineers and their cohorts in the defence services for their dedication and splendid achievements.

Sir, I was talking about restraint. Why successive Governments and successive Prime Ministers had to resort to restraint? Is it because those Governments were not at all concerned about the national security? Is it because those Governments were never concerned about the integrity of India? Is it because those Governments never cared to build up our defence forces? No.

As far as my party is concerned, we are second to none in defending the territorial integrity and sovereignty of this country. It was the Congress party which was responsible for freeing this nation from the foreign rule. We were very much concerned about the national security, but then our Governments believed that the security and integrity of the nation does not lie in possessing a bomb alone. The integrity and sovereignty of the country can be well protected by making the economy self-sufficient; by eradicating poverty and unemployment; and by giving people the drinking water. These were the priorities of our Government.

Why have we been talking about secularism? As far as we are concerned, we know that the principle of secularism is much more stronger than any atom bomb in safeguarding the territorial integrity of this country. I do not want to go into the details. I think, Shri I.K. Gujral, the former Prime Minister, has very nicely described the reasons why the previous Governments, including himself, did not opt for exercising that option.

He said in an interview and I quote:

"Ammunition alone do not make a country strong. Otherwise, North Korea would have been a power today and the Soviet Union would not have collapsed. In my balance sheet, economic development was more important."

That sums up the reason why the previous Government did not choose to exercise the nuclear option and exercised restraint.

When we see in newspapers and when we hear different Ministers talk in different ways, we are unable to understand what was the justification for going in for the nuclear tests. What was the basis? Was there any policy

framework? Was there any doctrine in it? There was nothing.

Many nuclear tests have been conducted earlier. Whenever Governments had gone for nuclear tests earlier, they had gone with certain principles and with certain doctrines. For example in 1974 when Mrs. Indira Gandhi decided to go in for the first test, her doctrine was very simple. The doctrine was that a test was meant for peaceful purposes. That is the difference. It was meant for peaceful purposes. That was the doctrine of the Congress party and of Mrs. Indira Gandhi in 1974.

When France went in for the first nuclear test, it had a doctrine. That doctrine was 'proportionate deterrence'. When China went in for the first test, its doctrine was 'overall security environment in the world', and the principle was 'no-first-use'. That was the doctrine.

But when we went for the Pokhran test on the 11th and 13th of this month, the Government is not able to tell us what was the doctrine and what was the basis. From the utterances of different Ministers - particularly from the letter the Prime Minister addressed to President Clinton, to other Heads of Governments and to other Heads of States - we came to know that the doctrine was 'security environment from neighbouring countries, particularly the two countries, the threat from China and the threat from Pakistan'. That was the doctrine. Is it a doctrine? I am happy that the Government has realised today that that doctrine - the doctrine of naming the country - was not good because the Defence Minister spoke about the Pakistan test before lunch and objected that the Pakistan test was India-specific. He condemned that doctrine also. He disowned Pakistan's doctrine, when his own test was Pakistan-specific and China-specific.

Today the Defence Minister of this country comes and tells what Pakistan has done was wrong because their doctrine was wrong. What was the doctrine? The doctrine was India-specific.

Do you think that the world is not listening to us, the world is not watching us, the world is not observing us? Is it the way that a great country like India should behave? Is it the way that the Government should run? On the day of Confidence Motion, from this very seat, I had specifically expressed my doubt and concern. I had said that I was not worried about the stability of the Vajpayee Government; I was more worried about how this Government will govern this country. Governance was the main issue. And today, we see how this Government is ruling this nation. However, I do not want to go into all points. So many points have been made earlier.

SHRI JAG MOHAN (NEW DELHI): The point is, you are now saying that 1974 explosion was a peaceful explosion and for peaceful purposes. How would you reconcile it with the statement made by Shri Shiv Shanker that was in response to the situation like the one that was created when President Nixon sent the US warship. You read his statement and you read your statement and then you kindly reconcile as to what is the stand of the Congress Party. This is the basic confusion in my view which I would like you to clarify.

The other point which I would like you to clarify is this. After the CTBT, after the indefinite extension of the NPT, has not the world situation changed in which a nuclear club was sought to be created, a power cartel was sought to be created from which India would have been permanently excluded and we would not even have the right to that so-called option? The option would have also lapsed after some time when the Treaty was confirmed. Would you kindly clarify that point?

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): If you remember, in 1974, the Government of India under Shrimati Indira Gandhi, not only had a doctrine but she had also done enough of diplomatic work. Before it was decided, Shrimati Gandhi took not only the country and the concerned people into confidence, but also took so many other friendly countries into confidence. That is the difference. And 1974 doctrine was for peaceful purposes and today, you are going in for weaponisation. I am coming to the question of weaponisation vis-a-vis CTBT and NPT. You have completely gone against the principles for which India stood for so many years. You have broken those principles and reasons on why we refused to sign the CTBT.

SHRI JAG MOHAN (NEW DELHI): India also stood for non-monopolisation of powers.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Every reason has been broken by you. I am coming to you. Just listen to me. For your own information, I am coming to your weaponisation programme. Now that this has been done and it cannot be undone

MR. CHAIRMAN (SHRI BENI PRASAD VERMA): Now, Shri Sangma may continue.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Now, the country having resorted to that policy of exercising its option, I would only like to know how this Government is going to handle the consequences. How are you now going to deal with its effects? Have you applied your mind? I am asking whether you are applying your mind. It is a very uncharitable question to ask because of yesterday's experience. What happened yesterday? On the one hand, you said you knew everything that was happening in Pakistan. You knew everything that was going on in Pakistan except that they had already tested their nuclear bombs. You did not know that. Even the Prime Minister of this country came to know about it after two hours. I think, the friends from this side came to know first. That is the reason why I am asking this particular question. Has the Government started exercising how you are going to deal with those situations? What will be the consequences? We know that number one consequence is the retaliation that came from Pakistan. How they have reacted is the first consequence.

Yesterday, I was talking to some children. It struck me very much. They said: "Sir, the people are talking about national pride that India has become a nuclear power, where is the pride in it?" I said: "Why?" If India has become as powerful as the United States of America, yes, we would feel very proud. But we have become as powerful as Pakistan is. Till yesterday, we were a superior country. The whole world knew that India has superiority. We had a leading role in the international community. But today, we have become same. We have a nuclear device. They also have a nuclear device. Where is the difference between Pakistan and India? A small country like Pakistan and the biggest democracy in the world - India - have now been equated. Where is the national pride in it? ... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN (SHRI BENI PRASAD VERMA): Please do not interrupt.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI CHETAN CHAUHAN (AMROHA): It is a message of weakness.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): For your information, it is the weak people who show their strength. The strong people never show their strength. Our power need not be our muscles which need not be demonstrated.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA): Sir, the difference between the two countries is that, today, there is a state of national emergency in Pakistan and we in the best traditions of democracy are discussing it. This is the difference.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Shri Sinha, I never said that it was my information. ... (Interruptions) I am only talking about what children told me. I am only telling you the children's perception. I am not saying that. ... (Interruptions) Yours is a great Government! ... (Interruptions)

This is a serious debate. Please allow me. I am expressing my opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): Sir, here is my only simple question. Shri Sangma, you are expressing on behalf of some children. We would like to know your opinion. That is very important. ... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

श्रीमती जयाबहन भरतकुमार ठक्कर (बडोदरा): जिस मामले ने राष्ट्रीय और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय ख्याति प्राप्त की है, (व्यवधान) बच्चों ने तो इस विषय को बहुत गौरवान् वित समझा है।

... (व्यवधान)

इस गौरव से परे किसी भी बात को इस तरह से लेना नहीं चाहिए।

... (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the consequences are, as I have said, firstly, as is evident from the reaction of Pakistan, how it would lead to a nuclear arms race and how it would disturb the peace and stability of the region; secondly, how it would affect the regional cooperation, that is India, today as it stands completely isolated from the international community, play its diplomatic role? How are we going to deal with that situation? Important countries like the United States of America have charged India with playing a role of duplicity. I am coming to that. It is very important point that I would like to make and that is, how America is charging India of playing a role of duplicity!

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Do you endorse the opinion?

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): It is based on your behaviour...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt.

श्री राजवीर सिंह (आंवला): क्या कांग्रेस पार्टी में मतभेद हो गये हैं? कल शरद पवार जी ने कहा था।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति जी, क्या कांग्रेस पार्टी में मतभेद हो गया है?

... (व्यवधान)

कल शरद पवार जी ने कहा था कि हम एक राय देना चाहते हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

इसका मतलब क्या है?

... (व्यवधान)

मुझे लगता है कि इनके नेता का विरोध हो रहा है।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री शरद पवार (बारामती) : हम वही राय देंगे।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय (श्री बेनी प्रसाद वर्मा) : सिन्हा जी, रूलिंग पार्टी के लोगों को शांत रहना चाहिए।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : बीच में इंटरप्शन नहीं होना चाहिए।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : आप धैर्य रखिए।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : रूलिंग पार्टी में रहकर आप थोड़ा धैर्य रखना सीख जाइये।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : इतनी गंभीर बहस चल रही है। इसको आप अगंभीर मत बनाइये। आप सत्ता पक्ष में हैं इसलिए आपको सुनना चाहिए और इसका जवाब देना चाहिए।

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): I am just listing out the consequences one by one.

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : आपके सिन्हा साहब बैठे हैं। उन्होंने जो कहा उसी का जवाब संगमा जी ने दिया है। आप धैर्य छोड़ देंगे तो यह सदन किस तरह चलेगा।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : अगर सत्ता पक्ष धैर्य छोड़ देगा तो सदन कैसे चलेगा। आपको ज्यादा शांत रहना चाहिए।

... (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

श्री राजवीर सिंह (आंवला): हमको शांत रहना चाहिए मगर सवाल यह है कि जो बात सदन के बाहर जा रही है।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये। अब आपकी कोई भी बात रिकार्ड में नहीं जायेगी।

... (व्यवधान)

(Interruptions) ... (Not recorded)

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): How is it going to affect the bilateral relations with our neighbours, particularly with China? I would like to know as to how the Government is going to handle that. What is the final stand of the Government on CTBT. The hon. Member of the ruling Party has already raised that question and I would come to that. More importantly, Shri Yashwant Sinha, the hon. Finance Minister, is here and I would like to know from him as to how he is going to handle the effect of this on the economy of this country. We are waiting for his Budget. I would discuss much more at the time when the General Budget would be discussed. But certainly I would expect Shri Sinha to tell the country as to how he is going to meet this challenge of sanctions.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, coming to the arms race, the Prime Minister in his statement, in para 14 of the statement, which has been laid on the Table of the House, stated and I quote:

"India shall not engage in arms race. India shall not subscribe or re-invent the doctrine of the Cold War".

I do not know how the statement was made by the Prime Minister of this country. I would like to know whether the statement stands valid even after Pakistan has gone in for five nuclear tests.

I would like to know from the Government as to whether this statement remains valid or not. If it remains valid, I do not know whether the Government has control over what is going on. What is the scenario? I would like to briefly share this with the House. We already know what Pakistan has done after our nuclear test. I am not going into it. What did Mr. Clinton say? President Clinton told Mr. Nawaz Sharif, to help them work together to guarantee Pakistan's security. This is what Mr. Clinton has said, that is America will guarantee Pakistan's security. This is the reaction of President Clinton. The United States ... (Interruptions) I do not understand why they are interrupting like this when such a serious issue is being discussed.

SHRI AJIT JOGI (RAIGARH): Such a serious debate is going on. Why is he giving a running commentary?

सभापति महोदय (श्री बेनी प्रसाद वर्मा) : यदि वे यील्ड करें तो आप पूछ सकते हैं।

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): I think Shri Sinha would clarify it. What was the reaction of Mr. Clinton? What did the US Secretary of State say?... (Interruptions)

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA (GUWAHATI): How can you allow him?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I am not allowing him. Please sit down.

... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding. Please sit down.

श्री एच.पी.सिंह (आरा): हमें दो मिनट का समय दीजिए।

सभापति महोदय : किस बात के लिए दो मिनट का समय दें? ये सीनियर मैम्बर हैं, स्पीकर रह चुके हैं। आपको इनकी बात सुननी चाहिए।

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): The US Secretary of State, Ms. Madeline Albright has said and I quote: "US would respond to Pakistan's security concern". We have reports that already talks and negotiations are on between the authorities of the United States of America and Pakistan for transfer of technology. There is a strong hope and it is almost certain that the Pressler (Amendment) Act, which was blocked in 1990, is going to be scrapped in order to supply F-16 Jets to Pakistan. I know that the Government has this information but I am sharing it with the House. There have been visits from Pakistan to China. We do not know what did they talk but we all know what indications did the Prime Minister of Pakistan in his broadcast to the nation give. He praised the longstanding, time-tested friendship between Pakistan and China. I think these are the things which the country should listen to.

There are widely publicised reports that Pakistan is seeking solidarity of the Islamic world in the matter of containing nuclear India. The self-styled Prime Minister of PoK, Barrister Sultan Mehmood Chowdhary, has already been received in the Foreign Office and Commonwealth Office of the British Government. These are the signals the Government should take notice of. This is what is happening in Pakistan. We all know what is happening in our State. I do not think I should repeat the pro-active action of the Home Minister, Shri Advani. We have heard him so many times. We have heard him yesterday also. I do not want to repeat the way he warned Pakistan.

My very trusted friend, Mr. Khurana, is not here now. He said, "India is ready to fight a fourth war with Pakistan. Let them tell us the time and place and we will show what India is and what my Government is".

The signals which should come to us, I have told you. The signal which was going to Pakistan, I am saying now. It is very important as far as arms race is concerned. Dr. Farooq Abdullah, the Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, said, "Time for talks and negotiations is over. We should take a tough decision now." This was the signal which was going from India to Pakistan. Shri Ashok Singhal, on 23-5-98, said, "What is the alternative, if

Pakistan continues to abet terrorism in India? It will not be wrong to attack and silence Pakistan." ... (Interruptions) Shri Pramod Mahajan said, "Nuclear tests are not for academic purposes."

श्री राजवीर सिंह (आंवला): उन्होंने क्या गलत कह दिया? इसमें गलत क्या है?

...(व्यवधान)

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Okay, I will not take VHP supremo's name.

श्री चेतन चौहान (अमरोहा) : जो व्यक्ति यहां उपस्थित नहीं है, उसका नाम नहीं लिया जा सकता।

श्री पूर्णो ए. संगमा (तुरा): लिया जा सकता है।

You can quote. Do not worry@ about the rules. I was Speaker here; I know the rules.

मैं पहले स्पीकर था।

श्री राजवीर सिंह (आंवला): आप स्पीकर रह चुके हैं, इसलिए लोगों की बात सुन लिया करिये।

...(व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN (BENI PRASAD VERMA): Please, let him continue.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Then, I come to China. We all know that China has claimed that India is in occupation of 90,000 sq km of their territory. They has also said that MacMahon Line is illegal. On the 14th of this month, China has accused that Indian tests were a brazen contempt for world efforts at test ban, that the tests were aimed at hegemony in South Asia and that India has slandered China by branding it as a nuclear threat. This was the signal from China.

1542 hours (Shri K. Yerrannaidu in the Chair)

What was the signal from Russia? Russia described India as her strategic partner and declared that she is willing to recognise India as a nuclear weapon State provided she joins the international non-proliferation regime that includes CTBT, NPT, etc.

These were the signals going on from one place to another. And Prime Minister says, "India shall not engage in an arms race. India shall not subscribe to or reinvent the doctrine of cold war." I do not know how he is going to stop it. I personally do not know. They have to change their attitude. It is very much required. With the kind of aggressive postures that the Government is making towards Pakistan and the kind of approach that they are taking towards China -- I do not want to refer to what the Defence Minister had said, etc., -- they had better be careful of what they talk. I do not know why the Ministers of this Government are so fond of talking. Please, for God's sake, let them stop talking. And when they talk, they should do so after they think about things sensibly. It is not easy to run a great country like India. What we cannot afford to indulge in is lavish cross talks. It is being done lavishly and it is not good for the country.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister of Pakistan had offered that Pakistan was willing to hold talks and that Pakistan was willing to offer a 'no war pact'. Of course, Indian Government had suo motu said to Pakistan that India was willing to offer 'no first use' agreement to Pakistan.

It is a good sign. Please persuade them.

I was in Pakistan in November last to attend the Conference of Conference was on 'people to people contact'. When I met some of the intellectuals of Pakistan in Islamabad they were very happy. Shri Jaswant Singh was

with me. I am happy to tell you here that one of the gentlemen in Pakistan asked: 'Mr. Sangma, do you know who is the most popular politician of India in Pakistan?' I asked him: 'How do I know?' He said: "The most popular politician of India in Pakistan was Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee." Please clap. ... (Interruptions)

श्री के.नटवर सिंह (भरतपुर): ताली बजाओ।

कृषि मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सोमपाल): झूठी बात पर ताली बजाने की संस्कृति आपके यहां है।

AN HON. MEMBER: This is childish. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): I asked him: "Why?" I asked him: "How?" ... (Interruptions) How is it that Shri Vajpayee is so popular in Pakistan? They said that today you are having a Conference on people to people contact, but this process of people to people contact between India and Pakistan was started by Shri Vajpayee when he was the Foreign Minister of India. He went to Pakistan. He liberalised and streamlined the visa procedure. He made the procedure for getting visa easy so that people from Pakistan could come to India and people from India could go to Pakistan. That was the initiative taken by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. That is why he was called the most popular politician in Pakistan. After 11th of May, I do not know as to what is the popularity of Shri Vajpayee in Pakistan. That, of course, I cannot say.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI SOMPAL): He is strongly popular now.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): I think you came back from Islamabad last night. ... (Interruptions)

I can tell you that I met a large number of people of Pakistan. I met the Prime Minister, Mr. Nawaz Sharif; I met the then President of Pakistan; I met the Speaker and the Members of Parliament in large numbers. Each one of them had told me that India and Pakistan have wasted 50 years in conflict. Let us forget the past; let us go ahead the next 50 years; let us concentrate on development and progress. Why do we quarrel?

I visited the Karachi Club in Pakistan. I was surprised to listen to the intellectuals. Almost 150 intellectuals were there. Each one of them had something to speak about India - Oh! my brother was a Brigadier; my uncle was in Navy; my father was in India. Why did they tell me? They did so just to show how keen they are to improve their relationship with our country and how they are willing to come closer to India. I do not know why we have spoiled all this.

MR. CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. YERRANNAIDU): Shri Sangma, you have already taken 45 minutes.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI JAG MOHAN (NEW DELHI): You have said that what all those people asked you and what you told them. Did you ask them why for the last nine years they have been sending terrorists to Kashmir? The stand of the Congress Party itself is that they have been aiding and abetting terrorists in Kashmir. Did you ask any of those intellectuals why they have been indulging in it? Is it an indication of friendship and people to people contact.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): I am talking about the people of Pakistan. I am not talking about the Government of Pakistan, please. I am only narrating my interaction with the people of Pakistan. I am not talking on behalf of the Government of Pakistan.

Well, with China, in 1962, we had war. We cut off our diplomatic relations with China. When was the diplomatic dialogue started? It was started in 1979. By whom? Again by Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee. The first Indian dignitary to visit China after 1962 war officially was Shri Vajpayee, the then Foreign Minister of India and from there things started with Rajiv Gandhi's visit, with the President's visit and so many other things. For the last

many years we have been trying to improve our relationship. We have been trying to build up, what you call, our confidence building measures.

I have visited China twice. I met President Jhiang Zemin there. When he came to India, I had a very long discussion with him. I met so many of the Chinese leaders in Beijing. When we have been talking, how to build up these confidence building measures, how to establish this mutual trust, let us forget other disputes, keep them aside and concentrate on economic cooperation in the interest of both the countries. With so much of pain, with so much effort, we have been trying to build up that relationship.

And what happened? What happened to those efforts? Today, with the simple action that you have done, I do not know -- I have a lot of points to make and the time is short, but I would come to CTBT because at least this point, I do not want to miss -- how are you going to handle CTBT. We would like to know about this. Different people are speaking in different ways.

Shri Pramod Mahajan says on the 13th of May, "Government has no intention of signing CTBT for now." Shri George Fernandes, on 18th of May, says, "The country would be willing to discuss CTBT as nuclear weapon State." I do not know what he is going to discuss, whether it is discussable or not. I know very little about CTBT. Shri Jaswant Singh on 18th of May, the same day, said, "We shall offer a meaningful discussion with key interlocutors of CTBT."

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (BOLPUR): What does Shri Brijesh Mishra say?

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): I am reserving him for something else because I do not want to take the name of one person many times.

In Para 19 of the Prime Minister's Statement, let us see what is said. It is important, I think we should read it.

"Subsequent to the tests, Government have already stated that India will now observe a voluntary moratorium."

Of course, he has withdrawn it last night, I heard him on Television. Why do they have to say that? They claim to know everything that is going on in Pakistan. They knew that Pakistan was going to have the test. After having known all these, the Prime Minister stated that they were observing voluntary moratorium. But after that, yesterday he suddenly said before Television, "No, I have to review the moratorium." Why do they do that?

"It has also indicated willingness to move towards a de-jure formalisation of the Declaration. The basic obligation of the CTBT are thus met."

What does that mean? They are going to sign. How are they going to sign? Have we really applied our mind?

When CTBT was discussed here, the House was unanimous that we shall not sign CTBT. That was the consensus -- not consensus, unanimity in the House. Our policy towards CTBT is also based on national consensus. And today the Prime Minister makes a statement, without even taking us into confidence, without even discussing it in Parliament, that we have met all the obligations and we are ready to sign CTBT.

Why did we oppose CTBT? We opposed CTBT because we wanted it to be really comprehensive. Has it become comprehensive after these tests? We took a position that it is not comprehensive. Now, has it become comprehensive after these tests? Secondly, we said that it should be non-discriminatory. We said: 'You have your weapon and you are not allowing others to make weapon. We do not agree to that. This is discrimination.' Now, India, having got it, wants to discriminate all the rest. What is the difference between those countries and India? So far you have said that it should be non discriminatory. Now you are also going in for discriminatory. The third one, which is the most important point, is that CTBT should be within disarmament framework and that we should have a time bound programme on disarmament. You are talking about non proliferation. You are not talking about disarmament. India insists on disarmament. You have refused to sign CTBT because it did not contain a programme for disarmament. Now, because you have tested it, I do not know how you have suddenly

said that we are going to sign it. You are against armament, stock pile of weapons. Even the programme is very clear.

Shri Jaswant Singh has said: "The question of weaponisation is implicit in the tests themselves. The demonstration by India is the capability to weaponise and deploy weaponised programme in different systems of delivery." This is what Shri Jaswant Singh has said.

Now I wanted to quote Shri Mishra. Somebody wanted to hear his statement. He has said that the tests establish proven capability for a weaponised programme. This is what the Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister has said.

I have already quoted Shri Pramod Mahajan, who said, "Tests are not meant for academic purposes." ... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (BOLPUR): Which date are you quoting? They are changing it every day. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Yes, they change it but on the spirit they are quite consistent.

Dr. Kalam has said: "India's weaponisation programme is now complete." Dr. Chidambaram, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said: "India will explode more nuclear devices to horn the weaponry it has developed."

I do not want to quote the statement of Shri George Fernandes. In the last debate, he vehemently spoke against weaponisation. I have the entire proceedings with me here. Mr. Chairman, Sir, as you have already rung the bell, I am not quoting it.

How is it that on the one hand you are going to sign CTBT and on the other you are going ahead with weaponisation programme? I really do not know. You owe an explanation to this country as to what is your final stand on CTBT. We would like to know this. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI CHAMAN LAL GUPTA (UDHAMPUR): No signing. That is the programme. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Okay. That means, what the Prime Minister has stated was wrong? ... (Interruptions) It is not a verbal statement. It is a written statement laid on the Table of the House. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI CHAMAN LAL GUPTA (UDHAMPUR): He has never said that we are going to sign it. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): It is a written statement laid on the Table of the House. I am sorry, the Prime Minister should consult you before he speaks. Why has he not consulted you? ... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. YERRANNAIDU): The Government will reply to him. Why are you unnecessarily interrupting him?

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Sir, I have no time to speak on the policy of duplicity. But I can speak on the sanctions only. Shri Venkaiah Naidu said that they are not bothered if sanctions are imposed. The Prime Minister said: "Sanctions cannot and will not hurt us. India will not be cowed down by any such punitive steps".

Shri Pramod Mahajan asks, 'how'? He said: "He does not care because in any case India is 85 per cent self-sufficient". Could they achieve this 85 per cent self-sufficiency in 50 days? He has forgotten that portion. Of course, I have quotations from everybody.

Sir, I demand, through you, that the Government should present before this House a full document on socio-economic cost and the implications of the tests. I have a lot of figures to tell the Finance Minister. Maybe, the

Finance Minister would not agree. I have a long list of aids and monies flowing into India from different countries. They have been stopped due to imposition of sanctions. I am reserving it for the debate on the General Budget. . I would only like, if not by the Prime Minister, at least, the Finance Minister to present before this House a full document on socio-economic cost and the implications of Pokharan tests on account of sanctions.

Thank you.

(ends)

... (व्यवधान)

श्री विजय गोयल (चांदनी चौक): संगमा जी, आप पाकिस्तान के परीक्षण पर भी कुछ प्रकाश डालते। नवाज शरीफ जी ने इतनी सख्त भाषा का प्रयोग किया है आप उसके बारे में कुछ भी नहीं बोले।

... (व्यवधान)

संगमा जी, ऐसा लगता है कि कोई बाहर का स्पोक्समैन बोल रहा है, क्योंकि आपने पाकिस्तान के परीक्षण पर एक शब्द भी नहीं बोला।

MR. CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. YERRANNAIDU): Please sit down.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH (BHARATPUR): Please tell your Prime Minister to answer. Tell Shri Vajpayee to answer. Please tell him.

... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please keep silence.

">

१६०३ बजे

श्री शांता कुमार (कांगड़ा): सभापति महोदय, ११ और १३ मई को पोखरन में जो परीक्षण हुए, उसकी प्रतिक्रिया पूरे देश के लोगों में और इस सदन के अंदर कई प्रकार से अलग-अलग हुई है। मैं समझता हूँ कि उस परीक्षण के बाद पूरे राष्ट्र ने एक स्वाभिमान की ओर नये कदम की अनुभूति की है, पूरे राष्ट्र ने आत्मनिर्भरता की तरफ बढ़ते हुए भारत के कदमों की आहट को सुना है। उस विस्फोट के बाद दुनिया के अंदर कुछ देशों में भूचाल आया। जिन देशों का एकाधिकार था, जिन देशों की मनोपली थी, जो चाहते थे कि भारत अपनी सुरक्षा के लिए भीख का कटोरा लेकर उन बड़े मुल्कों के दरबार के सामने खड़ा रहे वे देश परेशान हो गए, क्योंकि भारत का कद ऊंचा हो गया। भारत उन देशों के मुकाबले में आकर खड़ा हो गया, लेकिन इस सदन के अंदर कुछ घबराये हुए स्वर मैंने सुने, परेशानी की भाषा सुनी, उसका मुझे दुख अवश्य है।

सभापति महोदय, कल जो परीक्षण पाकिस्तान ने किया है उसके बाद ११ और १३ मई के हमारे परीक्षण के औचित्य स्वयं सिद्ध हो गए। उस तरफ से बार-बार पूछा जा रहा था कि क्यों परीक्षण किया, क्या जरूरत थी? शायद मेरे उन मित्रों को स्पष्ट करने के लिए कल पाकिस्तान ने बता दिया कि क्यों जरूरत पड़ी और क्यों परीक्षण करना चाहिए था।

श्रमैं अभी आदरणीय संगमा जी को सुन रहा था। उन्होंने सिद्धांतों की बात कही। सभापति जी, सिद्धांत अपनी जगह हैं, लेकिन जब युद्ध होता है तो शस्त्र चाहिए, सिद्धांत काम नहीं आता है। मैं आपको १९६२ की याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ जिसके जखम अभी तक हरे हैं। मुझे याद है, मैंने १९६२ के युद्ध के बाद हिंदी की सबसे बड़ी पुस्तक 'हिमालय पर लाल छाया' लिखी थी। उस समय भी यही भाषा बोली जाती थी। क्या जरूरत है युद्ध की तैयारी करने की, हमारे सिद्धांत हैं, हम किसी पर हमला नहीं करेंगे, सब हमारे मित्र हैं। लेकिन उस समय चीन युद्ध की तैयारी कर रहा था और भारत के अंदर 'हिंदी-चीनी भाई-भाई' नारे का नशा पिलाया जा रहा था। एक्साई चीन के अंदर चीन की मशीनरी आई, पहाड़ खोदा और सड़क बनना शुरू हो गयी। हिंदुस्तान की धरती में चीन ने सड़क बना ली लेकिन भारत सरकार को पता ही नहीं चला। हम 'हिंदी-चीनी भाई-भाई' का नारा लगाते रहे।

सभापति जी, इससे ज्यादा शर्म की बात और क्या हो सकती है कि सड़क हमारी धरती पर बनकर तैयार हो गयी और जब उसका उदघाटन हुआ, तब भारत सरकार को पता लगा।

हम १९६२ में युद्ध की तैयारी नहीं कर रहे थे, चीन कर रहा था। चीन ने जब हमला किया तो कोई सिद्धांत काम नहीं आया और हिंदुस्तान को शर्मनाक हार का मुंह देखना पड़ा। हमें तेजपुर खाली करना पड़ा, जवान मरे और घर-घर में मातम छाया तथा हमारी सैंकड़ों एकड़ भूमि आज भी चीन के कब्जे में है। हम १९६२ की उस हार को नहीं भुला सकते हैं।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि भारत एक और १९६२ सहन नहीं कर सकता है, देख नहीं सकता है। सभापति जी, १९६२ में भी यही भाषा बोली जाती थी और यही लोग सत्ता में थे तथा युद्ध की तैयारी की नहीं थी। युद्ध की तैयारी करने वाले को जंगजू कहा जाता था। इस देश के माथे पर उस समय हार का जो काला टीका लगा था,

वह आज तक धुला नहीं है, हम उसे भुला नहीं सकते हैं। आज भी हिमालय घायल है और उस समय हिमालय पर जो आक्रमण हुआ था, उसके कारण यह देश १० साल पीछे चला गया। इस बात को हमें भुलाना नहीं चाहिए। आज भारत की परिस्थिति क्या है? दोनों तरफ जो परिदृश्य है उसमें चीन एक महाशक्ति बन चुका है। अणुबम उसके पास है। तिब्बत बीच में से ध्वस्त हो गया है। अंग्रेज जब इस देश में रहे, मुझे क्षमा करें, अंग्रेज उस समय की कांग्रेस सरकार से ज्यादा बुद्धिमान थे। उनमें तिब्बत को हस्तगत करने की शक्ति थी। लेकिन उन्होंने तिब्बत को भारत और चीन के बीच बफर स्टेट के रूप में रखा। लेकिन हमने तिब्बत को चीन को सौंप दिया और चीन भारत की सीमा से आकर टकरा गया। आज चीन एक महाशक्ति है और भारत की सीमा के साथ मिला हुआ है। चीन ने १९६२ के युद्ध में भारत की जो हजारों एकड़ भूमि हथियाई और लोक सभा ने उस समय प्रस्ताव भी पास किया लेकिन आज ३५ वर्ष बाद भी उस भूमि के बारे में हमने चीन से कोई बात नहीं की है।

चीन पाकिस्तान को मिसाइल बनाने में मदद कर रहा है, एटम बम बनाने में मदद कर रहा है। हमारे सिर के ऊपर, हिमालय के ऊपर एक महाशक्ति बैठी है। पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे तीन युद्ध हो चुके हैं। कल यहां पर बहुत सी बातें कही गयीं। प्रोक्सी-वार जो पंजाब और जम्मू-काश्मीर में हुई है उसमें लगभग चालीस हजार लोग मारे गये हैं और करोड़ों-अरबों रुपया आतंकवाद से निपटने में हमारा खर्च हो चुका है। अब तो पाकिस्तान ने एटम-बम का परीक्षण कर लिया है। फतेहगंज के अंदर चीन की मदद से मिसाइल की फैक्ट्री पाकिस्तान ने बना ली है, परीक्षण कर लिया है, गौरी बना लिया है और गजनी बना रहा है, तो उसके इरादे साफ हैं। ऐसी परिस्थिति में भी हमारे मित्र हमसे बार-बार पूछते हैं कि परीक्षण की क्या आवश्यकता थी।

सभापति जी, मैं यह समझता हूँ कि ११ और १३ मई का परीक्षण ठीक समय पर लिया गया ठीक फैसला है। वह केवल सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से था, वह आत्मनिर्भरता को सामने रख कर लिया गया निर्णय था। भारत को एक महाशक्ति के रूप में कुछ देश देखना नहीं चाहते, इसलिए वे इससे परेशान हैं लेकिन किसी भी देश की सुरक्षा को गिरवी नहीं रखा जा सकता। सुरक्षा उधार लेकर नहीं की जा सकती। जब चारों तरफ यह परिदृश्य है, उसके अन्दर हमें आत्मनिर्भरता और सुरक्षा प्राप्त करनी चाहिए। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में 'टट्रिब्यून' के एडिटोरियल की कुछ पंक्तियां पढ़ना चाहूंगा :

"The whole nuclear question has to be seen in the light of the fact that today many nuclear-tipped missiles target the heart of India or can do so in a matter of minutes. India has to have adequate deterrence against any adventurism. The threat perception is not theoretical. India has had to suffer the ignominy of getting its nose bloodied by a country which claimed to be its brother. With the bitter experience still rankling three and a half decades later, it just cannot afford to lower its guard. Nuclear weapons can be an effective bulwark against any misplaced venture."

मैं इसमें कहना चाहूंगा कि यह ठीक समय पर लिया गया एक ठीक फैसला था क्योंकि देश की सुरक्षा को न गिरवी रखा जा सकता है, न देश की सुरक्षा के लिए भीख का कटोरा लेकर किसी बड़े देश के दरबार में खड़ा हुआ जा सकता है। यह महत्वपूर्ण निर्णय ठीक समय पर लिया गया है। भारत के स्वाभिमान को जगाने का एक ऐतिहासिक प्रयत्न हुआ है। २१वीं सदी में प्रवेश करने से पहले भारत अब बोना नहीं रहा। भारत का सिर ऊंचा हो गया और भारत विश्व की महान शक्तियों के बीच खड़ा हो गया। आज इस स्वाभिमान की अनुभूति पूरे विश्व में अनुभव की जा रही है।

सभापति जी, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह इस सदी के इतिहास की एक बहुत बड़ी घटना है। सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से दुनिया के देशों की बराबरी में, जो सम्मान भारत को ५० साल में प्राप्त नहीं हुआ, वह अटल जी ने ५० दिन में भारत को प्राप्त कराया है। इस बात को कभी भूला नहीं जा सकता। मैं श्री जे.एन. दीक्षित का एक आर्टिकल जरूर पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहूंगा। यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के सैक्रेट्री जनरल, कॉफी अन्नान का स्टेटमेंट बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है जिसमें उन्होंने कहा है :

"You cannot have an exclusive club whose members have nuclear weapons and are refusing to disband it, and tell others now not to have it. The nuclear powers need to rethink and set an example for other nations."

दुनिया के अन्दर अब यह अनुभूति हो रही है कि यह मनोपली खत्म होनी चाहिए, यह एकाधिकार खत्म होना चाहिए। अमेरिका ने १९४२ में ऐसा कार्यक्रम शुरू किया था। दुनिया का एकमात्र देश, सबसे पहला देश, जिस ने एटम बम का प्रयोग किया, आज वह अन्य देशों को एटम बम का प्रयोग न करने की सलाह देता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जितनी भी संधियां हैं - चाहे वह एन.पी.टी हो, सी.टी.बी.टी. हो, उसके प्रति अमेरिका का जो भी व्यवहार है, उसके पीछे एक ही मकसद है, एटम बम उनके पास रहे और कोई देश उसकी बराबरी में न आए। भारत में महाशक्ति बनने के पोटेंशल हैं। भारत को महाशक्ति बनने से रोकने के षडयंत्र का यह हिस्सा है। उस षडयंत्र को इस सरकार ने तोड़ा है। अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने ११ और १३ मई के विस्फोट से उस षडयंत्र को तोड़ा है। इससे यह साबित हो गया है। दुनिया के कुछ बड़े देशों को छोड़ कर छोटे-छोटे देश इस पर प्रसन्न हैं। मैं श्री जे.एन. दीक्षित के आर्टिकल की चार और पंक्तियां पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहूंगा :

"I have noticed in my interaction with Asian, African, South American diplomats, whatever their governments' formal stance, an undercurrent of satisfaction that a developing country overturned discriminatory pressure and asserted its self-reliance and technological achievement."

बहुत से देश इस बात पर खुश हैं कि किसी विकासशील देश ने इस मोनोपली को तोड़ने की हिम्मत की है। आगे जे.एन.दीक्षित एक और बात कहते हैं --

"We should not deal with the tests as an end in themselves, but proceed to make the capacity we have attained deployable both in terms of weaponisation and delivery system. There is no need to be defensive."

सभापति महोदय, इसलिए अमेरिका, जिसने आज तक १०२० परीक्षण किये हैं, दुनिया में ऐटम बम का प्रयोग किया है, वह भारत को महाशक्ति बनने से रोकना चाहता था, उसके विरुद्ध इस देश ने एक प्रयत्न किया है जो प्रयत्न बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण है। उपदेश, त्याग, मानवता की बात, नैतिकता की बात, ये कोई नयी बातें नहीं हैं। ये बातें १९६२ से पहले भी की जाती रही हैं, ये बातें आज भी वहां कही जाती हैं, लेकिन दुनिया चलती है धरती और ज़मीन की सच्चाई से। केवल भावनाओं से दुनिया नहीं चलती। मुझे रामधारी सिंह दिनकर जी के ठकुरुक्षेत्र की वह पंक्तियां या आ रही हैं जिनमें धर्मराज युधिष्ठिर को जब वह इसी किस्म का उपदेश दे रहे थे तो कहलवाया था कि जब स्वत्व पर आक्रमण होता है तो पुण्य की, पाप की भाषा बदल जाती है। उसमें उन्होंने कहा था कि --

‘छीनता हो स्वत्व कोई, और तू

त्याग तप से काम ले यह पाप है।

पुण्य है विच्छिन्न कर देना उसे,

बढ़ रहा तेरी तरफ जो हाथ है।’

यह है ज़िन्दगी की सच्चाई, और उस सच्चाई को कभी कोई देश भूल नहीं सकता। सभापति महोदय, यहां माननीय संगमा जी ने और बहुत से लोगों ने बातें कीं। मैं उनके विस्तार में नहीं जाना चाहता। कुछ लोगों ने डराने की कोशिश की, कुछ लोगों ने मायूसी की भाषा कही, कुछ लोगों ने परेशानी की बात कही, लेकिन राष्ट्र जीतते हैं हिम्मत के साथ, राष्ट्र जीतते हैं इच्छाशक्ति के साथ। डरकर, घबराकर न व्यक्ति जीवन में कुछ कर सकता है, न राष्ट्र कुछ कर सकता है।

आर्थिक प्रतिबंधों की बात कही गई है। उसके बारे में विस्तार से विचार होगा, लेकिन जहां तक मेरी जानकारी है, १९९५-९६ का भारत का सकल घरेलू उत्पाद भारत का है ११ लाख १९ हजार करोड़ रुपये है और १९९५-९६ के अंत तक जो सब प्रकार की गवर्नमेंट, नौन-गवर्नमेंट लोन ग्रांट के रूप में सहायता प्राप्त हुई है, वह १२.१६३ करोड़ रुपये है। यह उसका १.०१ परसेंट बनता है और जो देश सैक्शन लगा रहे हैं उनका हिस्सा ०.५ परसेंट बनता है। देश की सुरक्षा के लिए, देश के स्वाभिमान के लिए बड़े से बड़ा त्याग, बड़ी से बड़ी तपस्या की जा सकती है। ये आर्थिक प्रतिबंध तो कुछ भी नहीं हैं। इनसे देश को घबराने की, चिन्ता करने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है और जो बदली हुई आर्थिक परिस्थितियां हैं, जो बदली हुई आर्थिक नीतियां हैं, उसमें ऐक्सटर्नल असिसटेन्स के रूप में धन काम आएगा, उसमें फॉरेन इनवेस्टमेंट के रूप में धन ज्यादा आएगा। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि इसकी चिन्ता करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है और भारत जैसा बहुत बड़ा बाज़ार, भारत जैसा देश जिसमें पूंजी-निवेश की सबसे अधिक संभावनाएं हैं, उसे दुनिया इग्नोर नहीं कर सकती, इस बात का ध्यान रखना चाहिए। लेकिन यदि कुछ बातें होती भी हैं तो उस संबंध में मैं समझता हूँ कि देश को चिन्ता करने की ज़रूरत नहीं है। आर्थिक प्रतिबंधों की जब बात आई, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह तो होना था। हम कभी यह नहीं सोच सकते थे कि हम उन देशों के बराबर होने की कोशिश करें। हम आत्मनिर्भर होने की कोशिश करें। हम परीक्षण करें और अमेरिका हिन्दुस्तान में आकर हम पर फूल बरसाए, अमेरिका नोट बरसाए, यह तो होना नहीं था! परेशानी तो उनको होनी थी, चिन्ता तो उनको होनी थी! यह तो बिल्कुल स्वाभाविक है और इससे परेशान होने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है।

सभापति जी, मैं समझता हूँ कि मुझे इस बात की चिन्ता ज़रूर है कि कल विपक्ष के नेता ने जो बात कही, उससे हमें लगा कि शायद चर्चा और सोच की दिशा बदल जाए। १९७४ में भी जब इस देश में परीक्षण हुआ था, पूरा देश उस समय की प्रधान मंत्री जी के साथ खड़ा हो गया था, लेकिन आज वह स्थिति नहीं है। क्यों नहीं है, मुझे समझ में नहीं आता। कल जब उन्होंने यह बात कही तो मुझे लगा कि सोच बदल जाएगी, लेकिन आज फिर इसका विरोध हुआ है। आलोचना के लिए आलोचना की जा रही है।

शुद्धि भारतीय जनता पार्टी उधर होती, आप इधर होते और आप ऐसा करते तो हम समर्थन करते और देश के जश्न, देश के समारोह में शामिल होते, क्योंकि सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से देश आत्मनिर्भरता की तरफ बढ़ रहा है। इससे बड़ी राष्ट्रीय स्वाभिमान की बात और कोई नहीं हो सकती।

एक बात बार-बार पूछी गई कि परीक्षण क्यों किया गया, क्या ज़रूरत थी। मैंने सारी बातें आपके सामने रखी हैं। जॉर्ज फर्नांडीस ने ठीक कहा कि आपने नहीं किया इसलिए हमें करना पड़ा। इस बारे में एक विशेष बात और है कि ऐसा इसलिए हुआ क्योंकि हिम्मतवाला नेतृत्व यहां पर आया है, निर्णय लेने की हिम्मत करने वाला नेतृत्व यहां पर आया। आपने १९७४ में किया, आपको बार-बार बधाई है। लेकिन उसके बाद ऐसे क्षण आये, अभी श्री वेंकटरमण जी का बयान छपा है कि जब वह रक्षा मंत्री थे तो पोखरन में एक्सपेरीमेंट करने की बात तय हो गई, वे वहां पर गईं, जगह देख ली, तिथि तय हो गई, फिर लगा दुनिया नाराज हो जायेगी इसलिए परीक्षण नहीं किया गया। इससे बड़ी दुख की बात नहीं हो सकती। यदि देश की सुरक्षा के लिए परीक्षण ज़रूरी नहीं था तो योजना क्यों बनाई और अगर देश की सुरक्षा के लिए परीक्षण आवश्यक था तो किसी देश की नाराजगी के कारण उसे स्थगित क्यों किया गया। कोई प्रक्षेपास्त्र हम बना रहे थे। कोई देश नाराज होने लगा, उसके लिए योजना स्थगित कर दी गई। देश की सुरक्षा को गिरवी रखने की बात की गई। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि आप कई बार ठीक समय पर, ठीक निर्णय नहीं ले सके। इस बार नेतृत्व आया है जिसने देश की सुरक्षा को सामने रखकर निर्णय लिया और यह इस समय इसलिए हुआ है क्योंकि दमखम वाला, देश की सुरक्षा के लिए सब कुछ कर सकने की हिम्मत रखने वाला एक नेतृत्व आया और उन्होंने इस निर्णय को लिया। हमारे मित्रों की हालत तो यह थी कि जैसे कई बार कोई फ़ैसला नहीं कर पाता 'इरादे बांधता हूँ, जोड़ता हूँ, तोड़ देता हूँ, कहीं ऐसा न हो जाए, कहीं वैसा न हो जाए।' आपकी यही हालत रही। लेकिन श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने देश की सुरक्षा को सामने रखा, इरादा बांधा, न तोड़ा, न जोड़ा, पोखरन में एक बहुत बड़ा बम फोड़ा और उसका परिणाम यह

हुआ कि कल पाकिस्तान की बिल्ली भी थैले से बाहर आ गई। अच्छी बात है, छिपे हुए हथियारों की बजाय खुले हुए हथियार सामने हों तो उस चुनौती का सामना करना आसान हो जायेगा।

एक बात उधर से बार-बार कही गई कि देश के संबंध बिगड़ जायेंगे। क्या दूसरे देशों से संबंध सुधारने का एक ही तरीका है कि कमजोर होते जाएं। यह तर्क समझ में नहीं आया। हम अपने घर में मालिश कर रहे हैं, वर्जिश कर रहे हैं, योगासन कर रहे हैं, मजबूत होने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, उससे किसी पड़ोसी को परेशानी क्यों हो। अगर किसी पड़ोसी को परेशानी होती है तो इसका मतलब यह है कि उसकी नीयत ठीक नहीं है। भारत सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से मजबूत होना चाहता है। भारत के चारों तरफ जो संकट है उसे ध्यान में रखकर भारत मजबूत होकर एक स्वाभिमान और आत्मविश्वास की बात करना चाहता है। उसके लिए बार-बार कहा गया कि संबंध बिगड़ जायेंगे तो क्या संबंध सुधारने के लिए जरूरी है कि भारत कमजोर हो जाए। भारत के पास सुरक्षा के लिए कुछ न हो, यह तर्क बिलकुल ठीक नहीं है और यह मनोवृत्ति चिंता का विषय है।

मैं आखिर में एक बात कहना चाहूंगा। हमारे मित्रों ने वैज्ञानिकों को बधाई दी, बहुत अच्छी बात है। पूरा राष्ट्र इस देश के वैज्ञानिकों को बधाई दे रहा है, टेक्नीशियनों को बधाई दे रहा है, इंजीनियरों को बधाई दे रहा है, चूंकि ये लोग बधाई के पात्र हैं। हमारे मित्र उठे, वैज्ञानिकों को बधाई दी, फिर दो कदम और आगे बढ़े, टेक्नीशियनों को बधाई दी, फिर दो कदम और आगे बढ़े, इंजीनियरों को बधाई दी, फिर रुक गये, उससे आगे नहीं गये। उससे आगे यह सरकार थी, उससे आगे श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी थे। क्या उनको बधाई नहीं दे सकते थे? क्या कारण था। आप खुशी तो मना रहे थे, बधाई तो दे रहे थे, लेकिन आपके मन में कोई टीस थी, जिसे हमारे कुछ मित्रों ने कहा है कि हम भी यही करना चाहते थे। श्रेय की बात आपके मन में है, हमारे मन में नहीं है। इतने बड़े देश की सुरक्षा के बारे में अगर कभी महत्वपूर्ण निर्णय लिया जाता है तो उसमें श्रेय नहीं देखा जाता। हां, कोई काम करता है तो कभी उसे श्रेय मिलता है कभी नहीं मिलता है। लेकिन मेरे मित्रों के दिल और दिमाग में श्रेय की बात है।

यह बात कही गई कि १९७४ में हमने एक्सपेरीमेंट किया, १९७५ में हार गये, इसमें हार और जीत का सवाल ही क्या है, आपने एक्सपेरीमेंट किया, बहुत अच्छी बात की। लेकिन आपको १९७४ के एक्सपेरीमेंट का अफसोस है कि हमने १९७४ में एक्सपेरीमेंट किया,

लेकिन फिर भी हमें सफलता प्राप्त नहीं हुई। यह श्रेय का सवाल नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसका वैज्ञानिकों को श्रेय जाता है, टेक्नीशियनों और इंजीनियरों को श्रेय जाता है और यह काम ११ और १३ मई को नहीं हुआ है बल्कि वह बहुत पहले से शुरू था। इसको शुरू करने का श्रेय आपको है, सबको है लेकिन आपके मन में यह चीज है कि इसका श्रेय श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी को न मिले, इस सरकार को न मिले। इसलिए आपकी जो मुस्कान है, उसमें भी थकान थी। आपकी खुशी में भी परेशानी थी। आपकी खुशी, खुशी नहीं थी। इसी पर मुझे एक गीत की पंक्ति याद आती है:

‘तुम इतना जो मुस्कुरा रहे हो, क्या गम है जिसको छुपा रहे हो।’

अंत में मैं एक ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि वक्त की जरूरत है, राष्ट्र की जरूरत है कि सुरक्षा को दलों की दीवारों से ऊपर उठकर देखा जाये। मैं माननीय शरद पवार जी को कल की बात के लिए बधाई देता हूँ और बधाई दूंगा यदि वह बात सच्ची हो और आगे भी बढ़ सके। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि सारी बातों से ऊपर उठकर जब पाकिस्तान ने एक्सपेरीमेंट किया है, देश के सामने बहुत बड़ा खतरा है, १९६२ के घाव अभी हरे हैं, हिमालय, शिव का शिवालय घायल है--इन सारी बातों को ध्यान में रखकर सुरक्षा केवल सुरक्षा हमारी परम प्राथमिकता है और उस पर सारा राष्ट्र एक है, यह संदेश इस सदन से जाना चाहिए। धन्यवाद।

(इति)

>1626 hours

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL (JALANDHAR): Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to address this august House today. If I may say so, it is for the first time since the elections that I am addressing the House. I am addressing the House at a moment when I feel the situation so demands that with all seriousness and with all application of mind, we address ourselves to the issues that are emerging before us. It is no use emotionalising the issue; it is no use raising slogans about it. Matured nations, serious nations, analyse the situations and try to evolve policies to meet them.

I was initially thinking of speaking yesterday. If I had spoken yesterday, I would have addressed myself to the issues arising out of Pokhran-II. But today I am speaking in a different background because Pakistan also has tested its devices. Therefore, when I talk today about these issues that have arisen, I cannot but talk in terms of the immediate situations that have come before us. These are compounded issues, and the two tests have to be read together so that we are able to evolve a policy and come to some conclusions.

There are several issues which involve both India and Pakistan and, for several years, we have been talking about them. For several years, we have discussed them; for several years, we have been able to meet many of the difficulties that have been confronted and that we have to meet.

At the moment, when I am standing here before you, Sir, I am reminded of a long history. But I am not going to take your time to go into that history. It is no more possible to really undo that history. It is no more possible to discuss at the moment the Indo-Pakistan relations in the context that existed before the two tests were there. But before I address myself to the subject as such, may I, first of all, join rest of the House in also offering my homage to the scientists and the technologists because viewed purely in scientific terms, I think, the Pokhran-II has proved, if any proof was really required for, that our scientists and our technologists are second to none in the world and they are a world-class scientists themselves.

When I talk about Pokhran and I pay my homage and compliments to the nuclear scientists, I pay my homage to the scientific community in totality. Science cannot be divided into parts. Even Pokhran-II would not have been possible, if other dimensions of the scientific growth had not taken place. It was only a few months back that in your State we have gone and seen the spectacle of Sriharikota, how Indian science made us proud and how Indian scientists made us proud when we are able to launch a satellite on our own, particularly when some months back or a year back or two years back, America denied its cryogenic engine to India. Here are our people who did it themselves and we made this piece. I am aware that more satellites are about to be launched by us and now we have reached that stage when many countries are approaching us to engage our services for that purpose.

I also wish to talk about the super-computer. You will kindly recall and the House will recall that the super-computer was denied to us and here are our scientists and technologists who have made the super-computer themselves. Not that they made it themselves, but also today there is a market for it and many countries which were proud of their scientific achievements are in the queue to buy this super-computer. Without this super-computer, nuclear dimension was not possible and, therefore, when I pay my homage -- I repeat -- that I feel that I pay homage to the entire scientific community. They had met the challenge before them and that was they who have turned every denial into an opportunity. Everything that was denied, they turned into an opportunity.

It was my modest effort and a dimension of homage that some months back, India for the first time offered Bharat Ratna to a living scientist.

When I talk of homage to India, I have to talk of Nehru. But for his vision, but for his commitment to scientific growth, but for the way he led us and set up the first laboratories in this country and the best way in which he spelt out the vision for us, we would not have been where we are. When I pay homage to him, I am also reminded not only in terms of science -- Modern India would not have been modern India -- but for Nehru's, his visionary leadership.

In these 50 years that we have travelled, in this House itself you will recall and my friend Shri P. A. Sangma was presiding there, when we got together and for nearly a week, we discussed the pluses and minuses of our society, what we had achieved and what we had not achieved. At the same time, I think we should ask ourselves the question that if we had not achieved anything in these 50 years, what would have been the expectations of our nation about our performance in the coming years?

Therefore, I feel that the important thing for us is that science must continue to receive our focussed attention. Science and technology must receive our attention all the time. Without scientific and technological growth, we will never be able to fulfil the trust that Nehru spelt out for us. Science does not prosper in hot houses. Science does not prosper in the minds which are obscurantist. Science does not prosper in those areas where minds are not modern. Science prospers only if your schools, colleges and universities provide a wide base for the pyramid and from there, generation after generation we produce scientists who come to the summit and when they reach there, they will perform things as they have done now. I feel, therefore, that it is extremely important that we see to it that the base of science education is spread. That is the homage.

We see that in our schools and colleges there is a great deal of work done for the education of science. We also earmark funds for education. Since my friend, the hon. Finance Minister, is sitting here, I would request him to see that he earmarks a sizable amount of money for Research and Development.

I said a little while ago that science and scientific attitudes do not come unless your base for scientific temper is there. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru often talked about it. May I say, in my own humble way, Sir, when I was assuming office of the Prime Ministership, I had drawn the attention of this nation to this. Scientific temper is the base on which science and technology prospers and also scientific temper defeats obscurantism and andhvishwas. Unless you defeat andhvishwas, you cannot think in terms of scientific temper.

May I say with some pain and some anguish one thing? When we are trying to glorify science, is it not a cruel irony that we are thinking of building temples, we are thinking of carrying the dust, and we are thinking in terms of new situations which encourage our obscurantism and not scientific temper? It is no use passing resolutions here. It is no use paying compliments here from that side and this side if it does not lead you to encouragement of scientific temper. If you are going to turn scientific achievements into the basic temples, dusts and all these things, then, I am very worried about the future of science in this country. Therefore, I hope that if we pay any compliment and if the House decides to pass a resolution - which I would like to share - complimenting and paying homage to our scientific community, we should say in the resolution that we want the country to encourage scientific temper. Therefore, unless scientific temper is encouraged, it is no use passing any resolution. You will know that encouraging scientific temper is also a part of the Directive Principles of the Constitution. That is also what the Constitution has said. That is what we must do. We must pay a great deal of attention to this aspect.

Having said this, I think it is important for me to come and talk to you here how wild I look at the present situation. As I said a little while ago, I was thinking in a different framework yesterday to talk here. But today I am talking in a different scenario, in a different framework. I had, some time back, written two letters to the hon. Prime Minister. These two letters were of 13th and 22nd May, after the tests were performed. When I saw the environment building up in the country, I thought it was my duty to write to him. I said several things in those letters. One of the things that I suggested was that for God's sake please see to it that the Government speaks in one voice. The Government was speaking in five voices, all divergent, all confusing, all giving different messages and those who listened to them were confused. I do not know whether those whom he talked to were confused or not. So, I urged the hon. Prime Minister twice to see to it that the Government speaks in one voice, and ensures that everything that is said in the name of the Government has the Prime Minister's prior clearance so that we know that these are the authentic words of the Government. Well, I do not know if any attention was paid to that or not. But I also suggested to him that he may kindly ensure that...(Interruptions) The letters are here. But I will not try to read them. At the same time, I had also suggested in the letters that he must see to it that his colleagues manifest and exhibit some maturity, maturity of thought, exhibit the maturity of the office that they occupy, and exhibit the dignity of the office that they occupy. They were talking out of turn all the time creating a new type of atmosphere in the country.

Sometimes jingoism was talked of, sometimes war-mongering was talked of, sometimes challenges were given and sometimes new emotions were roused as if overnight the country was on the brink of a war. I had also suggested to him that the maturity of India is that once we create an atmosphere of war without the intention of going to a war, that is an extremely dangerous thing. For God's sake, take care of this.

I also wrote to him and suggested that India has one basic strength of consensus. Since I had the privilege of being the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister for some time, I had practised that consensus. I do not have to ask for your credit. But I think, we showed them in practice this consensus whether it was the CTBT or neighbours' relationship or the United Nations. We explained to everybody how consensus can be built. And I see in the Prime Minister's statement as also in the Prime Minister's speech saying that he supported all those things himself. I say, for God's sake, please do it again. Do not try to make it look your Party's achievement. It is not your Party's achievement. If you want to say that it is your Party's achievement and if you are thinking of elections, it is fine.

I was very disappointed when my learned friend Shri Jag Mohan whom I respect a great deal otherwise, tried to talk in a partisan spirit.

SHRI JAG MOHAN (NEW DELHI): No.

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL: You did it. If you read your speech again, you will come to the same conclusion and you need not intervene now. The main point, I am trying to say is that consensus is the strength of India, consensus is the strength of a party. I had requested the Prime Minister to ensure that whatever policies he was following, he should try to build a consensus. I also told him when I met him that there is a difference between consensus and 'giving of information'. There is a very vital difference. You call the leaders of the parties and give them information. That is not consensus. Consensus-building involves flexibility. It involves accommodation. It involves trying to understand the other man's point of view. It involves trying to understand what the other man is saying is of some value or not, and he then either tries to persuade or tries to get persuaded. Then only you can evolve a consensus. But I say this with a great deal of regret that even now, I do not see the process of consensus emerging particularly after yesterday when new challenges were being thought of. Everybody is talking in a different tone and in a different context. I think, this was the time when we should have sat together and evolved a consensus. My friend, the Leader of the Opposition, offered it yesterday. What did he say? He said: "If the challenge is grave, let us know it; let us understand the challenge. If we understand the challenge, perhaps, we will be able to come together". But there is no response, no consensus building effort. If you do not build consensus, how do you wield the situation? If attitudes are rigid, if attitudes are unaccommodative, if attitudes are un-appreciative, if attitudes are that we know everything, that we have achieved our glory, that we have arrived somewhere where we do not need anybody, then I am sorry, this is not the way to carry the country forward.

Having said all this, I do not want to go into that controversy now whether we should or should not have performed the test. It is behind us. The only thing I would say and I think I am speaking with a full sense of responsibility having held the high offices, that there was no security compulsion for doing the test. I am saying this because I was the Prime Minister. I am saying this because I knew everything. I am saying this because in this country, only the Prime Minister is privy to certain secrets which nobody else is. And I say that with a sense of responsibility that there was no security compulsion for performing the test.

There may be another consideration. There may be political considerations. There may be partisan considerations. But security consideration was definitely not there. When I handed over the country on the 19th of March, there was no security challenge before us. Why was it not there? It was not there because ever since 1987, a new situation had arisen before us. In 1987, what was the situation that had arisen? By 1987, we came to know -- very credibly, very definitely, Shri Rajiv Gandhi was the Prime Minister -- that nuclear weaponry technology had been transferred to Pakistan. We know it for certainty that America was looking aside. It is now on the documents of the Congress America that America, on Gen. Zia's time, had tried to look the other way primarily because Afghanistan situation was there. Gen. Zia was willing to accommodate the American intervention in Afghanistan through Pakistan on two conditions. One, that America will not demand democratization of the country and secondly, that America will not interfere in the nuclear programme of Pakistan. That is why, from that day onwards 1993, Presslar Amendment was not enforced. But I must give it to the credit of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. He was a committed man to the denuclearisation of the world. He believed in it. And, I think, in that, he represented the spirit of India.

From Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Indira Gandhi onwards, every Prime Minister -- if I may say, in my humble opinion, upto me -- we were committed to denuclearisation of the world. We feel that every country in the world will be more secure if there is denuclearisation. But at that time, Rajiv Gandhi had performed another duty also. And, that duty was the duty of the Prime Minister. He performed it very well. And, without letting any secret outside to which I am sure, I would only say that Shri Rajiv Gandhi initiated the process and that process has been well taken care of by all his successors and, that is, that the Indian security is very safe, that the Indian nuclear deterrent is absolutely in the form that you did not do nuclear tests. We wanted to have a deterrent all the time.

In this House also, it has been discussed and I want to say it again, that nuclear weapon is not a weapon of war. Nuclear weapon has never been used. Nuclear weapon can never be used and particularly by India. With one nuclear bomb on Hiroshima, what happened? With one nuclear bomb on Nagasaki, what happened? Millions and millions of people died. We, the country with a tradition, we the country with civilisation, we the country

with the great names to refer to, cannot possibly have a bomb which kills, in one block, a thousand people, 10,000 people or a million people. We cannot do it. Nobody has done it.

I have lived in the Soviet Union for five years as Ambassador of India. I have seen them keeping nuclear weapons. A stage had come by 1979 when Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee was the Foreign Minister. We were visiting Moscow. We were discussing the Nuclear Policy and we both had come to the conclusion that the Soviet Union had enough arsenal to kill the whole world nine times. The only difference was that America by that time could kill the whole world 13 times.

Do you want to kill the whole world nine times? Do you want to kill the whole world 13 times? And, how can you kill a person second time? This was the irony which ultimately destroyed the Soviet Union. Once you enter into the nuclear war race, do not be under any wrong impression, Sir, and all slogans that we have been patriotic and the zeal you might raise, no country has been able to keep pace. The Soviet Union would not have been destroyed; that civilisation and that 'ism' would not have gone, had they not joined this race. I was the Ambassador there and I saw to it when 25 to 30 per cent of their budget was being spent on the nuclear race.

America was able to destroy them because they pushed them into this race. "Your friends", both internal and external, have pushed you in this race. For God's sake, do not deceive yourself. This is not valour, this is not bravery, this is only self-destruction. Once you go into that race, I do not know how you can possibly get out of it. I can see the tragic consequences of the race.

The Prime Minister has said that we are a nuclear weapon State. I do not know. I have taken it exactly at the face value because weapon has a certain meaning. If by that he meant that we have a reliable deterrent, I accept it. If by that he meant that the word is used in the sense that we have whatever we have, it is enough to take care of our security, I accept it. But, for God's sake, draw a distinction between weaponisation and militarisation. There is a great deal of difference between the two.

I have a newspaper here of two days back where my friend and a learned man, the Defence Minister had said that the weapons have already been handed over to the Army. I do not know what he is talking. If that has been done, God help us. I ask the Prime Minister to assure us here that weaponisation does not mean militarisation. I want the Prime Minister to give me an assurance and give an assurance to this House and to the country that we are not joining the nuclear weapons race. Countries in despair can do it. Pakistan can be desperate. It is no democracy like we are. It has no civilizational commitment that we have. It does not have a commitment to peace that we have.

Peace, may I say, is not only a slogan, it is a policy. A policy framework has to be built on the peace. Only then can you possibly think in terms of that. I would only like to say that I am not talking in a voice of panicky. Nobody can tell me, nor need you tell me that all those who differ are panicky and all brave men sit on one side. Nobody need tell us that we who had participated in the freedom struggle are panicky and those who never participated in the freedom struggle are brave. Nobody need tell us that those of us who have run this country with great deal of zeal, commitment, enthusiasm and responsibility do not understand the country and they do. Nobody need teach us that lesson. Nobody need tell us that basically they understand. Please understand this. I beseech you to understand that nuclear weapons race, as I said and I repeat, has destroyed countries. Nuclear weapons race has destroyed civilizations. I call them civilizations because in my perception Soviet Union was a civilization of a new type. You may differ with it, you may agree with it. But it was a civilizational approach. We have also seen that super powers have been destroyed by this race. We are no super power as yet.

Therefore, let us be not deceiving ourselves because we must understand one thing. God forbid, and I say thrice God forbid, if ever a nuclear war comes, there can be no winner, there can be no loser. Never give nuclear weapons. That is why heaps have been destroyed. That is why all the SALT Treaties and SARC Treaties have been signed. Why are they being signed? They spent billions of dollars on building them. Even this is not to our satisfaction. We wanted them to be destroyed more speedily. All the same, some people are doing it. Therefore, I would only say this thing. I urge the Prime Minister, when he addresses us to kindly respond to me. I hope he would respond and tell me, tell you, tell all of us and tell the entire country that under no circumstances will India enter the nuclear weapons race.

It is not a question of prestige; it is not a question of glory; but it is a question of a sense of responsibility; it is a question of commitment to the future of the nation; it is a question of commitment to our children and the future generations that are to come.

I would like to add another point. You will kindly recall - you were a part of my Government - that for two years we made a gigantic effort to give a new twist to our foreign policy. That new twist was that India's foreign policy must not continue to be Pakistan-centred. That is why, there was not a chance that we started any polemic war with Pakistan. Unilaterally, we stopped responding to any of their provocative statements. I did not even respond to Nawaz Sharif's speech in the United Nations. It was not because we could not draft a speech; it was not because we could not use any harder words; it was not because we did not have the rhetoric at our disposal. It was primarily because, I thought and I believed - and this House believed, because it supported me at that time - that India has a role to play in the world and since India has a role to play in the world, its policies must never be Pakistan-centric. These tests and counter-tests are making you Pakistan-centric once again because the House discusses it. Some hon. Members say, 'We are more powerful than Pakistan; we are more courageous than Pakistan'. What is Pakistan? Pakistan may or may not be anything. I am not entering into that controversy. But India definitely must not, in the 50th year of its freedom, remain Pakistan-centric. Kindly understand this.

There is some sort of a latent controversy - call it, rivalry - going on between America and China. Please do not let anybody play the China card on you. I do not know who in the Prime Minister's Office drafted that letter. I know, the Ministry of External Affairs did not draft it and I am very sorry that it did not because we have very competent members of the Indian Foreign Service in the Ministry of External Affairs. I do not know how on earth they wrote to President Clinton and talked about China, playing into their hands, playing into a trap. For, persistently, when I was in-charge of the foreign policy, I have seen to it that we did not play the China card and that nobody played the China card on us. We gave no one else the chance to play the China card for us. We have done it now. We have annoyed China on one side. On the other, we have given a glee to people in Washington and we do not know which way to go. My dear friend, Dr. Subramanian Swamy is sitting here. He understands China more than I do. I hope he has not forgotten China by now as he is too much interested in the AIADMK. I think, when he talks, that is if he does, he will tell us how dangerous it can be and how dangerous this trap can be. Therefore, when you make your foreign policy formulations, please understand this: Do not let others play this card on us. This will do immense damage to us.

With China, we have been carrying on a sort of a slow process, but a process which was showing some way out. There is no use talking bravado. In 1962, something happened. Today, are we more of warriors because we have tested? They have tested 45 times. Does it make them more powerful? Can they use the nuclear weapon on you? Can you use your nuclear weapon on them? That issue does not arise. Why are you inviting a war again. No wise country invites a war. But here, I find that some sort of a jingoistic environment has been created. We are competing with each other whose language is more irrational, whose rhetoric is more forceful and thus create for ourselves a mess.

Kindly understand that weaponisation is a very serious game. It needs several things. My dear friend, Shri P. Chidambaram had initiated and spelt out several things. He understands finance much better than I do. Therefore, I will not try to tell you how much money it will cost you to do this.

But I would like to tell you a thing. It is the surest way of derailing yourself from the economic progress. The Economic Survey that was placed yesterday made all of us think as to how to get away from the problems that are staring at our face. The problems such as the impact of negotiations; the impact of Europe talking in another language; the impact of World Bank talking in different language; and the impact of Japan talking in another language. Bravery is a very good word. But josh without hosh is dangerous. That is what I would like to say. We must be very clear in what we want to do. I hope the hon. Prime Minister understands the difference between weaponisation and militarisation. I hope, as he understands, he would put his foot down. I do not know if a contingency plan has been worked out. If that has been worked out I would like him to discuss about it with us. I am not saying that he should make it public. But I definitely want him to discuss it with us. What is his contingency plan? What is his plan regarding diplomacy? It is because may be we can help him. What is his contingency plan regarding the economy? What is his contingency plan regarding strategy? What is his contingency plan for dealing with neighbours? What is his contingency plan for dealing with the major powers?

The Minister of Finance is sitting here. Please understand one thing. I am not so much afraid of sanctions. But I am afraid of one thing. We are all seeing the financial crisis in South-East Asia. It is not yet over. We are seeing how the crisis can be manipulated. We are seeing how fiscal arrangements can be disturbed. I went to Indonesia two years ago and I have gone there after ten years. It was doing wonderfully well. I went to Malaysia. It was doing extremely well. But what happened suddenly? They have got the switch. These people who control the Brettonwoods organisations and institutions can make you derail. God forbid, the rupee slides down further, God forbid, our rupee also slides down like the Indonesian rupaiah, those are bigger dangers than the sanctions. Some measures have to be taken to see that it does not happen. Many things have been said here which, I think, are very important for us to keep in mind. Think of a total strategy. The strategy papers or contingency papers should be shared with all of us. For God's sake do one thing. I appeal to you in the name of the country, for God's sake do not hype jingoism; and for God's sake do not raise passions. For God's sake do not create a problem for ourselves. We do not want a war. We want peaceful development. We want this country to catch up with those countries whose rate of growth is eleven to twelve per cent. I think the Minister of Finance would be much happier to present a Budget which can promise ten to twelve per cent rate of growth rather than presenting a Budget which is trying to tighten our belts. I hope the day will come and it can come subject to our wisdom. Another danger is there. In our relations with Pakistan we had succeeded in bringing Kashmir down to bilateral levels of negotiations. Our progress is very slow. We might not have succeeded as yet. But there is every danger of its internationalisation again. I do not know what the diplomatic contingency plan says about it. I do not know what my worthy Prime Minister who is also the External Affairs Minister has thought about it; and I do not know what kind of initiative he is thinking of taking.

I was very surprised and confused when the Prime Minister said yesterday that his stand had been vindicated. I am very confused. Pakistan has tested and he says like this.

This afternoon, before coming here I saw the television in which the CNN quoting the Foreign Minister of Pakistan said that Pakistan may test once more. It said that Pakistan 'may' test once more. If that is the vindication, then he would be doubly vindicated tomorrow. If they do the testing again, then obviously he will be more vindicated! And if they do it for the third time, he would be vindicated thrice! What is the vindication about and what is this vindication for? He has taken this entire subcontinent into this race. What is this vindication for? He has undertaken the test purely for political reasons and not for security reasons and I say this with a great deal of conviction.

The Prime Minister also said that we are a nuclear weapons State. He must explain the details. What does he mean by a nuclear weapons State? This word means several things to several people. That is why it is very important for us to understand the meaning of this word; then only we can possibly work out a detailed policy responses.

Now I come to what we can do and what should be done because I do not think it is the duty only of the Prime Minister. We are also a part of the system; we also want this country to survive; we also want this country to prosper; and we also want to attempt in getting out of this rut that you have got us in. I would also suggest at the same time - I think, it might be helpful, unless the Prime Minister has reasons to believe otherwise - you to unilaterally declare no-first-use of nuclear weapons. We have to unilaterally declare that we will never use a nuclear weapon against any power which does not have nuclear weapons.

He has also talked about moratorium. You may repeat it again and say it unilaterally. He also has to declare, as a part of our declared policy, that we do not believe in proliferation. This brings me to CTBT. I talk about CTBT at a later part of this address this afternoon because as this House knows, I have something to do with the CTBT policy. I presented to this House that policy, when I was making it. My approach added one dimension to our CTBT approach. We were talking all the time about denuclearisation as an ideology. I added the national security dimension to it.

When I was discussing this with Mr. Clinton in September last year in New York, I asked Mr. Clinton to put himself to my issues. I was Prime Minister at that time, not sitting here. I asked him to look at the map of India and around us. I would not spell out the details here. But I only wished that that should have been the scenario

presented in the letter that the Prime Minister wrote. After listening to me for a while, Mr. Clinton said, "I understand".

That was the approach that I have had when President Chirac came here. My friend, the then Finance Minister was also with me. I had the same approach with the Prime Minister of Britain. They were all coming around and seeing our point of view. For God's sake, use your diplomatic skills to present your case well. We have a case; it is not that we do not have a case; it only needs doing well.

Here I say this to all of us, including myself: "Let the voice of sanity prevail; let us talk of peace." This has been our commitment from the first day when we became free. We have Nehru's 'Tryst with destiny'. We have a reputation for peace-loving nations. For God's sake, preserve it; preserve the reputation. At the same time, we must also revive our strength and our commitment to denuclearisation. The world must be told that we want denuclearisation because then only every country will be secure and that India will also join them. 'You denuclearise, so shall we'. We have done it in the case of the chemical weapons. Nobody knew that we had chemical weapons when we signed the Treaty.

As a matter of fact, my friends who are sitting there on that side criticised me. And Shrimati Sushma Swaraj particularly did that. I hope that she holds a different view now. I told them that we will sign any treaty which meets our needs and we will observe it. We have observed it. We have also observed the biological weapons treaty. We are also willing to observe this.

I would like to say one thing more. With great deal of difficulty, with great deal of effort, with great deal of sacrifice, we have built a neighbourhood policy. Shrimati Sushma Swaraj had just gone to two such countries. She has seen the benefits of those policies. She has seen how Dhaka responds; she has seen how Sri Lanka responds. For God's sake, do not dismiss it because some people, without my consent, have given it my name. You can take the name also but please sustain the policy, sustain the policy of building good neighbourliness and good neighbourliness rules out war.

Pakistan has offered that they are willing to talk to us. Pakistan has said that they are willing to talk about a non-aggression pact. They want something more but we do not want to cut our size to their size. We do not have any ambition on Pakistani territory nor on Pakistan polity. Within the framework of Simla Agreement, we are willing to talk about Kashmir also. I had said it and I had committed that with the consent of Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee. Please continue that so that the entire issue remains confined to the bilateral framework. If you do not do it and if Shri Jag Mohan is your advisor, then God help you because then Kashmir will go to the United Nations and then you will have to go to New York. It will not stay in this Sub-continent.

At that time, when we made an agreement with Shri Nawaz Sharif in Male, we had identified eight items. He said that we will talk on these eight items. And when I met him last, in Dhaka, in January this year, both of us agreed - I repeat - Shri Nawaz Sharif and I agreed that future discussions between our Foreign Secretaries will be on the basis that all the eight issues will be taken up together in one venue, in one place and in one building. We both together gave these instructions to our respective Foreign Secretaries. This should be sustained. Before I sit down, I hope that my friends sitting on that side for whom I have great respect and for some of whom I have great love do not mind it and do not blush it...

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री तथा संचार मंत्री (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज): अच्छे पड़ोसी बनिये यहां भी।

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL (JALANDHAR): I would only say that contingency plan should be worked out. I would repeat that the contingency plan should have a defined objective. The objective is peace; the objective is good neighbourliness; the objective is not entering into a nuclear weapons race and the objective is preservation of a situation. That task has been made easier by my friend, the hon. Finance Minister. He can definitely come heavy on us tomorrow. He can definitely do anything and the country will cooperate. But why, have, that situation, if it can possibly be examined? I would only say this that I wish all that happened yesterday - though was expected - had not happened. I also hope, that is not something which is unfortunate but let us not turn into a calamity.

With this appeal, I conclude.

(ends)

">1714 hours

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (MADRAS CENTRAL): Sir, after listening to the speech of the former Prime Minister, Shri I.K. Gujral, I am compelled to think that the tests and the counter tests are dangerous and foolish in equal proportions because Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the nation, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki disaster, had described nuclear weapons as the most diabolic inventions of science. They are abhorrent weapons. But at the same time, I want to make use of this opportunity to congratulate the nuclear scientists and engineers who made the Pokhran-II possible.

A lot of verbosity - sometimes jingoistic and sometimes partisan - was used to describe the bomb. Shri Singhal of Vishwa Hindu Parishad has described it as Hindu bomb. But Shri Sharad Pawar has immediately commented that it is a complete nonsense.

Who are the scientists who contributed to the Pokhran-II? Bharat Ratna Dr. Abdul Kalam, Scientific Adviser to the Minister of Defence, Dr. R. Chidambaram, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission and Dr. K. Santhanam, Senior Scientist of DRDO are all Tamilians. So, in a lighter vein, if they say that it is a Hindu bomb, I would say that it is a Tamilian bomb or a Tamil bomb because it would be appropriate.

AN HON. MEMBER: A Tamilian is also a Hindu.

MR. CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. YERRANNAIDU): Do not interfere.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (MADRAS CENTRAL): I am saying it in a lighter vein. It is not a Hindu bomb. ... (Interruptions) We are Tamilians also.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): As Tamilians, we are proud of it. I agree with you.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (MADRAS CENTRAL): Thank you. For once, we are agreeing.

I have to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for his magnanimity with which he traced the historic background of our nuclear programme. It was Shri Jawaharlal Nehru who laid the foundation for our nuclear option. He passed away before China's first nuclear explosion in 1964. That set off India's nuclear weapon debate. Then, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri ordered India's nuclear explosion in 1965 but he did not survive long enough. Finally, it was Shrimati Indira Gandhi and the successors of Dr. Homi Bhabha who conducted the first Indian explosion in 1974. Even though Shrimati Gandhi called it a peaceful nuclear explosion, India became from that day a potential nuclear weapon capability State. Then, Shri Rajiv Gandhi - even though he campaigned for global disarmament - was pursuing this option. Then came Shri V.P. Singh and Shri Chandra Shekhar who all gave strong support to this programme. Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao took it close to a nuclear test in 1995. He strengthened the capacity to test at a short notice. So, the credit goes to him. Then, thanks to that effort, now we have camouflaged it. The CIA could not detect it.

Then, came Shri H.D. Devegowda and Shri Inder Kumar Gujral. They did not test it. It was possible for them. It was within their reach to issue a command to test but retained the option to do so by not signing the CTBT.

It is like a long relay race. Shri Atal Bihar Vajpayee ran the last lap getting the baton from one Prime Minister to another Prime Minister, thus making India an overt nuclear weapon power. So, what Shri Vajpayee has done is like this. What nine previous Governments have not done since Shrimati Gandhi detonated its first nuclear device 24 years ago, has been done by Shri Vajpayee.

But the question is why has it been at this time. I share the perception of Shri Gujral. There is no security compulsion. There is no security challenge. That is why an economist of England says that it is a brilliant diversion. Another comment is that it is a violent political coup. It looks like that. It looks more political. So,

what is the new security rationale behind Pokhran-II? It has to be explained to us. But there seems to be none because the RSS Secretary, Shri Sudarshan, has let the secret out. He has said, "Even during the 13-day tenure of BJP regime in 1996, they wanted to do it. Because the time was short, they did not do it. There is no security concern. They wanted to do it. They did it. How does the world look at us? That is a pity. You have done it at a time when a lot of denuclearisation is taking place all over the world. This happened at a time when they have denuclearised six nuclear weapon potential States, namely, Brazil, South Africa, Argentina, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan.

Twenty thousand nuclear weapons were decommissioned at that time. The other countries, for example, Taiwan to Iraq were all waiting to do this kind of nuclear explosions. Saddam Hussain and the mullahs of Teheran might go in for nuclear explosions. At this point of time we have done this. So, there is a feeling that we have revived the menace of a nuclear war.

Sir, here is a comment made by the Financial Times of London which says and I quote:

"The end to the Cold War has removed the menace of a nuclear war and therefore, the momentum to nuclear disarmament".

Sir, we are guilty of reviving the menace of a nuclear war. What have we done? What has happened because of Pokhran II? The Government has reversed the time tested policy of our nuclear strength which was supported by a national consensus. India's nuclear policy prior to 11 May was anything but a policy of nuclear sustenance and it has been blown off into pieces.

The South Asian region has changed after Pokhran II. India has changed. What has happened to the Gujral's doctrine? Shri Gujral had shown some letters from the British Prime Minister, Mr. Tony Blair and other dignitaries of the foreign countries wherein they have appreciated the benefits that we derived from out of the Gujral's doctrine. They have mentioned the name of the 'Gujral doctrine'. I saw the letter written by Mr. Tony Blair to Shri Gujral. Bangladesh was happy; other smaller countries were happy; Sri Lanka was happy. Even our Secretary level talks with Pakistan were going on as per schedule. A hot line was established between the Prime Ministers of these two countries. So, there was a thaw; everything was cooling down. But why did the Government choose to do it at this point of time? That is the question.

Our foreign policy has completely changed. It has been over-turned. What has happened to the Simla Agreement? The Gujral doctrine seems to have been thrown into the dustbin of history. I do not know whether we are still sticking to the Simla Agreement or not. I think, it is for the Prime Minister to give a reply.

Sir, our relations with Pakistan is at its worse since the 'Operation Bluestar'. Shri Vajpayee went to China in 1979 for normalisation of relations with China. Now, our relations with China are arguably at its worse since the 1960s. What I would like hon. Prime Minister to do is to re-define the foreign policy of India after the war with Pakistan and Pokhran II.

Sir, Pakistan's action was not unexpected. We were flexing our nuclear muscles and they were doing it. The Newton's law has worked - every action will have a reaction, opposite and equal. They have done it. But we knew since 1987 that they have got a bomb and they have openly agreed about it. But now, what have they done? They have given the last turn to the screw-driver. They have got all the materials. We know from where they have got the materials. The James weekly has made it very clear - part is acquired; part is clandestine and part is developed. So, by begging, borrowing and stealing they have made a bomb. It is the culmination of a clandestine programme. What is the result?

I would like to quote from, what is called, a very conservative newspaper, The Hindu. It says and I quote:

"With Pakistan's detonation of five nuclear devices yesterday, indicating an inevitable succumbing to the pressure of the arms race initiated by India under the stewardship of the Vajpayee administration. It is painfully clear that the region is heading for a period of grave crisis. There is little doubt that the provocative and the chauvinistic attitudes struck by the Vajpayee Government have brought the country to the edge of a precipice".

This is what a conservative paper like The Hindu has written.

DR. SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (MADURAI): It is a Tamil paper.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (MADRAS CENTRAL): No, it is not a Tamil paper. It is a paper closer to Dr. Subramanian Swamy.

Sir, I am not going into the sanctions. We may say that the sanctions may affect Pakistan strongly and it may not affect us. But that is not the point. Of course, Pakistan is a small country, it is small basket cake. They have got one billion dollar of foreign exchange which is equivalent to one month's imports. They may suffer a lot. It is a different matter.

They are raking up some kind of a mania, national hysteria. They have declared some kind of an emergency. They are in a different direction. We cannot compare it.

There are many war doctrines. The Prime Minister's statement says that we do not intend to engage in arms race. Consciously or unconsciously, we are responsible for an arms race; not an ordinary arms race but a nuclear arms race. It is taking place. We have triggered it. It has started and we do not know when will it end. As Shri Chidambaram has said, it is not stockpiling alone. It is not just preparing a bomb and putting it under the basement. How many bombs do we have under the basement, it is not that calculation. For every bomb there is a thing called Triton which may go on after some time. We have to renew it every time.

Not only that, the high priests of cold war have created a doctrine called MAD, that is the Mutual Assured Destruction. Unless one reaches that level, one cannot stop producing it. So, we should have enough material to destroy the enemies and the enemies also should have enough to destroy us. Till both will get that kind of perception, we will not stop producing further bomb. There are several war doctrines. This is one of the doctrines. Are we going to follow that MAD doctrine?

Nobody would wish to see a South Asian equivalent of the Cuban missile crisis. We saw the cold war. There is all round insecurity borne out of uncertainty that we saw in the early days of East-West cold war. It took some time to keep nuclear weapons under lock and key and to learn for the Western countries like America and the then Soviet Union as to how to communicate in a crisis. But here, our Defence Minister says it has been weaponised. Our former Prime Minister has asked a clarification; if so, who is having the command, who is having the control. Is it the military General, Prime Minister or the Cabinet, we do not know. What is the decision making time? There is no buffer between India and our neighbours. We do not have early warning system. According to our Home Minister, we are having proxy war. There is terrorism. People are coming here and shooting our people. We should look at it in this context. Minor skirmishes can be contained but if miscalculations take place, the ultimate consequence can be devastating. I would like to quote what a Pakistani Professor feels about the nuclear bomb. He is an Associate Professor of Physics in Islamabad University. I quote:

"The nuclear weapons are to be used in a war with India when conventional defence system fails to withstand the Indian superiority."

He agrees that if the conventional weapon system fails, they will press the nuclear button. I again quote:

"The message too is very clear. If in any future conflagration we find that our forces are losing ground, we shall not hesitate to use whatever nuclear arsenals we have. It may be small, but it surely will cause a damage that cannot be acceptable to you. We also know that you have a much larger stock of nuclear weapons, and that you can indeed inflict much worse damage onto us, but our level of desperation is such that it is acceptable to us in comparison to a capitulation to your hegemony.

A little mistake here and there can easily lead to havoc in the two countries. Should this be allowed?"

The Pakistani professor has asked this question. I would like to ask the same question. A small mis-calculation will lead to nuclear destruction of this ancient civilization. It would not stop with that. There is instability, a dangerous instability. They call it as not an ordinary instability but a hat-triggered instability to any future crisis.

In 1985, when the cold war was at its peak, President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev met and made a declaration that a nuclear war could not be won and, therefore, it should not be initiated. That was the lesson the two superpowers have learnt. The challenge now is to make the subcontinent and the whole region free of war and conflict. The most urgent need is to avoid a nuclear war or even the threat of nuclear weapons. We should avoid nuclear race. New Delhi needs to propose comprehensive negotiations and a whole range of conventional confidence building measures with Pakistan on nuclear and conventional arms fronts.

What we should do now is very important. We cannot unscramble an omelette. We cannot go back to the status quo. The tests have already taken place; Pakistan is going to continue the same. We have to think very deeply on what we have to do now. I do not know why we have unnecessarily invited China also into this trouble. In this connection, I would like to quote Shri J.N. Dixit, a former Foreign Secretary. He said:

"I wish we had not been so specific in mentioning China as the reason for our nuclear weaponisation. We have landed in an unnecessary confrontationist stand with China. It is absolutely necessary to bring our relations with China back on the track. Escalating the current confrontations, which frankly has been begun by us, will be detrimental to our mutual interest as well as the regional stability."

We should give top priority to this. As Shri Gujral has said, in 1993, China -- which was an acknowledged nuclear weapon state even then -- and India signed an agreement to bring about peace and tranquility on the border based on the principle of mutual and equal security. It was done in 1993 when Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao was the Prime Minister. The principle of mutual security now assumes more credible dimension. This should lead to greater understanding and mutual respect in accordance with the 'Pancha Sheel' doctrine propounded 44 years ago.

I would request the Prime Minister to start the process of concluding bilateral agreements and 'no first use' commitments between China and India. China has such an agreement with Pakistan and with Russia. So, we can also have such an agreement with China. Pakistan has offered us an agreement, more than four years ago, not to attack population centres and economic centres. A similar proposal may be revived, even if Pakistan continues to make hostile statements. As Shri Gujral has suggested, we should start talking with Pakistan. The need of the hour is to seriously engage in negotiating confidence building measures with our neighbours.

The world has changed. American President, Mr. Clinton says that we are on the wrong side of the history and we cannot be considered a nuclear weapon state. The Prime Minister, in his statement, says that we are a nuclear weapon state. It is not possible; they would not accept us as a nuclear weapon state. As to who are they to say so, is a different question. In the NPT, the cut-off date for admittance of a nuclear weapon power is 1-1-1967. That is why President Clinton says that we are on the wrong side of the history. But the United States should understand that history has changed, whether they like it or not. The myth that the world will be governed by the five nuclear powers has been blown to smithereens.

The NPT has left out countries like India, Pakistan, Israel and Cuba. We know that Cuba is not a party because of various reasons. Israel has already signed the CTBT. So, India and Pakistan are left. I think, instead of imposing sanctions, the so called global order is to acknowledge the reality and include India and Pakistan and, if necessary, Israel also in the list of nuclear powers. The US State Department officials have said that it is a difficult enterprise. It may be difficult but the Prime Minister should call for a conference of world leaders, or a world summit to consider nuclear security for the entire world. The scenario has changed. Tomorrow Iran may explode a bomb; North Korea may explode a bomb; and it may be bombs everywhere. Therefore, for the nuclear security of the entire world, not just of this region, the Prime Minister should call for a conference or a world summit in view of the totally new situation that has arisen.

They should evolve a phased programme of elimination of all the nuclear weapons and evolve the security norms. Special Envoys may be sent to all the countries. I would request the hon. Prime Minister to consider this.

What is the question about CTBT? Several voices are heard about CTBT. The hon. Prime Minister has given a commitment to the British Prime Minister, Mr. Tony Blair. I want to read this news item.

'The British Prime Minister, Mr. Tony Blair conveyed what he termed the G-8's strong exception to India's nuclear tests and claimed that he - Mr. Tony Blair - had obtained an assurance from Shri Vajpayee during the telephonic conversation that New Delhi will start negotiations on the CTBT and that the G-8 countries were now awaiting delivery of commitments made by Shri Vajpayee.'

We want to know as to what is the commitment.

Regarding the CTBT, the entire House rose like one and supported it. We opposed the signing of the CTBT. Why? Because it was not comprehensive; it was discriminatory; it did not address our security concerns. There was no time-bound programme of disarmament. We objected to the signing of the CTBT for these reasons. Now, under the changed circumstances, we may consider it. This is my personal opinion. I think, the hon. Prime Minister should initiate a talk with the leaders of the Opposition and with the experts in the field. I think, nothing is out of consideration in the sense because the situation is very serious. Things have changed. If the normalcy is restored by our signing the CTBT, then, we should reconsider it. There is nothing wrong in reconsidering it. Once again, I repeat. If all our concerns are duly addressed under the changed circumstances, we can even consider signing the CTBT on the basis of a consensus, after Pakistan also signs the CTBT.

Our main and only concern is peace. I am a pessimist. Already we are spending two times more money for the military than for our education, primary health and social services. What will happen to this kind of a security race? According to Shri N.N. Jha, our Ambassador, a bomb may cost 70 million dollars per annum. It is a small amount. We can bear it but there are delivery systems, stockpiling and other things also. I think, our priorities will be derailed. There is no doubt about it.

Already the hon. Prime Minister says that the bombing, the experiment, the testing is the will of the one-sixth of the population of the world. Yes, it is very sweet to hear about it. But, what is the fact? Where are the world's poor living? World's poor are living not in the Sub-Sahara, but they are living in South Asia; they are living in India. India has a third of the world's poor. Half of them are illiterates with no access to written word; and half of them are child labourers.

India was already a great nation before May 11. It should have become even greater nation if 40 per cent of its population did not live in absolute poverty. Therefore, I would request the hon. Prime Minister to de-escalate the tension, to have some kind of a peaceful atmosphere not only in India but also in the region and in the world. The responsibility is on his shoulders because they started it. They have triggered off the race. Now, we should find a way out. We should discuss about the post-Pokhran situation; post-Pakistan test situation. Therefore, in this context, we do not know where we will lead to. They are talking about sanctions. I am also worried about sanctions. We can have bravado, but sanctions will also affect us. It may be in a small manner or it may not be as Pakistan may be suffering.

One of the genius elder Statesmen of America, Dr. Kissinger has told in the CNN interview:

'The long-term interests of both India and United Nations, the decades ahead coincide much more than they divert. The United States should keep this convergence of interests in mind.'

There are also some friends of India in America. We do not have such support in the Congress, but we should make use of it. We should try to de-escalate the tension. That is my wish. I hope the hon. Prime Minister will initiate it.

It does not mean that I am against security measures. We are second to none in giving our lives, if necessary, for the security of the nation. But at the same time, was this necessary? We are guilty of initiating a nuclear arms

race, which is not only dangerous to India, not only dangerous to this region but it is dangerous to the whole world. So, in the name of humanity, I plead with the hon. Prime Minister to bring back normalcy to de-escalate the tension.

I want to finish my speech with what hon. Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has stated in the Assembly. He said:

"There can be a debate now about the correctness and the timing of the tests but when it comes to the question of India facing danger from the rest of the world, the country will stand together transcending the political barriers."

Thank you.

(ends)

">1741 hours

SHRI C. GOPAL (ARAKKONAM): Respected Chairman Sir, hon. Prime Minister has submitted to this House India's Nuclear Policy on the 13th of this month. India has conducted totally five nuclear tests successfully.

When that happened in India, what were the suggestions put forward by the politicians of our nation, particularly when this paper was placed before this House. The hon. Prime Minister clearly stated, "We do not intend to use these weapons for aggression or for mounting threats against any country. These are weapons of self-defence to ensure that India is not subjected to nuclear tests coercion. We do not intent to engage in an arms race." That was the suggestion put forward by the hon. Prime Minister.

With regard to the point raised in the papers that every person must talk about this in this House, I am also very happy on this occasion and on behalf of our leader Dr. Puratchi Thalaivi, I deem it a great pleasure and pride to put on record my deep sense of appreciation to our hon. Prime Minister in having taken the courageous decision, I say courageous decision, to conduct the nuclear tests.

Some efficient and eminent leaders from that side have said that before conducting the tests he did not consult any politician here. Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the Members of the other side that when in 1974, under the Prime Ministership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, nuclear test was conducted, she did not consult any politician at that time also. But now, they are raising this question and they are accusing the hon. Prime Minister of not doing so, when he gets credit for all this.

I would also like to draw the attention of this House about the intention in testing nuclear tests here in this nation.

What was the opinion of the leaders of the Congress Party on the 11th and on the 13th? What is their opinion now, for the past ten days? I want to draw this knowledge before this hon. House. When the nuclear tests were conducted, what was the opinion of our scientists? Our hon. Prime Minister appreciated the scientists alone. He did not take any credit for this test. Our hon. Prime Minister magnanimously has said: "All credit goes to the scientists, to the engineers and to the persons involved in these activities. This is not for me." He has clearly said this. But some of the efficient and eminent leaders here, by way of political motivation, accused the Prime Minister and said: 'No. The BJP has issued sweets. The BJP has got this intention.' That is not true. The Prime Minister has clearly said to this nation that all credit goes only to the scientists, engineers and the persons involved in these activities.

What about the opinion of our scientists? Sir, the Atomic Energy Commission Chairman, Dr. R. Chidambaram has said: "The three tests conducted simultaneously did confuse international observers but that was not the intention. The multiple tests were done to save cost." This is the opinion of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Two questions were put before this House now. The first question is about the timing of these tests. Secondly, why did India go in for these tests? What about the opinion of our politicians? I will come to this point later.

The former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. P.S. Iyengar has said: "India should be looked upon as an equal to five nuclear States of the world following Monday's three nuclear tests at Pokhran. The conducting of these tests was necessary for technological and operational reasons, the objective being to lay the foundation of India having a deployable deterrent capacity against potential threats. India had already delayed this process which had affected its security." This is the opinion of our intellectuals in India.

The eminent and efficient leaders of the Congress Party have put forward their suggestions. What were their suggestions on the 11th? The Congress had issued one page statement, after deliberations for more than a hour, largely speaking of its key role in formulating the country's nuclear policy and how Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi were instrumental in shaping them.

Shrimati Sonia Gandhi had also deputed two persons -- Shri Natwar Singh and Dr. Manmohan Singh -- to contact the BJP immediately. That was the statement made by the Congress Party on the 11th. On the same day, in Madras, our Leader of Opposition, Shri Sharad Pawar, had praised the activities of our scientists as well as the nation's pride. In the same way, our former Prime Minister, Shri I.K. Gujral had said: "India has proved -- he has not praised our scientists alone -- that it is second to none in the areas of hi-technology."

Sir, what is the point before this hon. House now? ...(Interruptions)

SHRI H.D. DEVEGOWDA (HASSAN): He has said this in the House itself. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI C. GOPAL (ARAKKONAM): I will come to that later.

Now, what is the point before this hon. House? It is, whether this nuclear test is wanted for this nation or not.

But how is it used? He has clearly said that it will not be used against other nations. It is only a safeguard for our nation. It is a clear point from the hon. Prime Minister. But what is your opinion? What is the opinion of the Congress leaders about these tests before this House? Why was it conducted in the year 1974? In the year 1974, it was conducted under the Prime Ministership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. At that time, it was said that even though India had been under constant pressure from Western powers, particularly, the United States, it would always use its nuclear programme for peaceful purposes.

Sir, our Father of the Nation is Mahatma Gandhi. Nobody can deny it. He was a man of Ahimsa. When he believed in the policy of Ahimsa, was he having a gun with him? Why was this nuclear test conducted? Even though we are saying that it is only for peaceful purposes, why was this nuclear test conducted in the year 1974?

I want to draw the attention of the Opposition Leader as well as eminent and efficient Congress leaders to a letter written by the former President of India. In the year 1983, that is, during the Congress regime, our respected Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister. In 1983, Shri Venkatraman was the Defence Minister of our country. Now, he has written a letter to the hon. Prime Minister. What has he written in the letter? Even in the year 1983, all the arrangements were made for conducting underground nuclear tests in India. The eminent leaders from the Congress side have cited so many things. Just now you were saying, without knowing anything, that the decision to conduct this nuclear test was taken only 10 days before it was conducted.

Even in 1983, all the arrangements were made for conducting underground nuclear tests but due to compulsion of major foreign nations, the test was postponed. This is the statement by the former Defence Minister. It was not for peaceful purpose and it was not in accordance with your point. According to what he has stated now is that due to compulsion of foreign nations, it was postponed.

What is the point behind it? What is your intention? The intention was that there was a threat to the nation from Pakistan as well as China. But this fact was well-known to the nation. Anyhow, there must be safety to our nation. Even Shrimati Indira Gandhi thought of it. Shri Rajiv Gandhi thought of it. But now you have become

fortunate. That is why, you are talking like this. That is why, you are not taking any interest in the policy now. It is because when the credit goes to the hon. Prime minister, you are not in a position to bear all these things. That is why, you are talking like this.

I want to say one thing to the hon. Member, Shri Sangma. What is the personality of our Prime Minister? Even after the year 1962, he was the person who had created good relationship with China and Pakistan. He is such a person. Now, what is the position? He wants to safeguard India. That is why, such a good person is taking a good stand now. That is why, on behalf of All-India Anna DMK, I am appreciating it.

I want to say one thing. Is this not a threat? Somebody said, "no". Pakistan has done it. Why should we bother about Pakistan? Let it do anything. Let it say anything. Let it fight for itself. We need not bother about Pakistan but we must safeguard our nation. Our intentions are correct. We are doing our activities within our nation. We are not aggressive against any other nation. Why Pakistan should do it? But Pakistan's intention is different. The American Intelligence Agencies have been quoted in the media here as saying that Pakistan is very close to a nuclear test. They are making final preparation to test.

They said that it could happen at any time. It was very precariously given by the CIA some 20 days back even before our conducting the test. So, what was their intention? What were the intentions of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Shri Rajiv Gandhi and of Shri Narasimha Rao? All their intentions are equal with our intentions now. The decision is made by our hon. Prime Minister. But you have become opportunist. That is why you are talking wrong things. Particularly, you are showing disinterest.

This House is a very peculiar House. What are you talking? You are talking something outside and something else inside. You are taking a double-stand. It is not good for our nation. My humble submission to you would be to be cooperative and fight for other nations which are interested in the aggressive policy of our nation. Therefore, my humble request to you would be always to cooperate with the nation and support our Prime Minister's best activity.

(ends)

">1756 hours

SHRI H.D. DEVEGOWDA (HASSAN): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The hon. Prime Minister is present in the House when I am addressing the House which is just a coincidence. I would like to express my sincere thanks to him.

The hon. Prime Minister while replying to the Vote of Confidence Motion in the very same House had given a categorical assurance to this House that any important decision concerning the country will be taken as a conscientious decision. The same thing he had reiterated when he was replying to the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address.

The question of the nuclear test which was conducted by this Government under the leadership of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is being considered. This issue has not come up before the Prime Minister for the first time. Just now the hon. Member from Anna DMK has mentioned that in 1983 this matter came up before the then Defence Minister Shri R. Venkataraman. In 1995 and in 1996 and in 1997 when Shri Narasimha Rao was the Prime Minister, when I was the Prime Minister then when Shri Gujral was the Prime Minister, it was considered.

Senior Member Shri Jag Mohan has mentioned that there was no courage for the previous Prime Ministers to take a decision. I would like to just mention courage and conviction are not the issues alone when you are going to take a decision on an issue of this type. Another argument was advanced by some members that there was no need to take the Opposition into confidence or the House into confidence or to have any discussion with any leaders. This was one of the arguments by senior members quoting Pokhran-I test by the late Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

The political situation in this country is totally different today. Yes, technically and numerically you have got the mandate of this House.

On the day of the Vote of Confidence, he had got the mandate of this House. I do not dispute it. But I would like to remind the hon. Prime Minister that when we were heading a coalition with 13 political parties, on an important issue like CTBT - the question was of signing the CTBT - the then Minister of External Affairs, Shri I.K. Gujral approached Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, approached the former Prime Minister Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, who was then the leader of the Parliamentary Party of the Congress, Shri Chandra Shekhar and our friend and a senior Member, Shri Somnath Chatterjee who is sitting here. All these four or five important leaders were consulted before we took a decision. I am only mentioning how we tried to take the House or every political party into confidence when we decided not to sign the CTBT in 1996. I would just like to recollect how we tried to function in a coalition Government, and his goodself is also heading a coalition Government with 18 or 19 political parties. He has taken a decision. He is courageous and bold enough. For that, I would congratulate him.

But today, he needs the cooperation of the House, he needs the cooperation of the people of this country to face the challenge posed by our neighbours. Sir, to get our cooperation, he should also show his magnanimity. We were not courageous to take the decision.

I wrote a letter to him on 15th. The tests were conducted on 11th and 13th. I do not want to go into the letter which was written to the President Clinton as I do not want to take the time of the House.

When the Defence Minister tried to make a provocative statement against China and against Pakistan, particularly against China, the Prime Minister's office issued a statement on May 6th which was reported :

"In what appears to be a damage control exercise, the Government today reiterated its commitment to the process of dialogue for normalisation of relations and development of friendly, cooperative and good neighbourly and mutually beneficial ties with China."

In the statement issued here today, the official spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs--the portfolio is held by the the Prime Minister-- emphasised the continuing relevance of the five principles of peaceful coexistence jointly enunciated by the two countries for the development of the bilateral ties. I do not want to read the entire news which has appeared.

Sir, he was the Minister of External Affairs in 1979. Not only as the Minister of External Affairs, even as the Leader of the Opposition, his contribution to the foreign policy was appreciated by the whole House, and even as Prime Minister, we did not have any grouse. But we are also equally concerned about the way in which things have been handled from 19th March onwards. We were not so much competent or courageous to take decisions. I was in office for 11 months.

Sir, what was the threat perception? The dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir and the border dispute between India and China, as you have quoted in your letter, have been there since the last 15 years. There is nothing new about it. The hon. Home Minister cited the reasons of militancy and insurgency. They are also not new.

Sir, after the present Prime Minister visited China in 1979 as the then Minister of External Affairs, Shri Rajiv Gandhi visited China in 1988, and subsequently, Shri Narasimha Rao also visited that country in 1993. When the President of China visited our country, I broke the protocol and I had myself gone to the airport to receive him. I think that was for the first time that a Prime Minister of the country had gone to the airport to receive the dignitary of our neighbouring country. I broke the protocol purposely and we entered into a Treaty, the Confidence Building Treaty. What had happened after that? The Prime Minister should enlighten the House, because he has got every material with him. I do not want to say what the RAW report was, what the IB report was, and what the Defence Intelligence said. The Defence Minister, Shri George Fernandes tried to cite the reports of the Standing Committee on Defence as a reason for this. Those reports are not the only basis for taking such a major decision.

Sir, during 1997-98, our trade with China had gone up by \$1.75 billion, if I am correct. Our trade with China had improved last year and our bilateral talks were going on. In such a situation, can you cite the security threat as one of the major reasons for taking this courageous decision. Yesterday, the hon. Home Minister tried to enlighten the House by saying that the Government wanted to put an end to insurgency activities which are encouraged by our neighbouring country, Pakistan. If they are going to achieve that by showing the bomb today, we welcome that.

Sir, the nuclear capability of this country was proved in 1974 itself. In 1974, when Madam Gandhi was the Prime Minister the first Pokhran Test was conducted. At that time, the Congress Party did not try to take credit by taking the sand from the test site and go round the country. Madam Gandhi did not stoop to that level or Madam Gandhi had not asked her party to go and construct a temple there or a 'Shakti Peeth'.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): But all the Opposition political parties gave credit to her.

SHRI H.D. DEVEGOWDA: The Prime Minister is here to reply if I have said anything wrong.

1809 hours (Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I was heading a coalition Government consisting of 13 parties and I had not secured a clear mandate. So, to take a decision on the CTBT, we had consulted all the major political parties and took them into confidence. In a changed political situation like this, if you want the cooperation of the entire country, the entire Opposition, you must also have the magnanimity to take the Opposition into confidence. That is what is needed. Why is the House divided today? Where is the need for us to speak in two voices? Are we not patriots?

SN. LDR. KAMAL CHAUDHRY (HOSHIARPUR): There are certain issues in which official secrecy is very important.

SHRI H.D. DEVEGOWDA: Please do not disturb me. I have been sitting in the back bench and I have never interrupted anybody. I will be the last person to do that. I feel that I have got a right to tell this House the things which have gone wrong.

Sir, in eleven months, we tried to follow the policies of the previous Government. We tried to solve the Bangladesh issue and Ganga water issue with the cooperation of all the parties. We also tried to solve even the Nepal issue and Mahalaxami Treaty. We tried to improve the relations with all our neighbours. Even with Pakistan, the official level talks began before I resigned on 7th April, 1997 ... (Interruptions)

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN (CHANDIGARH): Sir, the time of the House has to be extended ... (Interruptions).

SHRI H.D. DEVEGOWDA (HASSAN): There is no need for me to violate the ruling of the hon. Speaker ... (Interruptions)

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR (BARAMATI): Sir, please extend the time up to the Prime Minister's reply.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF TOURISM (SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA): Sir, the time of the House has to be extended.

MR. SPEAKER: The time of the House is extended up to 7 p.m.

SHRI H.D. DEVEGOWDA (HASSAN): Sir, some people try to argue the point regarding secrecy. Yes, secrecy is an important issue and is the most pivotal point. As per the Press reports, on April 23rd a leader in Madhya Pradesh - I do not want to take the name of the leader - said that be ready for the sanctions. They are patriotic because they can know these important and secret issues. We are not patriotic. The problem is this.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (BOLPUR): What is the level of that leader?

SHRI H.D. DEVEGOWDA (HASSAN): He is a Joint Secretary of a particular organisation. The chief of the organisation says that the nuclear weapon is cheaper so why do you want to have conventional weapons like Bofors Guns, Sukoi-30, etc. He asks, why do you want to spend money unnecessarily on these weapons when the nuclear weapons are so cheaper? I am talking on the basis of the Press reports. Otherwise, there is no other agency for me to have the information. The seniormost Member of this House from this side mentioned... (Interruptions).

SHRI RAJESH PILOT (DAUSA): The seniormost Member is Shri Indrajit Gupta.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (MIDNAPORE): But I was also a Minister. So, that period is cut off.

SHRI H.D. DEVEGOWDA (HASSAN): The mouth piece and the organizer of one of the newspapers highlights so many things.

Sir, according to them, this secrecy has to be maintained, but how could all these organisations or the media highlight this? Please tell us how you expect cooperation from us if you have no confidence in us even to discuss this important issue and take us into confidence, which you have promised on the very first day. You have not kept up your words and that is all I would like to say.

How was this Pokhran-II test conducted? It was a hidden capability. I can only say that nobody has doubted about India's capability. Otherwise, where was the need for the superpower to force us to sign the CTBT? If they have considered that this country is not capable, they would not have put so much of pressure on us. They know it. It was a hidden capability which we tried to maintain in the interest of maintaining our relations with our neighbours, especially in the sub-continent. Now, we have demonstrated that capability. We must compliment our scientists and there is no question of two opinions on that. There are some people who give different versions, but I do not want to enter into that controversy now.

Our former Prime Minister, Shri I.K. Gujral, has mentioned about some of the steps that he had taken after he laid down his office to improve the relations with the United States, U.K., and other countries. Not only that, just half-an-hour ago, he has also spelt out in this House the details of the bilateral discussions which took place between the Prime Minister of Pakistan and himself. Attempts were being made to minimise the tensions.

Now, with this test, we have demonstrated our strength and capability. On the question of whether we are going to weaponise, which is what the Defence Minister has said, I am not going to comment, and it is for the Government to decide on that.

Sir, in the National Agenda for Governance -- I will try to cut short my speech because I do not want to make a lengthy speech on this -- you have made so many promises. I am not going to doubt your intentions. But today, how are you going to keep up those promises? When the hon. Prime Minister visited the blast site, he gave a new slogan. "Jai Jawan, Jai Kisan" was the slogan given by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. The hon. Prime Minister gave the slogan of "Jai Jawan, Jai Kisan and Jai Vigyan". You have said that 60 per cent of the developmental grants would be provided for agriculture and rural development.

Can you keep up the promise tomorrow? I would like to ask this question.

I addressed a letter to the hon. Prime Minister when this matter came up before me. I do not want to reveal the discussion which took place between me and the two scientists. Lot of secrecy is there. I do not want to reveal that. When I took the ultimate decision not to give permission for the test, it was my primary concern because I am coming from rural areas and I am a farmer. I do not hesitate to tell this. My primary concern was to solve the problem of the suffering rural masses of this country. That is the reason which I have quoted in my letter which I have written to you on 15th May.

My friend Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav was telling certain details of our capability. Some of our friends try to question it and say that it is going to help our enemy. Nothing is secret. Everything has been printed, what is China's capability and our capability and Pakistan's capability, our army size and our warheads and everything. I

do not want to repeat all these things. There is nothing new. Today our country's position is known to others and the neighbouring countries' position is also known to us.

You say that now damage is controlled. How and on what lines is it controlled? What are the measures which you would like to take to control the damage? Please take us into confidence. We may differ in decisions because of certain factors which I have mentioned. It is not a party issue. Is it with your consent that your Party people have done it? I am not going to elaborate. Many of the Ministers, senior Ministers and Cabinet Ministers have given quotations of what many of the people said about the tests and you have addressed official quarters about the bold decision which you have taken. Is it not a fact that you have done all this to take political mileage out of this so called euphoria that you have created? If you expect the country should be together in fighting such a vital issue, then this type of shortsightedness is not going to help. I came to know that preparations are going on in Rajasthan for the erection of the temple. Is it there in the national agenda for governance? What is the promise which you have made? I am not going to raise my voice on the BJP manifesto. It is a Party manifesto. But you have not got a clear majority for the smooth functioning of the Government. You have drawn up your national agenda for governance. Is the point about temple construction included in that national agenda? How can you expect us to extend our cooperation to you on these issues?

I would like to tell the hon. Prime Minister that today the House is divided. There is no question of any hesitation to say this because of some of the events which have taken place during the last two months. Today if you want to take us into confidence, you spell out how the damage would be controlled and what are your strategies. By merely showing your bomb, you cannot expect the neighbouring countries to come to negotiating table.

Mr. Prime Minister, by showing your bomb, whether it is a big bomb or a small bomb, you cannot solve the boundary problem, the problem of Kashmir, the problem of the North-Eastern States.

When we conducted the election in Jammu and Kashmir, there was no death. Of course, there was only one bomb blast in the Valley, that too in a thickly-populated area. The blast took place before eight of the clock. It was only just to see that sufficient voters did not come to the booths. As I said a little while ago, there was a bomb blast in only one thickly-populated area in the Valley. Nothing happened. 53 to 55 per cent polling took place.

Our hon. Home Minister said yesterday that in order to deal with the insurgency and militancy problem, we must be either reactive or pro-active. I do not know whether the policy of "proactive" is going to improve the situation in Kashmir or solve the problem with the bomb in your hand.

Mr. Prime Minister, you have got that capacity. You have shown your capability to the whole world. With this, if you can solve it, we will welcome it.

Lastly, I would only request the hon. Prime Minister one thing. It is for you to take the House into confidence; it is for you to take the people into confidence. If you want to take this issue on party lines, things are going to be further worsened. That is all what I would like to say.

I thank you very much for having given me a chance to speak.

(ends)

">1827 hours

SHRI K. YERRANNAIDU (SRIKAKULAM): Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the outset I would like to say that I do not want to take much time of this House. Today, we are debating a matter of great significance - the underground nuclear testing.

First of all, on behalf of myself and on behalf of my Party, I want to convey our warm congratulations to our great scientists, engineers and technocrats for their achievement. In doing this, they have done us proud. I am

thankful to the hon. Prime Minister also for putting the issue in a proper perspective. He said it categorically that the underground nuclear testing is an on-going policy. The credit goes to our scientists, engineers and technocrats.

There are two issues which are before us. Yesterday, Pakistan also tested its devices. In Pokhran, we tested the underground nuclear tests on 11th and 13th May. Yesterday, the Prime Minister of Pakistan had taken into confidence all the political parties in that country. At this juncture, my party strongly feels that we cannot afford a division in the country on this issue. Some lapses are there. Whatever it may be, we feel proud of the achievement. The entire credit goes to the scientists and others. It is not a one-day job. The former Prime Ministers also had planned to do it. But, to some extent, they had not taken any decision basing our foreign policy, basing on the national consensus and everything.

Previously also, in this House, we elaborately discussed the policy regarding the CTBT. The House was taken into full confidence. Like that, this time also, we want to know one thing. After this, what is the contingency plan that the Government has planned? People want to know about it. Some people are feeling that after the nuclear weaponisation, what would happen tomorrow. Everybody in the world knows about the effect of the atomic bombs hurled on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That is why people want to know about the contingency plan on the economic side and in respect of our relationship with our neighbouring countries. My Party feels that we must maintain good neighbourly relations. Yesterday, our State Party unit also passed a resolution to maintain good relations with the neighbouring countries.

There is a common resolution. My humble appeal to the hon. Prime Minister is that he should take the opposition parties into confidence. We are unanimous on this issue. At this juncture, Pakistan has also gone in for an underground nuclear test. There is no difference of opinion at this stage in the House. We have got stalwarts and veteran politicians. My Party's policy is that you take a common view on the India's security perception. We must congratulate our scientists and others for this. The Government that takes a decision about such matters, normally gets the credit for it. The hon. Prime Minister has put the issue in a proper perspective. He warned his Ministers, some individuals and organisations for taking the credit for this. He said that credit for this goes to all the scientists and engineers. We must give full support to him for this underground nuclear test. If there is any difference, we must sort it out unanimously. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

(ends)

MR. SPEAKER: The time allotted for this subject was six hours and so far the time taken by the hon. Members is 11 hours and 18 minutes. I think, all the Members have spoken.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (AKOLA): It was mentioned that smaller parties would be given the chance at the end...(Interruptions)

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): What happened to my Party?

MR. SPEAKER: It is already 6.30 p.m. If you want, you can speak for two minutes each...(Interruptions)

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): I can give a complete list of the time taken by each Member who spoke in the House. Is it the way? Full time should be given to all the Members.

MR. SPEAKER: I have got a list of another five names.

Shri Sirpotdar to speak.

">1833 hours

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to express my viewpoint on this subject in this august House. These nuclear tests were undertaken

on the 11th and 13th of May, 1998. This decision was welcomed by practically all the people of this country. I must congratulate the hon. Prime Minister of this country as well as the scientists Dr. Abdul Kalam, Dr. Chidambaram, Dr. Kakodkar, Dr. Santhanam and other technicians and engineers who have participated in this experiment.

It is a matter of pride for our country that we have undertaken this test after 24 years. The reaction of some of the countries of the world was that they welcomed this test. Of course, the countries with vested interest countries have always condemned it as they want to help our enemies.

I have been listening to the speeches of the hon. Members for the last two or three days. The main question posed by most of the opposition leaders was: What was the reason for undertaking this test at this particular juncture?

That was the basic question. Most of the people welcomed this decision. But at the same time, while criticising this decision, people have not taken the reference of the previous history of this country. I have got some records with me. When the similar test was undertaken by China in the year 1964, at that time, the then Prime Minister, late Shri Shastri said:

"India was the first country to foresee military use of nuclear energy simultaneously with its entry into the select club."

At that time, China had said:

"It detonated its first atomic bomb in 1964 that it would not be the first use of nuclear weapon but hold them in reserves foreign counter attack."

Thereafter, it is very important to note, during the Lok Sabha Debates on Foreign Affairs in November 1964, Members from different parties including some Congressmen had demanded a change in the Government's Atom Bomb Policy. So, that was the demand from some of the Members of Congress party also that this country should have the atom bomb.

While reacting to this, sharing the concerns of the Members of the Chinese blasts, Shri Shastri said:

"The Government's present stand should not be regarded as a permanent one. No Government could afford to have a static approach to this problem."

This straightaway indicates that, this question was posed or was open to the Government. Why I am explaining it is that while criticising this Government, most of the hon. Members of this august House persistently raised this question as to what was the necessity of these tests... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Madhukar Sirpotdar, please conclude

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): What is this, Sir? Then I will sit down like this?

MR. SPEAKER: We have to accommodate others also.

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): Sir, every speaker has taken not less than 30 minutes. I have just started... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: There are three more speakers also. So, please conclude.

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): If this is the kind of treatment, I will sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: You please conclude and sit down.

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): I have to complete my full speech. Then I will sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude and then sit down.

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): Sir, this way we become helpless.

Sir, the then Pakistan Prime Minister, Shri Z.A. Bhutto, on 19th May, 1974 described India's nuclear explosion as a dreadful and a threat. If you see the overall situation with Pakistan particularly and China after 1962, you will find that we have always been under the threat.

My simple question to all the Members of this House is that how many persons have died, how many persons have been killed in Jammu and Kashmir? There is not a single MP who has come out and said that he has got sympathy for those innocent people who have been killed by the extremists. When Shri Devegowda wanted to have elections in Jammu and Kashmir, at that time, I just asked him that question that 'Devegowdaji, it is a good thing that you are having elections in Jammu and Kashmir but please let me know as to when you are going to solve this extremist problem.' That is very important. Everyday they have been killing our people. All innocent persons are being killed and on the other hand, we are always having negotiations to have peace. They are killing and we are having negotiations!

Is it the way that this problem is going to be solved? My simple question to all the statesmen and senior Members of Parliament over here, who have been listening to the debate and hearing about all these problems, is how we are going to solve this problem. Now Pakistan is threatening us. People talk about Ghauri missile. Some people call it Gauri. The word is not Gauri, it is named after Mohammad Ghori who attacked this country sixteen times and was defeated. On the seventeenth occasion when he attacked this country, at that time somehow Prithviraj Chauhan got into his custody and he was killed. That is the history. This particular missile has been named after that person. This gives the indication. Who was Ghazni? Their next missile will be named after Ghazni. Why? What is the reason?

Yesterday also when the bombs were blasted, when a trial was undertaken, that was known as India-specific. From our side not a single person said that it was Pakistan-specific. Wherefrom it has come? Yet we are saying all this. Yesterday the moment the information came after 4 o'clock that actually they had undertaken the trial of a nuclear bomb, people had become panicky over here. Our entire discussion was stopped in the House and the Leader of the Opposition wanted the House to adjourn for half-an-hour. It is really the most surprising thing. Let them have not only one, but ten tests. If they want to explode them, let them do so. Why should we go panicky? What was the reason for that? This is how I am looking at the problem. ...(Interruptions)

If you want to say something, you can stand up and speak. I have not interrupted anybody's speech since the start of this debate three days back. ...(Interruptions)

Ajit Jogiji, I am saying the same thing. You can do this, there is nothing wrong in it. But we can also change our policy and go on doing like this when you speak. But, to the extent possible we should keep patience. We had decided, if you remember, last year when a Special Session was held that we should not do this, we should not enter the well of the House and everyone signed that. But what have we been doing over here? Why should we do this futile exercise in this House? We commit something and do something else. Is it the way we are going to succeed in the Parliamentary system? This is my question. Shri Sangma is seated here. He was the Speaker at that time.

Today when he was speaking in this House, I thought he was not pleading for our country; on the other hand he was pleading for China and Pakistan. That was my impression about his speech. He was criticising our country. I do not know what happened to him. I can understand your spirit. After all we are Indians. If we are going to face any calamity, simultaneously we should face the calamity. If we have done something wrong, we can sit together and find out some solution. But it does not mean that when there is a live telecast all over the country and people are watching, this message should go to them. It is not a proper thing, I would like to mention this.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude. Should I thank you for your good speech?

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): Shri Murli Deora has given an interview somewhere. In that interview he had welcomed this particular suggestion. He said, instead of talking politically, the country should stand united on such issues. That is the statement made by Shri Murli Deora. I am very much thankful to him. Generally people expect this. It is the right of the Members of Parliament to criticise others. There is nothing wrong in it. But a message should not go to the country as well as abroad that we are divided. Just now Shri Devegowda said that this House is divided. Why should we give such a message? If you want to do something, you do it, nobody stops you. After all it is your right. But it is not necessary that when particularly there is a live telecast, when all the people of this country are watching the proceedings, we should do it.

I will try to finish. I have not taken up all the points only because the necessary time was not granted (Interruptions) There is no need for you to worry about our party. Every party's situation is very bright. We are capable of taking care of our own party. Do not worry.

Some hon. Members have spoken about the Simla Agreement. I would like to remind that only after the signing of the Simla Agreement was the nuclear test conducted in 1974. Where was the Simla Agreement then? No one criticised Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Today, we are criticised only because this Government has taken the decision. Otherwise, they would have welcomed it. This is something surprising!

Ever since our Independence, this country has landed in problems. One should not forget that activities are going on all over the country. As Shri Advani rightly said yesterday, the life of the people in this country is very much insecure. A bomb blast may take place anytime, anywhere.

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude. You have taken fifteen minutes' time. There are three or four more hon. Members to speak.

... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : In future, you will get more time.

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): Justice should be done to all. Otherwise, I will read out the names of hon. Members who have spoken and spell out the time that they have taken.

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude now.

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): This is not the proper way. Each and every hon. Member should get an opportunity to speak and express his views in this House.

MR. SPEAKER : We have to accommodate other hon. Members also.

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): Sometimes, some hon. Members and parties have been completely ignored. They have not been allowed to speak. This is most improper. (Interruptions) I have heard the speeches of all hon. Members. I have been sitting here very quietly and I have paid attention very carefully.

I know what Shri Indrajit Gupta spoke and what Shri Somnath Chatterjee spoke. I have noticed a negative signal in those speeches. I have observed in their speeches a negative signal. It is because they are worried about the credit. That is the only point which I have observed. If this credit goes to this Government, they do not like it. Do not forget, when you were running the Government, we never said, 'this credit is ours and so you should not get it'. On the other hand, whenever your Government - whether it was headed by Shri H.D. Deve Gowda or Shri I.K. Gujral - was toppled, we were prepared to support you. When Shri Gujral's Government was brought down, at that time also we supported you. I do not know what happened to the Jain Commission Report. It has totally disappeared. This was how, we spent our valuable time in this House on a very flimsy ground.

We should not forget about the entire country. We should not play politics when it comes to protecting the interests of the country. When we go out of this House, we may do that but we should not play dirty politics in this House. The nation is very important. Paramount importance should be attached to the nation and in the interest of the nation all of us should come together. We should serve this country together. That is my humble request to all hon. Members. Thank you very much.

(ends)

">

१८४९ बजे

श्री आरिफ मोहम्मद खां (बहराइच) : माननीय अध्यक्ष जी, सबसे पहले तो मैं परमाणु अनुसंधान के काम में लगे हुए अपने वैज्ञानिकों और इंजीनियरों तथा दूसरे जो काम करने वाले लोग हैं उन सब को बधाई देना चाहूंगा। निश्चित तौर पर पूरे देश में एक गर्व की भावना आई, कि बावजूद अपनी बहुत सी कमियों और कठिनाईयों के, उन सुविधाओं के उपलब्ध न होने के बावजूद जो दूसरे विकसित देशों में काम करने वालों को हासिल हैं, हमारे वैज्ञानिकों ने, टैक्निशियनों ने कम सुविधाओं के बावजूद उनकी बराबरी करके दिखाई।

श्वेदज्ञान के क्षेत्र में, परमाणु अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में शानदार रिकार्ड कायम किया है। मैं माननीय प्रधान मंत्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी को भी बधाई देना चाहूंगा कि जिस वक्त यह परीक्षण हुआ, उस वक्त वह इस देश की सरकार का नेतृत्व कर रहे हैं और निश्चित तौर से वे बधाई के पात्र हैं। मेरी पार्टी ने जरूर कुछ बातें कही हैं और कुछ संदेह व्यक्त किया है, लेकिन उस उपलब्धि के बारे में नहीं जो हमारे वैज्ञानिकों के श्रम और मेहनत का नतीजा है, बल्कि कुछ उन गैर-जिम्मेदाराना हरकतों और बयानों को लेकर, जो सरकार में शामिल सबसे बड़े पक्ष से जुड़े हुए संगठन और दूसरे संबंधित नेताओं ने दिये हैं।

आज माननीय देवगौड़ा जी यहां बोल रहे थे। उन्होंने डिवाइडिड ओपीनियन की बात कही। उस डिवाइडिड ओपीनियन के लिए कोई दूसरा जिम्मेदार नहीं है बल्कि गैर-जिम्मेदारी के बयानों पर इसकी जिम्मेदारी जाती है जो बहुत से संगठनों ने दिए हैं। मुझे पता नहीं कि यहां पर उनका नाम लेना उचित रहेगा या नहीं रहेगा। वे कहते हैं कि कल तक भारतीय जनता पार्टी के लोग परामर्श लेने हमारे पास आया करते थे, आज हम उनके पास परामर्श देने चले जाएंगे, क्योंकि वे आज सरकार में हैं। कुछ मंत्री जो इस सरकार में जिम्मेदारी के पदों पर हैं, उनके गैर-जिम्मेदाराना बयानों से पूरे देश में एक माहौल बना, उससे यकीनन उस राय में एक डि वीजन आया। यह बात सही है और हर कोई इसे जानता है। इसमें किसी को उपदेश देने की जरूरत नहीं है।

परीक्षण अपने आप में कोई आखिरी चीज नहीं हैं। अगर इस देश पर संकट होगा, अगर इस देश पर कहीं से खतरा होगा, तो सब लोग देश के अंदर और देश के बाहर भी जानते हैं कि पूरा देश एक व्यक्ति बनकर उस खतरे का सामना करने के लिए खड़ा होगा। इसलिए किसी को उपदेश मत दीजिए। एक ऐसी उपलब्धि जिस पर सारा देश गर्व करता है, अगर उसको साम्प्रदायिकता का जामा पहनाने की कोशिश करेंगे, आप कहेंगे कि वहां पर मंदिर बनाया जाएगा, तो इस देश को बांटने का काम आप करेंगे। यह पहली दफा आप नहीं कर रहे हैं, बल्कि इस देश को बांटने की आपकी परम्परा है। माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि अगर यह केवल इस देश की सुरक्षा का मामला होता, तो मैं बधाई देकर बैठ जाता, लेकिन यहां बात की गयी है राष्ट्र के गौरव की, राष्ट्र के सम्मान की। कल माननीय गृह मंत्री जी बोल रहे थे और कह रहे थे कि विदेशों से लोग फोन करके कह रहे हैं कि अब कुछ गौरव की अनुभूति होती है। अगर यह सुरक्षा नहीं केवल गौरव और सम्मान का मामला है तो मैं एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया का कोई भी बड़े से बड़ा और ताकतवर मुल्क क्यों न हो, क्या हम उसके सामने कटौती लेकर भीख मांगने के लिए खड़े रहे, इस डर से कि कहीं वे हम पर प्रतिबंध न लगा दें। आप कहिये कि हमें तुम्हारी मदद की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। यह कौन सा गौरव है कि वे प्रतिबंध लगा रहे हैं और सरकारी पक्ष और माननीय प्रधान मंत्री के सलाहकार कह रहे हैं कि

"Economic restrictions will not come in the way of Indo-US relations".

वे हमें गाली बक रहे हैं और केवल प्रतिबंध नहीं लगा रहे हैं, मान्यवर, स्टेट डिपार्टमेंट के स्पोक्समैन ने माननीय गृह मंत्री के वक्तव्य को लेकर कहा कि यह बयान बेवकूफी का और खतरनाक बयान है।

This statement is foolish and dangerous. I am not going into the merits of the acquisition.

श्वेद उसमें नहीं जा रहा हूँ कि यह बयान बेवकूफी का है या नहीं लेकिन निश्चित तौर पर मैं अमेरिका के किसी प्रतिनिधि को किसी स्पोक्समैन को यह अधिकार देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ कि वह हमारे गृह मंत्री के बयान को बेवकूफी भरा कहें। अगर वह ऐसा कहते हैं तो मैं आपसे एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। अगर आपको यकीन न हो तो मैं वह बयान निकाल कर दिखा सकता हूँ। वह २१ तारीख के अखबारों में छपा है। मैंने पहले ही कह दिया है कि मैं उसकी मैरिट्स में नहीं जा रहा। मैं सिर्फ यह कह रहा हूँ-

I cannot give this right to the spokesman of the State Department of the USA to describe the statement of the Home Minister of my country as foolish and dangerous. That may be foolish, but he has no right to describe it as foolish.

मेरा आपके माध्यम से अनुरोध है कि अगर आपको राष्ट्रीय गौरव की चिन्ता है तो फिर खड़े हो जाइए। जो बेवकूफ कहने की हिम्मत करता है, उससे कहिए कि हमें आर्थिक प्रतिबंधों की परवाह नहीं है, हम आपको यह कहने का अधिकार नहीं दे सकते। अपना बिस्तर बांधो और इस देश से जाओ। आप अपने अम्बैसडर को वहां से बुलाइए। जब तक अमेरिका की सरकार की तरफ से ऑफिशियली इस बारे में माफी नहीं मांग ली जाती, तब तक आप उनसे सम्बन्ध विच्छेद रखिए। माननीय आडवाणी जी का इस प्रकार से अपमान नहीं होना चाहिए। यह आडवाणी जी का नहीं, भारत सरकार का अपमान है। यह इस देश के गौरव पर हमला है, सम्मान पर हमला है। भारत का नागरिक होने के नाते और संसद का सदस्य होने के नाते मैं निश्चित तौर पर इसको बर्दाश्त करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। यह उनका निजी अपमान नहीं है। यह एक राष्ट्रीय अपमान है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अगर आपको गौरव और सम्मान की फिक्र है तो खड़े होकर स्टैंड लीजिए और कहिए आप चाहे कितने ताकतवर

हो, हम आपको डील करना जानते हैं।

माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी, मुझे यकीन है कि आप इस बात को बेहतर समझेंगे। आप जरा इतिहास पर गौर करिए। इस देश की सुरक्षा को कहां से खतरा पैदा हुआ है? मुझे ऑथर का नाम याद नहीं लेकिन बहुत साल पहले मैंने एक किताब पढ़ी थी जिस का शायद नाम दी लास्ट सौर्ड ऑफ टीपू सुल्तान था। उस किताब में आखिरी चैप्टर है, उसमें बहुत मार्मिक शब्द हैं। टीपू सुल्तान ने मरते हुए अपने प्रधान मंत्री पुरनइया को कहा कि यह देश तब गुलाम बनेगा जब इस देश को अन्दर से खतरा पैदा होगा। इस देश को खतरा उन लोगों से है जो इस देश को अन्दर से बांट कर रखना चाहते हैं। मैं सिर्फ प्रधान मंत्री जी से निवेदन कर रहा हूँ और उनसे जानना चाहता हूँ कि आपकी सरकार आने के बाद देश अन्दर से कैसे मजबूत होगा, राष्ट्रीय एकता कैसे मजबूत होगी? वह भावना भाईचारे से पैदा होती है। भाईचारे की भावना अपनाईयत से पैदा होती है। जिस समाज में हजारों साल से जन्म के आधार पर यह कहा जाता है कि इसका पैर छुआ जाएगा, इसको पैरों के नीचे रगड़ा जाएगा, यह ऊंचा है, यह नीचा है, यह बड़ा है, यह छोटा है, यह अछूत है, यह मलीच है। यह सामाजिक व्यवस्था

... (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN (BAHRAICH): Kindly permit me to speak, Sir.

मैं जल्दी ही कनक्लूड करूंगा। एक व्यवस्था ने इस देश को कमजोर करके रखा है। अगर देश की सुरक्षा को खतरा है तो इस व्यवस्था से है। अगर इस देश की सुरक्षा को कोई खतरा है तो उन आन्दोलनों से है जो विघटनकारी प्रवृत्ति के साथ मिलकर मंदिर बनाने के नाम पर, कहीं किसी और नाम पर इस देश में आन्दोलन चलाते हैं।

मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से जानना चाहूंगा कि उस अंदरूनी विघटन को रोकने के लिए, उस कमजोरी को दूर करने के लिए इस सरकार ने क्या कदम उठाए हैं? मैं आपके माध्यम से एक सुझाव देना चाहूंगा। गृह मंत्री जी की रथ-यात्राएं निकालने में बहुत दक्षता है। आप ध्यान करें तो अयोध्या की रथ-यात्रा निकालना कौन सा भारी काम था, लेकिन मानसरोवर तक रथ-यात्रा लेकर चलें तो मैं उनके साथ रथ पर बैठूंगा। अगर आप हिम्मत नहीं करते तो आपके बगल में जोशी जी बैठे हैं, वह कम से कम झंडा फहराने चलें। आखिरकार मानसरोवर इस देश के पवित्रतम स्थलों में से एक है। देश के कब्जे में है। कायदे में बात यह है कि माननीय आडवाणी जी को चलना चाहिए।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री विजय गोयल (चांदनी चौक): क्या ये न्यूक्लीयर इश्यू पर बोल रहे हैं? ...

(व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN (BAHRAICH): Sir, if they do not disturb me, I will conclude in five minutes. ... (

व्यवधान)

श्री राजवीर सिंह (आंवला): आप विषय पर बोलिये।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री आरिफ मोहम्मद खां (बहराइच) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन्हें बस इतना बता दीजिए कि सदन का संचालन राजवीर सिंह नहीं कर रहे हैं, यह आपकी ज़िम्मेदारी है।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री दिनशा पटेल (खेड़ा) : ये आपको याद दिला रहे हैं जो आपने वायदा किया था देश की जनता से, वह तो पूरा कर लीजिए।

... (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

श्री आरिफ मोहम्मद खां (बहराइच) : माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे साथी समझते हैं कि शायद देश को चलाने का मामला भी ऐसे है जैसे कि आप किसी सूबे में खाकी निकर पहनाकर परेड करा दीजिए। देश की सुरक्षा के मामले पर जब हम चर्चा करेंगे, तो हमारे समाज के अंदर जो कमज़ोरियां व्याप्त हैं, उन पर ध्यान देना पड़ेगा कि कौन सी ऐसी चीजें हैं जो हमारे समाज को कमज़ोर बनाती हैं, कौन सी चीजें ऐसी हैं जो हमें मज़बूत बनने से रोकती हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Please wind up.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN (BAHRAICH): I will just take two minutes and I will conclude with it.

माननीय बरनाला साहब ने बहुत दर्द के साथ पंजाब की घटनाओं का जिक्र किया। मैं आपके माध्यम से बरनाला साहब से सवाल करता हूँ कि अगर १९८४ की कुछ घटनाएं लोगों के दिलों में इतनी बड़ी दरार पैदा कर सकती हैं, जो सही था, तो मुझे बताइए क्या इस देश की सुरक्षा केवल परमाणु बम बनाने से सुनिश्चित होगी?

... (व्यवधान)

प्रो. प्रेम सिंह चन्दूमाजरा (पटियाला) : १९८४ के बारे में आपने बोला है कि वह सही था उसको ज़रा ऐक्सप्लेन कर दें। जो कत्ले-आम हुआ था और हज़ारों लोग मारे गए थे

... (व्यवधान)

श्री आरिफ मोहम्मद खां (बहराइच) : मैं तो आपकी बात को और आपकी भावना को सही कह रहा था।

... (व्यवधान)

श्रीमन्, मुझे अपनी बात खत्म करने दें, मैंने प्रोमिस किया है कि मैं दो मिनट में कनक्लूड कर रहा हूँ।

चूँकि बरनाला साहब भी इस सरकार के एक महत्वपूर्ण अंग हैं, उनसे मेरा निवेदन और अनुरोध है कि ज़रा उनके दिल की हालत पर भी गौर करें कि जहाँ भारतीय जनता पार्टी के बड़े-बड़े नेता सामने खड़े हुए थे और एक इबादतगाह को अयोध्या में पलक झपकते गिराकर तहस-नहस कर दिया गया

... (व्यवधान)

उसके बारे में मेरा कहना सिर्फ यह है कि आज की तारीख में भी मरहम लगाने का कोई काम कर दिया जाए तो शायद इस देश में जो अंदर का बंटवारा है वह खत्म हो जाए।

वैसे भी न भी खत्म हो तो भी अगर इस देश की सुरक्षा को खतरा होगा तो मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि इस देश का एक-एक आदमी, सारे देशवासी एक व्यक्ति बनकर खड़े हो जायेंगे और उस खतरे का कामयाबी से मुकाबला करेंगे। धन्यवाद।

(इति)

">1906 hours

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (AKOLA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would not like to go into the post mortem of the explosion. But, I think, we have to look at a situation which is going to develop after the explosions have taken place both in India and Pakistan. What worries me is the situation that we faced in some

parts of the country, basically in the North-Eastern States. We have made China a target. We have also made Pakistan a target. We have said that there is an internal and external security problem with us. I think, this explanation given by the Prime Minister is unsuitable and unconvinceable. Even last time, when they were in power for 13 days, they had made efforts to go in for nuclear explosions. Had they been in power for two more days, I think, we would have had an explosion during that period itself. Whatever has been projected today as a security angle, I think, does not have any relevance. But the basic relevance, which I come to, is a theory that is being followed by the RSS.

If you look at a map published in 1950, there was an agreement between Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and the then RSS President that they will be released on the 26 January, 1950. Everybody was released. A book was released at that time. Even the map of the world was published in that book. In that book, the name of Pakistan was missing. The border of India was shown to be touching Afghanistan.

May I know from the Prime Minister about it? Everybody has said that when he was in China in 1979, he made efforts to normalise the relations. Yes, he made the efforts. But at the same time, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee had to leave China because China had declared a war on some other country. May I know from the hon. Prime Minister that when you are looking at China or when you are looking at Pakistan, why are you making China a target? Is it a sort of personal revenge? If that is so, then, I have my own doubts as to what we are going to achieve. The whole international scenario is going to change now. As soon as India has exploded and Pakistan has also exploded, there are nations in the world which are going to the same path. A new situation which is going to arise again, the NPT and even the CTBT will have no relevance as such in that situation. How do we look at the things?

Then, I would like to know from the Prime Minister that Pakistan has already declared that it is an Islamic bomb and we know from the reports that have emanated not only today but also for the last many years that the Gulf countries have been making an effort to develop a nuclear weapon in that part of the country. After the trend of the cold war, new theories have been circulated. The theories that have been circulated are that if there is a world war, it might be one on an issue of water or it might be on an issue of civilisation.

Sir, the opening speaker from the ruling side, Shri Jagmohan referred to civilization. I do not know what he means by civilization in this country. It is because we have many civilizations in this country and many things of civilizations.

What is the thinking of the RSS? I do not know whether they are thinking in terms of a Muslim civilization war or a Hindu civilization war. This is a point on which I would like to seek a clarification from the hon. Prime Minister.

Sir, the information that I have been getting is very disturbing. I would like to know categorically from the hon. Prime Minister whether the Government is planning for a war some times in the month of June or July. If that is so, then let me point out that today the situation in the North-Eastern region is such that the petroleum products which are to be stocked for a period of four months - because one cannot go to the North-Eastern region during the rainy season - have not even reached the North-Eastern region. If the Government is thinking in terms of any adventurous theory then let me point out that - from the other side, the country which has been identified as the first enemy by your Government - the things would go to the waters that we have created; it would go to the ponds that we have created.

The Government have never got culturally united with the people of the North-Eastern States. The Government have neglected the region. The Government have left out a tiger. Only, time will tell whether it is going to have teeth or it is not going to have teeth. It is because, along the borders we are surrounded by unfriendly countries.

Sir, I would like to submit that the Government have started one thing as a nation and we have to be with the Government. We cannot speak in a different voice. But let me also request the hon. Prime Minister that irrespective of whatever internal differences that we have in this country, please show political statesmanship and try to settle them at a political level and then speak in one voice.

(ends)

">1912 hours

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (PONNANI): Sir, the Prime Minister was kind enough to invite me to meet him earlier. At that time, I had given him our statement. Today, I have only one or two more points to add to it.

Sir, Pakistan has detonated its nuclear devices. The entire world failed to dissuade Pakistan from doing so. This is a dangerous situation. I only hope that it does not lead to any race for nuclear weapons. Happily, our Prime Minister has said in his own statement and I quote:

"We do not intend to engage in arms race".

Sir, I want to emphasise that this clear statement deserves due consideration and respect from the entire world including China and Pakistan. Perhaps, we have still to convince the world, including Pakistan and China, that we do not want any war. We are committed to global peace.

Yes, we had our own nuclear tests. We congratulate the scientists and all others for the successful completion of those tests and for bringing glory to the nation. We also congratulate the Government for having given the green signal, the 'go ahead' to the scientists to bring this glory to our nation. But it must be understood that the goal of our nuclear policy is to be able to prevail upon the nuclear powers to correct their flawed thinking with respect to having a non-nuclear world.

That remains and that has always been the nuclear policy that we have followed.

The Prime Minister has put forward several proposals for the world and even for Pakistan. Pakistan has also proposed negotiations and talks. It is for the Prime Minister to react to it.

I would be failing in my duty if I do not take strong exceptions to and express my deep indignation at the total and utter mishandling of the post-Pokhran-II scenario. Time does not permit me to go into the details with respect to them but then it was shocking to find in the post-Pokhran-II scenario, the Government speaking with different voices. Somebody pointed out unnecessarily at China and other pointed out unnecessarily at Pakistan when the goals of our nuclear policy, as I have stated earlier, are for a global peace through nuclear control. It was sought to politicize and even communalise the achievement through talks about a temple at Pokhran. I do not want to go into the details of that. There were attempts to pat on the back, have party celebrations for political exploitation of the glorious achievement of our scientists and ignoring the contributions of the successive Governments since Independence. It is a fact. Pokhran-II would not have been possible without Pokhran-I. Pokhran-II would not have been possible without the nuclear policies successively followed by all the Governments since the Independence. Shocking it was that intoxicated with the achievement, even responsible Ministers of the Government indulge into reckless and provocative statements. One Minister even challenged Pakistan to select the venue, day, time and everything for the fourth war. He used a language that may suit a professional wrestler but not a responsible politician or a Minister of a country that claims to be now a nuclear power.

Sir, I must submit that I am afraid that the Pakistan's nuclear tests are a reaction to the utter mishandling of the post-Pokhran-II scenario and the Government is speaking in different languages, in different voices.

I would now conclude with only one point. The hon. Prime Minister has stressed upon a policy of consensus. Beautifully the Prime Minister has said and I quote: "It is vital to maintain the consensus as we approach the next millennium". It is a beautiful language, well put and well expressed sentiments. I must appreciate and welcome these sentiments. But then, Sir, has the policy of consensus really been pursued? That is the question. I do not know. You can enlighten me whether the offer about moratorium on further explosions which closes our nuclear options, was based on any consensus or not? I do not know. Yesterday, the Prime Minister even said, "we will have to review this offer of moratorium on our further nuclear tests".

I do not know whether there was any consensus. I must, therefore, emphasise that when we state that we follow a policy of consensus, we must really be true both to our words and to our actions and not have a unilateral closure of options that may be available.

There is the question of sanctions, I do not want to say much, from some of the protesting nuclear powers. I only want to say that we need not panic. The situation is there. But if any situation of any type whatsoever is forced upon the country, Insha Allah!, the country and its people will stand firm with determination, with faith and with iron unity - let there be no mistake about that. That is with respect to any situation - economic situation is also there. But let us know, if you have any blueprint of any strategy that needs to be followed and our cooperation will always be there.

But then, I conclude by saying that really a policy of consensus should be followed and it is only through this policy that the country will be able to stand united and will be able to face any challenge that may come before us.

Thank you.

(ends)

">1922 hours

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE (BERHAMPORE) (WB): Thank you, Sir, for the opportunity given to me to express our view on the Prime Minister's suo motu statement on the nuclear tests in Pokhran range.

This is a very important debate which is initiated by our senior-most leader Shri Indrajit Gupta as mover of the Motion on Prime Minister's statement in respect of nuclear tests in Pokhran range. Sir, I have heard many valuable speeches on the topic and I shall be very brief on my legs to express my views on this topic in such a grave situation.

Before I enter into the depths of the national security calculus, I should express my thanks and gratitude; I should express my warm greetings and ovation and congratulations to the Indian scientists and engineers who have successfully conducted the nuclear tests in Pokhran range. I express my congratulations specially to Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam, Dr. Santhanam, Dr. Chidambaram and other scientists. It is really an endowment to the nation by Indian scientists and engineers.

Whether there was any threat from Pakistan or from China is a lost question today when Pakistan had successfully conducted nuclear tests in Baluch hilly region. The area of tension, the area of conflict, has been increased after the nuclear tests in Pokhran which is followed by the nuclear tests in Baluch hilly region. This is a preparation not for proxy war, but war directly. The whole Indo-Pak subcontinent has been turned into a war zone and the preparation for war material is going on. This is not good for the mankind living in this subcontinent.

I was listening yesterday, to the speech made by our hon. Home Minister Shri L.K. Advani. That was a very eloquent speech just to rouse the patriotism in defence of national sublimity or in the name of national security question.

We are united. We stand for the defence of India's national sovereignty and security. Definitely, we are united.

I wish to remind a very simple proposition. Emotion is good, but the reason is better. The patriotism is good, love for the country is good, but love for peace, love for world peace and love for the mankind is better.

With your kind permission, I wish to refer to an incident: What is the message of Pokhran issue today? The message of nuclear tests in Pokhran region is very simple. India is now a nuclear weapon State. The hon. Prime Minister I have the highest regards for him - has claimed that India can now enter into the Nuclear Club as the

sixth member. Today, Pakistan can also claim that they can enter into the Nuclear Club as the seventh member. This is the arms race. This is the arms competition which is going on.

With your kind permission, I quote from our famous poet, Annada Shankar Roy, a famous name in Bengali literature, a great personality and a great poet of Calcutta. He has termed the Nuclear Club as a Suicide Club and that has published in many papers. There was a Suicide Club in France. In France, Lords and Aristocrats joined such a Suicide Club to commit suicide in a hilarious laughter and that was their bliss. Today, the nuclear weapon States joined the Nuclear Club to commit suicide in hilarious laughter in respect of their peoples.

Sir, to prepare for the nuclear tests or to join the nuclear club does not add to the glory of the Indian tradition and culture. It is a complete departure from the principles of non-alignment, from the principle of nuclear disarmament. It is a complete departure. It is our opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE (BERHAMPORE) (WB): It is the opinion of many eminent persons that nuclear weapon alone cannot save the country from the crisis. What does the fall of the Soviet Russia indicate? That was a mighty State; that was a powerful nuclear weapon State. Why does it fall? Why does it disintegrate in spite of having so many nuclear weapons in its arsenal? This disintegration of Soviet Russia indicates that the people of Russia have no sympathy for the nuclear policy of the Government of Russia. What is the chief component of the national security calculus? Can a man be secure with a revolver? A man goes to sleep with the revolver beneath the pillow. Does it indicate the best structure of that man? A man sleeping in the kingdom of fire arms with only a revolver beneath the pillow is not the security given to him. It is my opinion and I express my opinion that the national security is impossible without the economic security of the people.

The money wasted for the nuclear tests or for the conduct of the nuclear tests can be invested, can be utilized for the restoration of the economic security of the country. Only the economic security can give the people and a nation absolute national security. So, the question of national security should be settled, should be resolved fast and only the question of national security will come. ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please wind up.

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE (BERHAMPORE) (WB): Yes, Sir.

In 1974, in the month of May, under the leadership of the then Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi an experiment was successfully completed. That was a brilliant experiment that was done in the name of the defence of national sovereignty. But after one year, in 1975 on 25th June, Emergency was declared by Shrimati Gandhi at that time to save the country from internal problems. The experiment was a prelude to the declaration of Emergency. May I ask the hon. Prime Minister and the Government whether the nuclear tests in Pokhran are a prelude to the change of the system?

Today, there are many discussions taking place in the country for the changeover or the switchover of the parliamentary system to Presidential form of Government. Does it indicate that? It should not be a prelude. It is expected that it should not be a prelude. Be cautious please.

So, I will be concluding by saying that the national security can be preserved only after the economic security is achieved. Thank you for the opportunity given to me.

Thank you.

(ends)

">

प्रधान मंत्री (श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी): अध्यक्ष महोदय, पोखरण के बारे में लम्बी चर्चा समाप्त होने जा रही है। इस चर्चा में जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने भाग लिया है, मैं उनका आभारी हूँ। सारा सदन इस सम्बन्ध में एकमत है कि हमारे वैज्ञानिकों ने, इंजीनियरों ने, तकनीशियनों ने और सेना के जवानों ने पोखरण के परीक्षण में जो महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निभाई है, उसका सब अभिनंदन करते हैं, उनको बधाई देते हैं।

इस सवाल पर भी लगभग एक राय है कि अगर आर्थिक क्षेत्र में हमारे ऊपर अनुचित दबाव डालने का प्रयास किया गया, हमारी आर्थिक प्रभुसत्ता को सीमित करने की कोशिश की गई और जो विश्व संस्थाओं से सहयोग हमें अभी तक मिलता था, उसको रोकने का प्रयास हुआ, तो देश पर जितनी भी मुसीबतें आएंगी सारा देश मिलकर उनका सामना करेगा। स्वाभाविक रूप से इस चर्चा में यह प्रश्न खड़ा किया गया है कि आखिर पोखरण में परीक्षण की आवश्यकता क्या थी? एक बात मुझे याद आ रही है जब पोखरण 'उपग्रह' पर चर्चा हुई थी १९७४ में, तो उस समय मैं चर्चा में उपस्थित था, कामरेड इन्द्रजीत गुप्त भी उपस्थित थे और संसद में दो ही सदस्य हैं जो उस समय भी उपस्थित थे, आज सदन में मौजूद हैं।

उस समय मैंने जो बातें कहीं और आज जो बातें कहने जा रहा हूँ, उनमें कोई अन्तर नहीं है। १९७४ में इंदिरा जी ने परीक्षण की इजाजत दी थी, सारे देश में उसका स्वागत हुआ था। उनका निर्णय कोई सामूहिक निर्णय नहीं था, उनका निर्णय प्रतिपक्ष से विचार-विनिमय करने के बाद किया गया हो, ऐसा निर्णय नहीं था लेकिन निर्णय सही था, देश की रक्षा के लिए था। हमारे वैज्ञानिकों को एक आवश्यक अवसर देने की दृष्टि से था, इसलिए उसका स्वागत हुआ। मुझे याद है, जो चर्चा हुई थी, उसमें श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी ने भाषण नहीं दिया था। उनकी ओर से, सरकार की ओर से, किसी एक और मंत्री ने भाषण दिया था। सारे देश में संतोष था। अभी पड़ोस से इशारा हुआ है कि १९७४ में हम तैयार नहीं थे, इसलिए हम चुप रहे लेकिन अब हम तैयार हैं।

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि भारत ने परीक्षण किया, इसके जवाब में पाकिस्तान ने परीक्षण किया। क्या सोलह दिन के भीतर परमाणु परीक्षण संभव है? यहां परमाणु परीक्षण से परिचित लोग भी बैठे हैं, जानकार उपस्थित हैं, पन्द्रह दिन के भीतर कोई देश परमाणु परीक्षण की तैयारी नहीं कर सकता। यह तैयारी वर्षों से चल रही थी। कल परीक्षण हुआ, आज खबर आई है कि उन्होंने दूरमार करने वाली कोई मिसाइल आकाश में भेजी है। यह सिलसिला कब से चल रहा है, हमारे नेताओं को इसकी जानकारी है और देश को तैयार करने का काम भी उन्होंने किया। मैंने एक दिन में आकर फैसला कर दिया और परीक्षण हो गया, ऐसा नहीं हुआ है। जैसा मैंने पहले कहा था, आज मैं फिर से उसे दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि इसके पीछे पचास साल का अन्वेषण, अनुसंधान, परिश्रम, हमारे वैज्ञानिकों का प्रयास, पोखरण की चिलचिलाती धूप में, गर्म बालू में, पचास के करीब टेम्परेचर में जो वैज्ञानिक काम करते रहे, जो जवान काम करते रहे, उनके मन में एक ही भावना थी और एक ही भावना है कि देश की रक्षा होनी चाहिए।

श्वेश का सम्मान बढ़ना चाहिए। मैं नहीं समझता कि इस भावना को लेकर सदन में कोई मतभेद है। हम सबकी भावना है और इस देश की विशेषता रही है कि जब-जब संकट आता है, तो देश सारे मतभेद भूला देता है - लोकतन्त्रवादी देश है, मतभेद होना स्वाभाविक है - 'मुण्डे-मुण्डे मत भिन्नः'।

अभी की बात नहीं है, मैं देख रहा था कि १९८५ में - शायद किसी ने श्री राजीव गांधी के वक्तव्य को उद्धृत किया है - ११ अक्टूबर को दिल्ली के प्रैस क्लब में एक प्रैस कान्फ्रेंस में श्री राजीव गांधी ने जो कुछ कहा है, मैं उसे उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ -

"As I have said on a number of occasions, we have to consider our security and there is no question of allowing New Delhi or for that matter any other city in India to be flattened out. We will not allow that to happen. What is even more worrying about Pakistan's programme is that we are fairly sure that at least part of the finances of this programme have come from other countries. Now what we worry about is that the nuclear weapon when developed will also have to go to these countries. I did not say that we are going to wait on your decision, on your response. For Pakistan to explode their device, I said, that we have to take certain measures to protect ourselves. There are a number of measures, apart from making a nuclear weapon ourselves."

यह उनका १९८५ में दिया गया प्रैस कान्फ्रेंस का वक्तव्य है। सरकार के मन में चिन्ता थी और सीमा के पार क्या हो रहा है, इसकी जानकारी भी थी। इसीलिए जब सवाल आया कि विश्व की महाशक्तियां, जिन्होंने अणु अस्त्रों के अम्बार लगा रखे हैं, इस बात के लिए तैयार नहीं है कि एक समयबद्ध कार्यक्रम के अन्तर्गत उन सारे अणु अस्त्रों के विनष्ट करने के लिए स्वीकृति दे। वे भेदभावपूर्ण संधि को दुनिया पर लादना चाहते हैं, तो सबने मिल कर फैसला किया, इकट्ठे फैसला किया कि

CTBT

पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं करेंगे। डर था कि हम अलग-थलग पड़ जायेंगे। कभी-कभी अलग-थलग पड़ना भी जरूरी होता है, लेकिन फैसला सही होना चाहिए और हम अलग-थलग हैं, यह इतना महत्वपूर्ण नहीं है। विकल्प हमने खुला रखा। लेकिन बाद में जो समाचार प्राप्त हुए, उनसे ऐसा लगा कि इस संबंध में कुछ करना आवश्यक होगा। वैज्ञानिकों की भी सलाह ली गई कि कौन से कदम उठाए जायें। हमारे लिए अणु अस्त्र विनाश के अस्त्र हैं। अगर ज्यादा से ज्यादा उनकी लाभ है, तो उनका लाभ रक्षा में है, आत्म-रक्षा में है। हमारे विरोधी जान लें कि हमारे पास अणु अस्त्र है और हमारे ऊपर हमला करने की उनकी हिम्मत न हो। इस तरह की परिस्थिति पैदा होनी चाहिए, होगी।

२५० साल में तीन बार हम हमलों के शिकार हुए। शांति का संदेश देने वाला यह देश है। इसने कभी किसी की भूमि नहीं चाही, इसने किसी पर आक्रमण नहीं किया, बल्कि यह आक्रमण का शिकार हुआ। अपनी जमीन हमें छोड़नी पड़ी। हम उसे फिर से वापस लेने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, बातचीत कर रहे हैं और वह बातचीत के द्वारा ही संभव है। लेकिन सौ करोड़ का यह देश इस स्थिति में नहीं डाला जा सकता कि अपनी रक्षा के लिए दूसरों की दया पर निर्भर करे।

हम शांति के पुजारी हैं, हमें न्याय पर आधारित मित्रता चाहिए। पारस्परिक हितों का संवर्धन करने वाली मित्रता चाहिए। भारत बड़ा है, भारत शक्तिशाली है, भारत पड़ोसी देशों की तुलना में समृद्ध है, इसलिए भी हमने कभी अनुचित लाभ उठाने की कोशिश नहीं की। आखिर गुजराल डॉक्टरों का निचोड़ तो यही था, लेकिन इसे स्वीकार करने में गुजराल साहब को भी संकोच नहीं होना चाहिए कि जहां तक पाकिस्तान का सवाल है उनकी डॉक्टरों नहीं चली। पाकिस्तान ने नहीं चलने दी। देश के भीतर आतंकवादियों का प्रवेश, सीमा पर संकट बना रहा। बातचीत चल रही थी और मैं इस अवसर पर उस प्रस्ताव को दोहराना चाहता हूँ- हम पाकिस्तान के साथ वार्ता को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए तैयार हैं। पाकिस्तान हमारा पड़ोसी देश है, इसलिए मतभेद के प्रश्नों को हमें आपस में बैठ कर हल करना चाहिए, लेकिन जो ढाका में प्रस्ताव वार्ता के लिए मंजूर हुए थे, जो सहमति बनी थी उस सहमति पर पाकिस्तान चलने को तैयार नहीं है। कल पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री जी ने फिर यह प्रस्ताव दोहराया है कि वह भारत के साथ वार्ता के लिए तैयार है- बड़ी अच्छी बात है, वार्ता होनी चाहिए।

मुझे याद है, मैंने एक बार पाकिस्तानी राजनेता से कहा था कि इतिहास बदल सकता है मगर भूगोल नहीं बदला जा सकता। हम और आप पड़ोसी हैं, यह तथ्य कैसे बदला जाएगा। मित्रता से रहें, बहुत अच्छी बात है लेकिन अगर मित्रता टूटती है तो पड़ोस तो नहीं छूट सकता, भूगोल तो हमें बांधे हुए है। मैं इस अवसर पर पाकिस्तान के मित्रों से एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। बहुत से लोग पाकिस्तान जाते हैं, पाकिस्तान की जनता के साथ उनके संबंध हैं, वे मैत्री संबंधों का विकास करते हैं और लौटने के बाद यहां आकर कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान के मन में असुरक्षा की भावना है कि भारत ने पाकिस्तान को स्वीकार नहीं किया है, ऐसी भावना होने का कोई कारण नहीं है। देश का विभाजन हो गया, पाकिस्तान अलग बन गया। वे सुखी रहें, संतुष्ट रहें, सम्पन्न रहें, हमें शांति से रहने दें और हम दोनों मिल कर इस भूखंड से ही क्यों सारे संसार से गरीबी, बेरोजगारी, बीमारी, अशिक्षा के निराकरण के लिए प्रयास करें।

श्वसमें एक ऐसे विश्व की कल्पना भी कायम है, ऐसे विश्व की कल्पना का समावेश है जिसमें अणु-अस्त्र नहीं होंगे। भारत को निर्णय क्यों करना पड़ा? क्या हम फिर बेखबर हो जाते? कल मैंने पत्रकारों से कहा कि जो कुछ हुआ है, उस पर मुझे आश्चर्य नहीं है। हम जानते थे यह हो रहा है और इसी की रोकथाम हम करना चाहते थे और हमने कदम उठाया है। मगर इसकी इस तरह से व्याख्या करना कि उन्होंने इसलिए परीक्षण किया है कि आप पहले परीक्षण कर चुके थे। तो वे क्या तैयारी कर रहे थे?

हमारे लिए तो और भी संकट हैं। उनके लिए तो अकेले हम हैं। उनके अणु-परीक्षण हमारे खिलाफ हैं।

India is specific.

हम जब अणु परीक्षण करते हैं और अणु परीक्षण के मामले में जब अन्य देशों के साथ मिलकर आवाज उठाते हैं और महा-देशों को कहते हैं कि आप अपने अस्त्र नष्ट करिये। एक साथ नहीं कर सकते हैं तो चरणबद्ध कार्यक्रम के अन्तर्गत करिये। तब फिर कहा जाता है कि यह रवैया ईमानदारी से नहीं अपनाया जा रहा है। ईमानदारी पर संदेह करने से काम नहीं चलेगा। हम तो चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान भी इस मांग में शामिल हो। अणु-अस्त्र विनाश के अस्त्र हैं, यह बात कल बार-बार कही गयी है, फिर अणु-अस्त्रों को समाप्त करने के लिए मिलकर कदम क्यों नहीं उठाये जा सकते हैं। लेकिन हमारे अणु-परीक्षण को तीसरी दुनिया के देशों का जिस तरह से व्यापक समर्थन मिला है और कहीं समर्थन व्यक्त है और कहीं अव्यक्त है, उससे लगता है कि विश्व का बड़ा भाग, मानवता का बड़ा हिस्सा स्थाई शांति चाहता है। ऐसी शांति चाहता है जो अणु-अस्त्रों के कारण खंडित न हो, जिससे शांति विभाजित न हो। हम उसमें अपनी भूमिका अपने घर को सुरक्षित रखकर अदा करना चाहते हैं। हम अपने घर की सुरक्षा और विश्व की सुरक्षा, दोनों में फर्क नहीं करते हैं। लेकिन हमारी बात सुनी जाए, हम इस लायक हों कि कोई गौर से हमें सुने और हम हवन करने जाएं और हाथ जला लें, ऐसी स्थिति हम उत्पन्न होने देना नहीं चाहते हैं और कोई नहीं चाहेगा।

श्री देवगौड़ा जी यहां नहीं हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

एक माननीय सदस्य: हैं, पीछे बैठे हुए हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: मैं उनके जनता दल का १९९६ का मैनीफेस्टो देख रहा हूँ। शायद मैं जिस जनता दल का नाम ले रहा हूँ उससे देवगौड़ा जी संबंधित हैं।

"We will formally give a pledge of first non-use of nuclear capability against Pakistan."

हम यह गारंटी देने के लिए तैयार हैं कि हम अपनी आणविक क्षमता का पाकिस्तान के विरुद्ध पहले इस्तेमाल नहीं करेंगे, बाद में आवश्यकता हुई तो करेंगे। मगर प्रयोग करने के लिए पहले आपको अणु-क्षमता का विकास करना होगा।

श्वह भी इस तर्क की पुष्टि करने वाली उक्ति है कि राजनीतिक दलों में इस सम्बन्ध में एक व्यापक राय रही है, एक आम राय रही है। इसे कब किया जाए? कल जो कुछ हुआ, उसके बाद यहां ऐसा प्रश्न नहीं है, जिस का उत्तर देने की आवश्यकता हो। यह निर्णय किस ने किया, कौन करेगा? यह आप स्वयं सोच सकते हैं, विचार कर सकते हैं। मेरे बड़े-बड़े सहयोगी जब यह कहते हैं कि उन्हें इसकी जानकारी नहीं थी तो इसमें यह भाव प्रकट नहीं होता कि उन पर मुझे विश्वास नहीं

था। इसलिए यह भाव ग्रहण करना कि आम सहमति की बात करते हैं, सलाह नहीं की, उस क्षण जब परीक्षण होना था, सलाह करना सम्भव नहीं था। इसकी बहुत सीमित लोगों को जानकारी थी। जैसा कल आडवाणी जी ने कहा कि जहां हर चीज लीक हो जाती है, कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पूरी की पूरी प्रकाशित हो जाती है, वहां कोई इसका पता नहीं लगा सका। विदेशों में इसको लेकर काफी आलोचना-प्रत्यालोचना हो रही है। यह भी राष्ट्र की शक्ति का एक परिचायक है। अगर हम चाहें, परिस्थिति का तकाजा हो और देश के सामने संकटों की चुनौती हो तो इस देश के लोग बड़ी से बड़ी कुर्बानी करने के लिए तैयार हैं, बड़ी से बड़ी सावधानी बरतने के लिए तैयार हैं। यह एक उपलब्धि है। इसका समादर होना चाहिए।

मुझे बड़ा दुख हुआ, जब ये आरोप लगाए गए कि सुदृढ़ राजनीतिक स्वार्थ की पूर्ति के लिए यह काम किया गया। मैं पहले भी कह चुका हूँ और आज फिर दोहराना चाहता हूँ। मैं ४० साल तक प्रतिपक्ष में था और प्रतिपक्ष के सदस्य के नाते, नेता के नाते मेरी भूमिका की प्रशंसा होती रही है और कहा जाता है कि आपने कभी पार्टी के स्वार्थ को आड़े आने नहीं दिया, देश के व्यापक स्वार्थ को अधिक महत्व दिया। आज जब मैं प्रधान मंत्री के पद पर बैठा हूँ या बैठा दिया गया हूँ तो क्या मैं छोटी बात, स्वार्थ की बात, दलगत स्वार्थ की बात बीच में आने दूंगा। यह गुनाह मुझ से कभी नहीं होगा। भगवान मुझे ऐसा पाप कभी न करने दे। कोई फैसला गलत हो सकता है, कोई फैसला किस समय किया जाए, किस समय न किया जाए, इसके बारे में दो राय हो सकती हैं लेकिन प्रामाणिकता पर संदेह नहीं होना चाहिए। यह १९७४ में क्यों किया गया था, हमने ऐसा नहीं पूछा, देश ने नहीं पूछा क्योंकि वह एक ठीक कदम था। ठीक कदम कोई भी उठाए और इन्दिरा जी उसे उठा सकती थीं। बंगला देश के निर्माण के समय, बंगला देश की मुक्ति के समय, हमारे कांग्रेस के मित्रों ने इन्दिरा जी का सम्मान किया। हम लोग भी उसमें शामिल थे। उसमें सारा देश शामिल था। इसके बाद चुनाव कराने का फैसला कर लिया गया। हमने इसकी आलोचना नहीं की। हमने इसके लिए किसी को दोष नहीं दिया। हमने कहा कि इन्दिरा जी ने बड़ा अच्छा काम किया। मेरे शब्द थे युग परिवर्तनकारी काम किया है। अगर हम चुनाव हारेंगे तो हार जाएंगे। चुनाव तो हारे जाते हैं, जीते जाते हैं। सरकारें बनती हैं, बदलती हैं।

सरकारें बनती हैं, बदलती हैं मगर देश एक रहे, यह देश गर्व के साथ संपन्न हो,

यह देश अपनी अनमोल आज़ादी को बचा सके - यह केवल एक पार्टी का काम नहीं है, यह सरकार का काम नहीं है। पोखरन में मैंने अपने भाषण में, शुरू में यह कहा था कि मैं इसका श्रेय नहीं लेता, न पार्टी श्रेय लेती है। जो कुछ किया गया, देशहित में किया गया। मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ जब यह सवाल उठाया गया कि आपने अपने नेशनल एजेण्डा में जो कुछ लिखा है उसके अनुसार काम नहीं किया। आज हमारे नेशनल एजेण्डा की काफी चिन्ता की जा रही है। हम इस पर अमल कर रहे हैं या नहीं कर रहे हैं इस पर नज़र रखने वाले लोग हैं, यह जानकर हमें खुशी हुई है लेकिन उन्होंने अर्थ का अनर्थ कर डाला। जो हिस्से अलग-अलग हैं, उनको उन्होंने इकट्ठा कर दिया। वह कहेंगे कि ऐसा छपा है तो मैं कहूंगा कि वह ठीक नहीं छपा है। उसमें तीन मुद्दे हैं -- सशस्त्र बलों को सुधारना।

"The state of preparedness, morale and combat effectiveness of the Armed Forces shall receive early attention and appropriate remedial action."

इसके बाद के वाक्य में कहा गया है कि --

"We will establish a National Security Council."

और उसका विवरण दिया गया है। अंत में यह कहा गया है, सचमुच में वह पैरा अलग होना चाहिए था, तो पढ़ने में कठिनाई नहीं होती, लेकिन समझने में तो कठिनाई नहीं होनी चाहिए।

"Towards that end, we will re-evaluate the nuclear policy and exercise the option to induct nuclear weapons."

यह भाव नहीं है कि पहले सेना सबल कर ली जाएगी, सिक्यूरिटी काउंसिल बना ली जाएगी और सारी कसरत करने के बाद अगर परिस्थिति का तकाजा होगा कि कल करो तो भी हम यह कहेंगे कि अभी हम ऐसा नहीं कर सकते क्योंकि अभी सेनाएं सशस्त्र नहीं है, अभी सिक्यूरिटी काउंसिल का निर्माण नहीं हुआ है - कोई भी यह अर्थ नहीं निकाल सकता। लेकिन यह अर्थ निकालने का प्रयास हुआ। हमारे साथ अन्याय हुआ है। इस अवसर को लेकर प्रतिपक्ष के साथ जितना विचार-विनिमय संभव था, जितना परामर्श आवश्यक था, वैज्ञानिकों के साथ जिस तरह की मुलाकातें उनकी आयोजित की गईं, मैं नहीं जानता आखिर ऐसा पहले कभी हुआ हो। हम बंगलादेश की लड़ाई लड़े, हम चीन से युद्ध में फंसे थे, हमने पोखरन में परीक्षण भी किया था, यह किया तो कोई अहसान नहीं किया। लेकिन मुझे अफसोस इस बात का है कि वैज्ञानिक श्री चिदम्बरम हमारे राजनीतिक चिदम्बरम साहब को समझा नहीं सके। लेकिन भाव उसका यह नहीं था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, चर्चा में और भी प्रश्न उठाए गए हैं, बड़ी लंबी चर्चा चली है। मैं उन सबके बारे में विस्तार से नहीं कहूंगा। हमने कुछ फैसले किये जिनका आंशिक रूप से उल्लेख हो चुका है।

We are disappointed that U.S. has displayed a lack of appreciation of India's legitimate security concerns. I wish to reiterate Government's commitment to engage with all principal interlocutors in a responsible dialogue. We remain ready to discuss and explain our position.

Since 11th May, the Government have taken certain initiatives, which I am going to enlist here.

1. We are already observing a voluntary moratorium and are ready to consider and discuss converting it into a de jure commitment.

2. We have volunteered to engage in negotiations on AFMCT.

3. India will undertake stringent export controls on nuclear and missile-related technologies as well as those relating to other weapons of mass destruction.

We had already announced and reiterate our offer to discuss a 'No-First-Use' agreement with Pakistan and also with other countries bilaterally or in a multilateral forum.

अध्यक्ष महोदय, सरकार की नीति चीन के साथ मित्रता के संबंध रखने की है। चीन हमारा पड़ोसी है, दोनों देश एशिया के देश हैं, बड़े देश हैं। दोनों में परस्पर मित्रता हो और पंचशील के सिद्धांतों के अनुसार वे व्यवहार करें, इस बात की आवश्यकता है। सीमा को लेकर कुछ चिंता की बातें जरूर हैं। सीमा पर शांति है। हम बातचीत के द्वारा सीमा का प्रश्न हल करना चाहते हैं। बातचीत जारी है, उसकी गति को बढ़ाया जाना चाहिए और सीमा का एक संतोषजनक हल निकालने का प्रयास होना चाहिए। चीन पाकिस्तान को जिस तरह से सहायता देता है, उससे भी चिंता पैदा होती है। क्योंकि वह सहायता हमारे विरुद्ध काम में आती है। हमारी चिंताओं का भी चीन ध्यान रखे, इस बात की जरूरत है। भारत और चीन मिलकर काम करें, सहयोग से आगे बढ़ें, यह दोनों देशों के ही हित में नहीं है, एशिया के हित में है, सारी दुनिया के हित में है। कुछ वक्तव्यों को लेकर गलतफहमी पैदा करने की कोशिश हुई थी। कठिनाई यह है कि अगर वक्तव्य गलत रूप में छप जाए और फिर उसको सही करने का प्रयास किया जाए तो जो सही वक्तव्य है वह उचित स्थान नहीं पाता और जो चटपटा मसालेदार मामला है वह सुर्खियां प्राप्त कर लेता है। हमारी नीति मित्रता की नीति है, इस भूखण्ड में शांति बनाये रखने की नीति है, विकास की नीति है। अपनी रक्षा की तैयारी रखते हुए हम सभी देशों के साथ मित्रता चाहते हैं और मुझे विश्वास है कि जो आज हमारे आलोचक हैं, उनके भी दृष्टिकोण में परिवर्तन आयेगा। हमने परीक्षण किया, देश में कोई युद्धोन्माद पैदा नहीं किया। देश में परीक्षण हुआ तो स्थिति सामान्य थी। मैं खुद पोखरन गया था, वहां रेडियोधर्मिता भी नहीं थी, हम वहां कई घंटे थे। यह खबर भी छप गई कि वहां नाक में से खून निकल रहा है। किसकी नाक में से खून निकला, कितना खून निकला, यह बताने वाला कोई नहीं था। मगर यह खबर सुर्खियों में छपी और विदेशों में खास तौर से छपी गई। वहां जवान रह रहे हैं, इस वातावरण में रह रहे हैं।

श्रेडियो धर्मिता का तो सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता। इसका हम राजनैतिक लाभ उठाएं, इसका तो प्रश्न ही नहीं है। सबके सहयोग से आम सहमति के आधार पर नीतियों का निर्धारण करते हुए हम आगे बढ़ना चाहते हैं। मेरे कंधों पर जो दायित्व आया है, उस दायित्व को मैं ऐसी जिम्मेदारी समझता हूँ जिसके निर्वाह के सामने और सब वस्तुएं गौण हो जाती हैं। अब व्यक्ति का, परिवार का, दल का, बिरादरी का और मजहब का सवाल नहीं है। यह देश बहुधर्मी है।

मुझे सुनकर ताज्जुब हुआ, कल हमारे पड़ोसी देश के प्रधान मंत्री ने टेलीविजन पर जनता को संबोधित करते हुए किस तरह भड़काने वाला भाषण दिया। वे अपनी जनता को उभाड़ रहे थे। उन्होंने यह नहीं सोचा कि उनके पड़ोस में भी करोड़ों लोग रहते हैं। उसमें इस्लाम को मानने वाले भी करोड़ों लोग हैं जो भारत के नागरिक हैं। समान अधिकार का उपभोग करने वाले हैं। अब एक जुनून पैदा करने की कोशिश की गई। या तो हम सजग हैं, सतर्क हैं, ऐसी छोटी सी बात हो जाती, मीडिया में उसकी चर्चा होती और फिर जो बात शुरू करते हैं, उन्हें पता लग जाता है कि यह बात ठीक नहीं हो रही है, तो उसको छोड़ देते हैं, लेकिन अगर टेलीविजन पर खड़ा होकर मैं देश की जनता को भड़काने लगूँ, ऐसा कभी नहीं होगा, और जिस दिन यह करने की नौबत आएगी, उस दिन मैं अपने पद पर नहीं रहूँगा, यह मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

देश की सेवा करने का अवसर मुझे मिला है। वह समय ठीक प्रकार से देश की सेवा में लगे और इसमें सबका सहयोग मिले, यही मेरे हृदय की कामना है।

पोखरन-एक का मेरा भाषण उद्धृत करते हुए किसी ने कहा था- उसमें मैंने कहा था कि वैज्ञानिकों और सैनिकों ने अपना काम कर दिया, अब राजनेताओं को अपना काम करना है- तो राजनेता से केवल मेरा मतलब नहीं है। राजनेताओं से मतलब सब लोगों से है। अब हम अपने दायित्व का पालन करें, इस बात की आवश्यकता है। धन्यवाद।

(इति)

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR (BARAMATI): The Prime Minister of Pakistan has made a suggestion that Pakistan is ready to discuss No-War-Pact with India. What is your thinking? Are you ready to discuss with other political parties also to take some definite view on this?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: This is not a new offer. But whenever talks were held, we reached the conclusion that they want No-War-Pact but only after the solution of the Kashmir problem, according to their wishes. But if a new offer has been made, we are prepared to probe it.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR (BARAMATI): The suggestion has been made only yesterday.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH (BHARATPUR): May I respectfully ask the Prime Minister as to how does your letter to President Clinton find a place in The New York Times? Who drafted the absurd letter?!

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी; अध्यक्ष जी, ऐसे सवाल पूछे जा रहे हैं, जिनका मैं उत्तर नहीं दे सकता।