

**Title:** Raised a discussion on the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on 27.5.98 on the recent nuclear tests in Pokhran. (Not Concluded)

14.39 hrs

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, the discussion on the statement made by the hon. Minister under Rule 193 has been admitted in the names of Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee and Shri V.V. Raghavan. They have now requested me to allow Shri Indrajit Gupta to raise the discussion on their behalf. I have allowed Shri Indrajit Gupta to raise the discussion.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (MIDNAPORE): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I listened very attentively to the statement made. ... (Interruptions)

कुमारी मायावती (अकबरपुर) : माननीय अध्यक्ष जी, डिस्कशन से पहले हमें वह जानकारी मिलनी चाहिए, जिसके बारे में माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने आश्वासन दिया था कि जब दोबारा बैठक होगी तो बाहर प्रदर्शनकारियों के ऊपर जो लाठी चार्ज हुआ, गोली वगैरह चली है और माननीय कांशी राम जी को गिरफ्तार किया गया है, उसके बारे में डिटेल्स में जानकारी देंगे। माननीय गृह मंत्री जी हाउस में मौजूद क्यों नहीं हैं? जब दोबारा सदन की बैठक शुरू हो गई है तो उन्हें अपना जवाब देना चाहिए।

अभी हम पार्टी ऑफिस गए थे। वहां बहुत से कार्यकर्ता इकट्ठे थे। गोली चली है, बहुत से लोग अस्पताल में भर्ती हैं। अभी तक हमें मालूम नहीं है कि हमारी पार्टी के राष्ट्रीय अध्यक्ष कहां हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

कुमारी मायावती : उनको कहां पर भेजा है, हमें अभी तक इस की जानकारी नहीं है। पहले हमें उसका जवाब मिलना चाहिए। गृह मंत्री जी ने कहा था। वे यह बता दें कि कितने बजे स्टेटमेंट देंगे।

... (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Please cooperate. I have just called Shri Indrajit Gupta.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened very attentively to the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister this morning, for which I think the whole country was waiting. I think there is a practically unanimous feeling in the country that the major share or credit for the scientific achievement which has been recorded must go to our scientists and our engineers and cannot go to any political party. It cannot go to the ruling party which may like to take credit in order to extract some political mileage out of it.

These scientists and engineers actually demonstrated their capability in the nuclear field 24 years ago, not today. These things do not happen overnight. These require long periods of preparation, research and so on. Twenty-four years ago when the first blast took place in Pokhran they had already demonstrated their capability and of course they have been up-dating their technology and now they have demonstrated in 1998 that they are capable of making an independent contribution which is of the highest importance.

Incidentally, I would like to at this stage congratulate Dr. Abdul Kalam for getting the Bharat Ratna which he richly deserves.

As far as the sovereign right of a country is concerned, an independent sovereign country has got the right. Nobody can question our right to go ahead with this type of testing if we want to do so. It is for us to explain why we are doing it, for what purpose we are doing it and so on. But if some countries, somewhere here and there talk in a way, as if they are questioning our right, they have no business to do that because every country, especially an independent sovereign country certainly has got its own right.

The question that I would like to raise is why this testing has been done now at this stage. In his letter to President Clinton which I think was not meant to be publicised, but it was leaked to the Press, or the Press got hold of it somehow, the Prime Minister has attributed this sudden testing to what he calls the deteriorating security environment of India. And he makes it quite clear that he is referring to a threat from China and this appears to be in tune with the anti-Chinese fulminations of the Defence Minister made a few days earlier.

In fact, the Defence Minister's rather aggressive remarks, I think were meant obviously to prepare the ground for official explanation which has now been made available in the Prime Minister's letter to the U.S. President.

I am not raising the question, at the moment, whether this type of letter should be considered as somewhat unusual or not. I do not know whether this kind of a letter, dealing with such a subject, addressed to the President of another country is proper or not in the field of international relations. Anyway, the letter has gone.

Sir, the question I am asking to which I would like to have a reply is this. What was the sudden provocation, if any, at this stage? If it was from China's side, we would like to know what that provocation was. We have had our disputes with China for a long time and most of those disputes, perhaps, are not resolved yet. We all remember what happened in 1962. We remember that large tracts of Indian territory are in the possession of China and that the questions relating to the border have also not been resolved, but this is nothing new. This has been going on for so many years. I find that there is a statement which is connected with Starred Question number 20 to be answered today, the 27th of May in the Lok Sabha. This is a statement regarding neighbouring countries. After all, this is an official statement. May I just read it? It says :

"In recent years, India-China relations have developed steadily. The momentum of high level dialogue has been maintained and there is a growing functional cooperation between the two countries in diverse fields. The two countries have agreed to work towards a constructive and cooperative relationship oriented towards the 21st century. The bilateral trade reached US dollars 1.8 billion in 1997.

Various issues of mutual interest, including the boundary question, are being discussed in the framework of the India-China Joint Working Group and India-China Expert Group."

Now, does this statement which has been submitted to the House on behalf of the Government give an impression that suddenly today there is a deterioration in India-China relations or the bilateral mechanism which has been set up, the cooperation which is taking place, and the constructive dialogue which is taking place as mentioned here has suddenly been interrupted or sabotaged by China? I do not find it here in this statement.

Also, Sir, in this statement which was made by the hon. Prime Minister, there is a paragraph number thirteen. I do not want to read it because it will take too much time. It says that our policy towards our neighbours and other countries also have not changed. This is here. This is what was read out :

"India remains fully committed to the promotion of peace with stability, and resolution of all outstanding issues through bilateral dialogue and negotiations. ....

.....The Government will continue to remain engaged in substantive dialogue with our neighbours to improve relations and to expand the scope of our interactions in a mutually advantageous manner."

I do not know whether all these statements are meant to indicate that China alone is an exception to this line and attitude that we, officially, here have said that we are taking and we want to continue to take. Nowhere it is mentioned that the exception of all this is China and China has suddenly started behaving in some different way which has created a provocation at this moment which has suddenly led us to take this decision of testing of nuclear weapons.

Therefore, I have this question to ask and I would like some clarification. In fact, I think, the Prime Minister should have - even before the testing, perhaps, maybe they did not want to do that - taken at least the major political parties into confidence. They could have taken their own allies into confidence. But anyway, that was

not done. Now, when we are debating this matter in the House, certainly we have every right to ask this question as to what was the sudden provocation which had led to this testing.

We all agree that there must be absolutely no relaxation of defence preparedness. There should be no relaxation of security measures, especially in our country where we have got a very troublesome environment along the borders of our country. But what I am asking is this. Is it essential for our security that we should go in for production and deployment of nuclear weapons? Many countries, of course, as we know, have manufactured and stockpiled nuclear weapons in the name of security. But these are such weapons that they cannot be used. America which has the biggest stockpile of nuclear weapons was not able to use them against a poor and backward country like Vietnam. It fought Vietnam for 12 years in order to crush the liberation movement of the Vietnamese people. But it could not and dare not, in the face of the conscience of the world, use those weapons.

SHRI ABDUL GHAFUOR (GOPALGANJ): Does it mean that we have to wait for 100 years?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You can talk after you become the owner of those weapons. You are not the owner of those weapons.

So, what is more essential for our security in the long run is this. Firstly, what has been stated here in the Prime Minister's statement which I have already read out is "building of good relations with our neighbouring countries and the creation of bilateral and regional mechanisms for that purpose". These are weapons of mass destruction. He had quoted in the morning - approvingly, I suppose - from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who had said on the 2nd April, 1954 in this House that "nuclear, chemical and biological energy and power should not be used to forge weapons of mass destruction".

We are now saying that we have now become a weaponised State, a nuclear weaponised State. So, I would like to know whether the weapons which we are engaged in researching and trying to manufacture can be used as weapons of mass destruction or not. Are they weapons of mass destruction or not? Of course, the Government must declare and has declared - I am glad to see - that we have no aggressive intentions towards anybody. These weapons will never be used for aggressive purposes and so on. But intrinsically, are they weapons of mass destruction or not? If they are, why are we giving up the line that we have pursued consistently for so many years and go in for this? Of course, some provocation may have been there, I do not know, from the side of Pakistan, because they suddenly developed this Ghauri missile and said that it has a long range of so many thousands of kilometres. This Ghauri missile may be interpreted as a threat to us.

So, if the Pakistan Government chooses to go in also for development of nuclear weapons what would happen? The Prime Minister of Pakistan has reported to have said that the Indian experiments of underground testing are considered by Pakistan to be a threat to them and therefore, he has said that, within a few days, they would also test their own nuclear weapons.

This means that a sort of competition and a race in nuclear arms is being triggered off and the history has shown that this is a very risky thing and is a very reckless thing. Even with the best of intentions one cannot say where a mishap may occur.

Sir, I think that it is not enough for the Prime Minister to have told President Clinton - I do not know whether the idea was to please the American rulers - that we consider the main threat to be from China. The Defence Minister, of course, is one of the outstanding champions of what is known as the Socialist International based in Amsterdam. He is one of the top leaders of that Socialist International which has always been a China baiter. It is nothing new. But I do not expect the policy of the Amsterdam International to be taken over as the official policy of the Government of India. It cannot be done.

Now, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the conscience of the world has renounced the use of nuclear weapons as weapons of mass destruction which cannot serve a military purpose. For example, the United Kingdom is one of the nuclear powers. But everybody knows that it has become a second class power. In the world, it is considered to be a second class power though it holds nuclear weapons. The mighty USSR got itself bankrupted by trying to chase nuclear parity with the United States and NATO. In that mad race for parity in nuclear arms, the first

biggest historic casualty has been the USSR. On the other hand, Japan and Germany are considered to be the powerful States. But they do not have nuclear weapons. They do not have nuclear weapons but they are not certainly weak countries. So, let us think about these things.

As I said, if Pakistan chooses to go in for what you may call a sort of tit-for-tat policy then there is a grave risk of nuclear arms race being triggered of in this part of the continent.

The Prime Minister has said nothing about the economic cost of producing nuclear weapons. He has not specifically said anything about the impact of sanctions or the threat of sanctions. But I think our country, our Government, along with development of nuclear testing should give a clear-cut commitment that we are not going to go in for the first use or the first strike of such weapons. We should say that the first strike will never be by India and invite all other countries to join in this commitment and ask them to respond to it and if they do not respond, they will automatically be exposed.

Sir, the United States sanctions may not cause irrecoverable damage to our economy because they are supposed to be coming mainly from the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and so on. In fact, I find that there is perhaps a very farsighted calculation even by our Government behind all this that these sanctions if they come - I think they have already been started operating will push forward the economic liberalisation policy which we have been following since 1991. If the multinational corporations are assiduously wooed, then the private capital can replace the aid from the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. It may even increase.

15.00 hrs.

I find, Sir, that a well-informed paper like The Economist of London has pointed out that "soon after the nuclear blasting, the Government of India has awarded 18 oil exploration contracts -- 11 of them to American companies, whose projects had been in limbo for two years. It has cleared 34 exploration licences for onshore minerals in four States. Three foreign investments in power projects, which had been languishing for want of a Government guarantee, were suddenly approved and, according to newspaper reports, the Government is to allow foreign investors to own 100 per cent of the equity of housing companies against 40 per cent earlier and to raise hard currency loans for the first time."

So, these American companies who are very conscious of the huge market which exists here in India, even if the official agencies impose sanctions, and nothing that we have done will dissuade or should dissuade the American private investors and multinational corporations from taking advantage of these various projects. So, on the balance, we may not lose, we may even gain.

The Prime Minister mentioned this morning that they have declared a voluntary moratorium. I would like to know a little more about this. What exactly do you mean by this 'voluntary moratorium'? We have already said that we would consider signing some aspects of this CTBT. Nobody has clarified, what is meant by 'some aspects of the CTBT'. One of the main conditionalities of the CTBT is that nuclear testing should be stopped. This applies to all signatories to the CTBT. If we have already unilaterally declared that we are going to go in for a voluntary moratorium, now does it mean that one of the conditionalities of the CTBT is, in fact, being accepted by us by the back-door and that is the signal that we want to send out? Whatever it is, let the country and the Parliament be taken into confidence. There should be transparency now about these things and we should be told what exactly the Government is preparing to do.

So, Sir, I must say more or less in conclusion that the whole exercise appears to me to have been an exercise in futility. This type of weapon does not strengthen our security at all. Secondly, we have declared a moratorium. Thirdly, we do not know what is going to be the cost of it. We have a pretty favourable standing in the international comity of nations. I do not know to what extent this thing will reduce our friends abroad and, perhaps, isolate us to some extent.

Fourthly, it is a very ironical matter, Sir, that in the Capital City of Delhi, thousands and lakhs of people are going without power and water, and we are going to go in for producing nuclear power now and saying that this is a great achievement, that you have done something which requires to be hailed with great enthusiasm. They

cannot supply ordinary water and power to the inhabitants of the Capital City of this country. You just see what is going on. Yesterday, people from so many colonies and areas of Delhi have come out of their homes and staged angry demonstrations and they have even gheraoed the houses of some Councillors and other popular representatives of the ruling party because they have been given all sorts of assurances and those assurances have come to nothing. So, where does all this lead to? How does it add up?

Therefore, I think that this is something which after a few days you will find there is little room left for enthusiasm. What is the enthusiasm about it except that our scientists have proved that they are second to none in the world? That is something which I am proud. But beyond that, where do we go from here?

So, these are some of the questions which I would like the Prime Minister to deal with when he replies and apart from that, I do not have anything much to say because we are not condemning the fact that nuclear testing has been done. That by itself, technical or scientific, is a good achievement. But, on the other hand, there is nothing to get so euphoric about it.

Therefore, we should continue to pursue the other methods and other efforts that we have been making over the years in order to improve our relationship.

It is quite heartening to find that in the recent Conference of the non-aligned countries which took place in Cartagena, except for three or four countries, the overwhelming majority did not condemn India. They did not at all consider that India has done something which is against the spirit that has actuated the non-aligned countries all these years. That is a good thing. Therefore, I think we should have second thoughts on this whole matter and the Prime Minister should think over it.

Lastly, I would say the Prime Minister must take steps to see that his Ministers, if I may say so, do not speak in different voices. How can people in this country have confidence on a Government whose Ministers go on speaking in different voices on the same thing? I broadly agree with what the Prime Minister says, the kind of line that he is trying to propagate and advance, because it is consistent with what we have been doing all these years. But we have got Ministers here who are making such bellicose and aggressive statements which are not calculated to strengthen peace or security, but which may provoke other people. We have got neighbours who are not very friendly with us and this subject is something on which even some Ministers, I think, do not have any direct dealings at all. They also come out with statements. I do not know who has authorised them to do it. (Interruptions) I think on such a delicate and sensitive matter, official statements in the name of the Government, should be confined to the Prime Minister who in the past, as we know, was considered to be quite a renowned foreign policy expert even when he was not in the Government. When he was the Leader of the Opposition, the Government at that time had sent him many times on foreign policy missions abroad because he was trusted as a competent and authoritative spokesman of the line which India had been following and he conducted himself with great distinction, I should say, even in such meetings where we have confrontations directly with the Pakistanis in Geneva and so on.

So, I stand more or less by what he has been saying. I find it very awkward and very jarring that some other Ministers every now and then -- I do not know whether they do it for publicity purposes or for what other purposes -- always chip in with something or the other which strikes a jarring note and which is not in keeping with what the Prime Minister has said. I do not know why the Prime Minister allows these things to go on. (Interruptions) It does some damage to the country's image and reputation abroad. This should be stopped as soon as possible.

This is broadly what I want to say. I do not wish to take up more time. Thank you very much for the chance you have given me.

">SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH (BHARATPUR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are meeting here today under the stress of momentous events. I listened with the profoundest respect to the hon. Prime Minister whose vocabulary has not been impoverished although the sources of his moral inspiration seem to have dried up.

He said much and he conveyed very little.

Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, your statement begged of all questions and answered none. The central thesis of your statement was flawed on account of the absence of a moral dimension.

As far as the Congress Party is concerned, our views on the subject have been made clear in the Congress Working Committee which met on the 14th of May and endorsed the statement of the Congress President Shrimati Sonia Gandhi which reads as follows:

"I would like to place on record, in this formal meeting of the Congress Working Committee, the pride we feel in the achievement of our nuclear scientists and engineers who are putting India's nuclear capability in the front rank. We recall with equal pride the successive Congress Governments have ensured India's nuclear capability remains up to date so that our security is not compromised.

The nuclear question is a national matter, not a party-run one. On this, every Indian is united. The Congress Party remains committed to a nuclear-weapon-free world, non-violent world and that remains the sheet anchor of our policy.

The Congress Working Committee reiterates India's commitment to peace in the region so that India and our neighbours can move ahead in accelerating the economic growth, eradication of poverty, illiteracy and improving the living conditions of all citizens."

Mr. Prime Minister, your statement and the accompanying document are more or less the same. Except there is some expansion, the longer version. You said that the House is aware of the different reactions that have emanated from the people of India from...(Interruptions)

श्री अब्दुल गफ़ूर : जुबानी बोलिये, ये क्या पढ़कर बोल रहे हैं।

श्री के.नटवर सिंह : नहीं-नहीं, मैं तो स्टेटमेंट पढ़ रहा हूँ।

श्री अब्दुल गफ़ूर : यही तो मैं कह रहा हूँ। आपकी सारी स्पीच इसी में खत्म हो जाएगी।

श्री के.नटवर सिंह : अरे, चचा बैठिये। मैं आपका बहुत अदब करता हूँ लेकिन यह जरा पेचीदा मामला है। इसको जरा गौर से स्टडी करिये, फिर आप समझेंगे कि यहां क्या हो रहा है। मैं आपकी बहुत इज्जत करता हूँ, आप जरा सुनिये।

MR. SPEAKER : Please do not disturb him.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Now, Sir, what has happened is that the nuclear test are behind us. If the hon. Prime Minister and the BJP had simply said that in their manifesto they had said that they will review the defence policy, the strategic policy; there will be a National Security Council which will examine this and they will then re-evaluate their policy and then they will go for nuclear weapon programme and exercise the nuclear option, we could understand that. But it is not so. The reason given by the Government in the letter to President Clinton, as has been said by Shri Indrajit Gupta, is that there is a security threat from China. Now, we are entitled to know from the hon. Prime Minister when did this threat begin? Did it begin on the 19th of March when he took over? Or, did it begin on the 8th of April when he gave the green signal to his scientists? How serious was this threat? Have the Chinese forces moved round to our borders? Have the Pakistanis mounted an exercise which threatened the city of Amritsar? I think we are entitled to ask these questions because he has had no time to review the threat perception obviously between 19th of March and the 8th of April. Mr. Prime Minister, if you had done the review the House would like to be told what these findings are of the high-level review of India's security concerns.

You preside over a Government of eighteen parties. While you have experience of being the Foreign Minister of India, but the parallel political and diplomatic management of your action on the 11th and 13th has been highly unsatisfactory.

And what have we succeeded in doing?

Today there was a Question about the visit of the Chinese Chief of Staff to India and his discussions with you. And the answer of the Minister of State was, I am afraid, I have to read it and you have to listen to it -- as follows:

"The Prime Minister welcomed the positive trends in India-China relations and spoke of his desire to continue the momentum of our relations. He requested General Fu to convey his good wishes to President Jiang Zemin, Prime Minister Zhu Rongji and Chairman NPC Li Peng. The Prime Minister expressed the view that improvement in relations between two countries should be based on the recognition of and respect for each other's concerns. An understanding based on mutual respect between the two most populous countries in the world will contribute to peace and security in Asia and in the world. The Prime Minister drew particular attention to the Border Peace and Tranquility Agreement of 1993 and the Agreement on Confidence Building Measures of 1996 and said that India needed a stable environment in order to concentrate on raising the living standards of the people. There were some problems along the Line of Actual Control because it was not delineated etc. etc." How do you reconcile this with your letter to President Clinton? How do you reconcile this with the pronouncement made by the distinguished Defence Minister who, if I may respectfully say, is a human El Nino, who from time to time comes out with the most outrageous statements. On the 5th of May, Shri George Fernandes said, "we will undertake a review and then come to a decision about whether we will exercise our nuclear options or not." It is a matter of fact. But you had already given a green signal a month earlier. Obviously, the Defence Minister had not been taken into confidence by you.

I do know what the distinguished colleague sitting on your right probably was saying. I will just come to what he has done - the damage Shri Advani has done to our relations with Pakistan with his unbridled statement. I will just come to that because he has mentioned about the 'pro-active policy'. Do you know what it means in fact? It means that you will pot for hot pursuit into territory of India occupied by Pakistan. Do you know what the consequences are going to be? The Security Council will be summoned within a few minutes of your hot pursuit and a condemnatory resolutions will be passed with mandatory sanctions, sanctions under Chapter-VII of the UN Charter. There are 54 Muslim countries in the world. We have good relations with those countries. We have massive trade with them. About 1.2 million Indians live there. They remit large amounts of money. What is going to happen to those people? Have you thought through as to what your 'pro-active policy' means? You say, you are running a Government on consensus. You have not asked us. You have not asked anybody here that you are fundamentally changing the nature of India's foreign policy and defence policy, without a review and without a reference to this House. If you represent 25 per cent of votes of India, so do we. If you represent one-third of the strength of this House, so do we, rather more than that. We were not consulted and you have taken a profound step.

You were asked in the interview in the Outlook a question, "The Government in its National Agenda had promised a strategic defence review before inducting nuclear weapons. Why was this not done?" Your answer is, "There was no such promise in the National Agenda." But there is. The Outlook has quoted exactly what you have said. I am not saying that you forgot what you said. But I think, you better look at your facts.

I would like to draw your attention to different reactions of the Government. It not only tells us that the decision was right and that the country wants a focussed leadership which attends to national security needs.

Now, who was unfocussed? For 25 years, since 1971, there has been no security threat to India. The Simla Agreement has ensured that there is no conflict with Pakistan and your own visit began the process although you did not succeed in 1979. There was Rajiv Gandhi's visit, Mr. Li Peng's visit to India, Shri Venkataraman's visit to China. Mr. Jianh Zemin whom you have quoted from the answer of Minister of State that there is peace and tranquillity on the border. Forces have been withdrawn. Not a single incident has taken place which has raised the temperature except by the pronouncement of your Ministerial colleagues. I will respectfully submit that a

period of silence on their part will be most welcome because these are extremely sensitive issues. You know the reaction of the Chinese?

You have read it Mr. Prime Minister. You are level headed, you are wise and you are balanced but what a crew you are carrying with you! Take your political advisor. What is his vision? He is a nice young man with an engaging personality. Why have you asked him to brief the Press on Foreign Affairs? It is a great pity. You know that I have been for 45 years dealing with foreign affairs and I am still learning. And, you have a young man who sits in judgement and pronounces on the policy matters. I do not want to use the phrase he used about China. China is a great country. We have in 2,000 years have had one conflict with them and no in-depth analysis has been done as to why that happened. But you agreed and this House passed a Resolution and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said that 'eventually the border dispute with China will be settled through negotiations'. But the antenna has been upped. Day in and day out statements are made by people who ought to know better. Your Minister for Parliamentary Affairs wanted the Pakistanis to name the date and the place and time for a war... (Interruptions)...

Sir, all I can say is that I would hate to be in your shoes because of this kind of irresponsibility witnessed in the Cabinet Ministers who are being exposed. There are 125 foreign missions in Delhi. They report everyday as to what is happening here. Have you read Shri Muchkund Dubey's article today? You say that you are a nuclear weapon State. Well, good luck to you. But read Muchkund Dubey's article and you will find that it is going to be very very tough. The heat is already being put on you. The US-sponsored access to contain India. What is your access? With your actions you have helped to produce a Pakistan, Washington, China axis. And how are they going about it? You please read The Times of India of today carefully and ask your colleagues to do so.

You are very pleased with your telephonic conversation with Mr. Tony Blair. Mr. Tony Blair is the author of the document that is being produced by the European Union. It says that you were to get ready because we are going to put the heat on you left, right and centre and you have not got a prayer going for you in the international community. The G-8 did not do anything because Mr. Yeltsin was there. But in the European Union, he is not there. This is the true language of Mr. Tony Blair who drafts these things very well. I do not want to repeat all these things. Please read them.

Shri Muchkund Dubey says that 'it is going to be extremely difficult for India to muscle its way into this world nuclear order. After the latest Pokhran Test, India has declared itself a nuclear weapon State and made a number of moves to be recognised as such, etc. The recent five tests themselves have not given India its nuclear deterrent. By these tests, we have only displayed our clear weapon capability in a much higher technological level in 1974. We still have a long way to go before acquiring a credible deterrent.'

I have the profoundest respects for our scientists. But you know that in science, this is not the latest technology. I do not want to say more about it because these are very sensitive matters.

Then, Shri Sharada Prasad has said: 'In other words, whatever the detonations might have done for the world perception of India, the post-Pokhran India will not be very different from the pre-Pokhran one. We still remain a poor country with a few troublesome toys.' They are all very sober, level-headed, highly experienced and knowledgeable people writing about these matters.

We are not for a moment saying that where the security of India is concerned, we will be in the second row. We will be with you, in front of you when the security of India is concerned. Please tell us where your threat is coming from and why you have unilaterally overturned a national consensus which persisted for 25 years without any debate. You have not yet carried out your statutory review.

It is now said everywhere that in 1996 you had decided to detonate bombs. You resigned in 13 days. But everybody is saying this and I would like you to deny it that you had any such intentions. What had happened then? Where was the security environment deteriorating? It now transpires that you had planned this in 1996 when there was no Ghauri, no Ghaznavi and no George!



If you had honestly told the House, 'From the 11th of May, I am not going to be Atal Bihari Vajpayee, I am going to be Atom Bomb Vajpayee', we would have accepted it. It would have been perfectly understandable. Nobody is minimising the action that you have taken but only the justification that you have provided.

Shri George Fernandes has thrown into the dustbin ten years of hard diplomatic work. The Working Group appointed by Shri Rajiv Gandhi had said: 'All these matters were discussed including the missile.' The Chinese said, 'If you object to our giving it to Pakistan, we will give it to you.' Ask Shri J.N. Dixit. Send for him and ask him if anything new has happened in these days.

The nuclear test is a tribute to the country, a tremendous tribute to our scientists and a tremendous tribute to Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, Shri Narasimha Rao, Shri Inder Kumar Gujral and all the other Prime Ministers who said, 'Go ahead with this programme.' But Shri Gujral has written a letter to you and very kindly in a spirit of great fraternal relations with the Congress Party sent us a copy. Shri Gujral has said on 22nd May: 'It is indeed unfortunate that in the past several days a number of statements have emanated from various quarters on how we intend to deal with the CTBT issue, the proxy war in Jammu and Kashmir, counter-measures to deal with the sanctions etc. All in all, taken together, these varying postures create the impression of growing aggressivity and virtually mean that we are on the brink of military confrontation and I hope such courses of action had not been mediated by you.' He is a former Prime Minister and he has been a Prime Minister longer than you have been. I hope, we have a change of Prime Ministership soon. You have been in office for only two months.

Shri H.D. Deve Gowda has also written a letter to you. Shri Narasimha Rao who has himself said that the nuclear option was open repeatedly said so for the last thirty years. Implicit in it was that it could be exercised. There was a national consensus on keeping the nuclear option open.

There was no consensus on your exercising that option. ... (Interruptions) What I am trying to say is that you should have thought over this instead of inventing that the security environment has deteriorated, though in your statement you have not referred to it. It is because what you have said does not indicate that you are yourself convinced that a security threat exists. If it does exist, I think, this House is entitled to know where that threat comes from. I am glad in your statement you have said that you are for nuclear disarmament. Although you did not mention Rajiv Gandhi's name, but it is implied. I also know that the response to it was not enthusiastic for a variety of reasons because the Russians have also made a proposal for disarmament. Rajiv Gandhi said that all nuclear weapons should be abolished by 2010 and Gorbachev came out with a proposal, if I remember correctly, that the nuclear weapons should be abolished by 2005. Then, the Soviet Union disintegrated. The Soviet Union had 10,000 nuclear warheads whereas you have five or six. The Soviet Union has disintegrated. Why? It is because the economic cost for weaponisation was too excessive. The Americans made sure that Russia's Budget after the Second World War never came below 25 per cent of GDP. Now, we know what Pakistan has been saying. We also know that Chinese have asked you to give concrete evidence of your good will. I am glad that when you went to Pokhran you said that you would like to have good relations with China and so did your Principal Secretary who was the first Indian on whom Mao-tze-Dung smiled after 1962 when he was our charge d'affaires in Beijing. So, he knows the facts of what diplomatic life are. I am very glad that you have, Sir, in your wisdom pulled back the country from the brink. Your assertions or pronouncements give a ray of hope to the damage that has been inflicted on India's foreign policy, India's relations with China, India's relations with Pakistan, India's relations with EU, and India's relations with USA. I am not for a moment saying that we should succumb to any pressure, certainly not. The hands of five nuclear weapon States are not clean. They have no business to pass judgement on us and they have no business to impose sanctions on us. If they do so we will be with you to tighten our belts and march along with you to oppose those sanctions. Instead of increasing the number of your enemies, please increase the number of your friends. That is the first fundamental law of diplomacy. There is a difference between foreign policy and diplomacy and it is very subtle and profound. You know it, Shri Advani knows it but the hotheads in your party do not know it. Foreign policy is what you do and diplomacy is how you do it. For the first time, questions are being asked as to what do you expect our diplomats to do. On the one hand you are writing to Clinton and on the other hand you say you want good relations with China. ... (Interruptions) What I am trying to say is that we will give you full support as far as the nation's security is concerned. We will give you full support if sanctions are put on us. But when you make a

pronouncement as Prime Minister of India that these tests have been undertaken on account of a threat, then you must in all fairness tell us where the threat comes from, how serious it is and how imminent it is. The Minister of State, while answering a question, says that there is no threat from China and that it is hunky-dory and our relations are good. Please reconcile these contradictions.

I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to speak in this debate.

... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Lalu Prasad.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI RAM NAIK): Sir, is it not the turn of our Member to speak now?

MR. SPEAKER : We have reached an agreement yesterday that two hon. Members from the Opposition side would speak first. So, the next hon. Member would be from your side. There was an agreement yesterday on this aspect.

">

श्री लालू प्रसाद (मधेपुरा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं क्षमा चाहता हूँ हमसे बड़ी पार्टी के नेता को या सत्ता पार्टी को बोलने का पहले मौका मिलना चाहिए। लेकिन मैंने आपसे इजाजत ली है, पांच बजे मुझे वापस पटना जाना है इसलिए आपकी परमीशन से मैं बोल रहा हूँ।

... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, सदन आज अत्यंत संवेदनशील मामले पर विचार कर रहा है। चाहे सत्ता पक्ष हो या विपक्ष हो, राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के सवाल पर सिर्फ पोलिटिकल पार्टियां ही नहीं, भारत की सभी जातियां, वर्ण, धर्म, देश की सारी जनता एक हैं और एक स्वर में हम राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा चाहते हैं। युद्ध और तनाव की स्थिति पूरे भारत में पैदा हो गई है। लोग काफी असमंजस में हैं। प्रधानमंत्री जी ने अपना वक्तव्य दिया, सुनकर घोर निराशा हुई है। इस देश के वैज्ञानिकों को, उनकी टीम को, डा. कलाम और चिदम्बरम जी तथा उनके साथी साइंटिस्ट लोगों को जितनी बधाई दी जाए, बहुत कम है। पूर्व की सरकार और पूर्व प्रधानमंत्री गुजराल साहब ने डा. कलाम को भारत रत्न की उपाधि दी थी। सचमुच में बहुमूल्य रत्न इस राष्ट्र को मिला है। डा. कलाम ने दुनिया में और दुनिया के वैज्ञानिकों के सामने न्यूक्लियर डिवाइस का प्रयोग करके भारत का मस्तक ऊंचा किया, इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती। इसमें भारत की जनता और सभी लोगों का कंटीब्यूशन है। इस समय रक्षा मंत्री जी को भी यहां रहना चाहिए था

... (व्यवधान)

पता नहीं वे कहां चले गये, लगता नहीं कि रक्षा मंत्री जी से पूछा गया या नहीं। क्योंकि वह फोरफ्रंट पर कहीं नजर नहीं आते हैं।

15.38 hrs. (Shri P.M.Sayed in the Chair)

इसमें रक्षा मंत्री जी से भी पूछा गया या नहीं प्रधानमंत्री जी जब जवाब देंगे तब बतायेंगे। हम लोग वैज्ञानिकों को धन्यवाद और बधाई देते हैं। प्रधानमंत्री जी ने भी स्वीकार किया कि पचास साल की यह उपलब्धि है। पहला विस्फोट १९७४ में हुआ था और अब यह डिमांस्ट्रेशन हुआ है। हम इस सवाल का उत्तर चाहते हैं कि यह किनके खिलाफ हुआ है। आज दुनिया में जिनकी मोनोपोली है वे राष्ट्र अमरीका, रूस, फ्रांस, ब्रिटेन और चाइना है। पूरे देश में डुगडुगी पीटी जा रही है, चाहे जो लोग भी पीट रहे हों कि हम भी तैयार हो गये हैं। पूरा होल वर्ल्ड और देश इसको वाच कर रहा होगा, मैं उसकी तह में, गोपनीयता में नहीं जाना चाहता कि यह जो डिमांस्ट्रेशन हुआ टैस्ट हुआ, उसकी कैपेसिटी क्या है। जिन पांच राष्ट्रों के खिलाफ हम चारों तरफ वातावरण बना रहे हैं,

महोदय, उस मंजिल तक जाने में हमें कितनी देर लगेगी और हमारी क्या क्षमता है, इसे हम जानना चाहेंगे। मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ और कहना चाहता हूँ कि कहीं हमारी हंसी न हो जाए क्योंकि जो लोग संपन्न हैं, समृद्ध हैं, उनके बेटे-बेटियों की शादी में खूब आतिशबाजी चलती है, खूब पटाके चलते हैं। यह धन का डिमांस्ट्रेशन है। जिन देशों का क्लब बन चुका है वे चाहते हैं कि अब इन अस्त्र-शस्त्रों को कोई न बनाए, बस यही हमारे हित में है। आखिर इन देशों के इस प्रकार से कहने का क्या मतलब है और इनका निशाना कहां है? मेरे और इस देश के करोड़ों देशवासियों के मन में ये बातें हैं कि भारतीय जनता का नया अध्यक्ष बनने के बाद गांधीनगर (गुजरात) के राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन में

one culture, one nation, one religion

की भूरि-भूरि प्रशंसा की गई।

Yes, I do agree with one nation. But I do not agree with one culture; I do not agree with one religion.

जार्ज साहब पीछे बैठे हैं। पाकिस्तान में जब गौरी मिसाइल का परीक्षण किया गया, तो अखबार वालों ने जार्ज साहब का घेराव शुरू कर दिया और पूछा कि भारत इससे बचने के लिए कुछ कर रहा है या नहीं, लेकिन वे उपलब्ध ही नहीं हुए और यहां से नार्थ-ईस्ट चले गए। वहां से भी यह बात छपी और जार्ज साहब ने कहा कि भारत को पाकिस्तान से इतना खतरा नहीं है जितना चीन से है। यह भी कहा गया कि भारत का नंबर एक दुश्मन पाकिस्तान नहीं बल्कि चीन है। जार्ज साहब भारत के रक्षा मंत्री हैं। इनके पास सारी इंटेलीजेंस की सूचना होती है। इनकी जानकारी में सारी बातें होती हैं। मैंने अपने पूर्व भाषण में कहा था और आज भी मैं अपनी उस बात पर कायम हूँ कि हमारा कैलाश, हमारा मानसरोवर, हमारी जमीन चीन के कब्जे में हैं। यह ठीक है कि हमने पहले 'हिन्दी चीनी भाई-भाई' के नारे लगाए, लेकिन इसके बावजूद युद्ध हुआ, हमारी जमीन चीन ने दबा ली और आज हमारे भगवान वहां कैद हैं जिनके हम लोग वहां दर्शन करने जाते हैं।

महोदय, चीन के रक्षा मंत्री का बयान आना और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का कुछ न बोलना, कोई भी एक्शन न लेना, यह क्या बताता है। चार-पांच रोज के बाद रक्षा मंत्री का पटना जाना और वहां जाकर उनके द्वारा सफाई दिया जाना कि इस प्रकार का हमने कोई बयान नहीं दिया कि भारत का एक नंबर दुश्मन चीन है। यह बात तो अखबार वालों ने तोड़-मरोड़ कर छाप दी, यह क्या बताता है, यह किस ओर इशारा करता है, यह सब मालूम होना चाहिए।

अशोक सिंघल जी का पटना जाना और वहां से यह कहना कि हम पोखरन में एक शक्ति पीठ की स्थापना करेंगे। हो सकता है कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय को मालूम न हो क्योंकि उनकी जिम्मेदारी बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ गई है और वहां बहुत स्वतंत्र लोग हैं। पटना में जाकर अशोक सिंघल जी ने कहा कि हम वहां एक दिव्य मंदिर बनाएंगे और वहां की मिट्टी पाकिस्तान और रिलीजन का नाम लेकर हम पूरे देश में घूमेंगे और इसका प्रचार करेंगे। मुझे ऐसे लोगों से खतरा है और अंधेरा है यदि मीडिया की खबर झूठी है तो कोई बात नहीं लेकिन अभी कुछ समय से मीडिया में यह छप रहा है कि देश में स्थान-स्थान पर मंदिर बनाने का कार्यक्रम चल पड़ा है। हम मंदिर के संबंध में न्यायालय का जो फैसला है, उसे मानेंगे।

लेकिन हमें जानकारी मिली है कि चारों तरफ, अयोध्या में मंदिर बनाने के ढांचे तैयार हो रहे हैं। लखनऊ में गेट बन रहा है तो राजस्थान में कुछ और बन रहा है। यह जांच का विषय है। हमारा उद्देश्य क्या है? हमारे शत्रु कौन हैं? हमारे दुश्मन कौन हैं? पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री श्री गुजराल साहब बैठे हुए हैं। खाड़ी के देशों में, पड़ोसियों के साथ हमारे रिश्ते

... (व्यवधान)

मैं फॉरन पालिसी के विषय में बता रहा हूँ। आप बोलते हैं कि आपने क्यों नहीं फोड़ दिया, आपने क्यों परीक्षण नहीं कर दिया, श्री मुलायम सिंह जी ने क्यों नहीं बटन दबा दिया? श्री वाजपेयी जी ने बटन दबा दिया। बड़ा भारी शेर मारकर लाये।

... (व्यवधान)

अगर हिम्मत है

... (व्यवधान)

अगर आणविक शक्ति में आपको विश्वास होता और न्युक्लियर डिवाइस में आपकी पार्टी की आईडियोलॉजी होती तो इस देश की भावी पीढ़ी को उनके रहन-सहन और संस्कार की शिक्षा हम लोग नहीं देते। जिस आईडियोलॉजी में आपको विश्वास नहीं, फिर उसकी क्या जरूरत थी? खाकी पैट और हाथ में डंडे की क्या जरूरत थी, माथे में टोपी लगाने की क्या जरूरत थी? क्यों आप लोग बोल रहे हैं न्युक्लियर डिवाइस, आणविक विस्फोट, आणविक शक्ति? अगर हिम्मत है तो आज आप आर.एस.एस. को खत्म कर दीजिए। जो न्युक्लियर डिवाइस है, आणविक शक्ति है, वही शिक्षा दीजिए। देश को पोंगापंथ की ओर, लाठी, डंडा और गुल ली पटकने की ओर मत ले जाइये। इसके अलावा आप बोलते हैं कि हमें श्रेय है, क्या यह बता रहे हैं कि इन लोगों ने कुछ नहीं किया।

सभापति जी, मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ

... (व्यवधान)

आप बैठिये। ... (व्यवधान) आप सुनिये। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि १९७४ में विस्फोट हुआ।

... (व्यवधान)

१९७४ में परीक्षण हुआ, उस समय कांग्रेस पार्टी सत्ता में थी। मरूहम श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी देश की प्रधान मंत्री थी। श्री वाजपेयी जी और हम तमाम लोग जेलों में बंद थे। इमरजेंसी लगी थी।

... (व्यवधान)

मेजर जनरल भुवन चन्द्र खण्डूरी, एवीएसएम (गढ़वाल) : वह १९७६ में लगी थी।

श्री लालू प्रसाद : आप हमको ज्यादा मत पढ़ाइये।

... (व्यवधान)

आप सुनने की कोशिश करिये। आप क्यों क्रेडिट लेना चाहते हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

आप सुनिये। १९७४ को देखकर आप लोगों ने और आपकी पार्टी ने भी मन बनाया होगा कि अगर यह विस्फोट कर दिया तो देश हमारे साथ होगा। लेकिन १९७७ में कांग्रेस का सफाया हो गया और अब ये भी सफाये में जाने वाले हैं। इनको आटे-दाल का भाव मालूम हो जायेगा। ... (व्यवधान) आप हमें बोलने दीजिए।

MR. CHAIRMAN : No interruptions please. Let him speak.

श्री लालू प्रसाद : जब प्रधान मंत्री जी और डिफेंस मिनिस्टर इस बात का जवाब देंगे तब मैं नहीं होऊंगा लेकिन हमारे साथी यहां रहेंगे। हम इस बात का जवाब चाहते हैं कि वह क्या गोपनीय बात है? सी.टी.बी.टी. पर दस्तख्त नहीं हो रहा था, दुनिया को मालूम था कि कुछ न कुछ दाल में काला है। भारत इसमें कुछ कर रहा है।

सी.टी.बी.टी. के बारे में आपने बार-बार पूछा कि क्या स्टैंड है? दुनिया को मालूम था कि भारत के पास ये सामान हैं लेकिन आपने भेद खोल दिया, और भारत को आइसोलेट करके रख दिया। आज भारत का कोई मित्र नहीं है। मैं यह महसूस करता हूँ कि जहां हमें संपन्न होने के लिए, अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने के लिए, दुनिया का मुकाबला करने के लिए, अमरीका, रूस, जापान और ब्रिटेन का मुकाबला करने के लिए, आपने एक टेस्ट किया लेकिन उसने हजारों टेस्ट करके रखे हैं। आपके पास कितना सामान है, मैं यह नहीं बोलना चाहता क्योंकि इसे सभी समझते हैं। यह चीज आपको मालूम होगी, आप इसको देखेंगे।

महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपको किसी देश का फेवर नहीं करना चाहिए, भारत का फेवर करना चाहिए, भारत की रक्षा करनी चाहिए।

... (व्यवधान)

अमरीका ने अपनी जान बचा ली। यहां आप विस्फोट करते हैं, अमरीका की टीम पाकिस्तान में जाती है। पाकिस्तान को क्यों हाईलाइट किया जा रहा है। आपकी सफाई का लैटर कि 'मैं अमरीका टीम भेज रहा हूँ', पाकिस्तान तुम मत फोड़ना। वहां से चेतावनी आती है। इलेक्ट्रॉनिक मीडिया और टी.वी. में हम देखकर कि भारत के सवाल पर अमरीका का इकोनॉमिक सैंक्शन कायम रहता है या नहीं, तब हम अपनी बात को रखेंगे। क्या आपने यह भेद नहीं खोला? क्या आपने दुश्मनों को नहीं बताया? मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे पास शक्ति है, हमें अपनी गोपनीयता मेंटेन करना चाहिए, रोड और चौराहों पर उसे उजागर नहीं करना चाहिए। यदि धान और खेती के बारे में कोई साइकोलॉजिकल बात हो तो वह अलग है।

जब मां सीता का अपहरण हुआ, राम बनवास गए, गिद्ध जटायू ने कहा कि रावण मां सीता का अपहरण करके जा रहा है। एक हमारी मां सीता है और दूसरा रावण है। जटायू ने युद्ध किया। रावण को काफी परेशान कर दिया। उसे कोई रास्ता नज़र नहीं आ रहा था। लेकिन गिद्ध जटायू इतने भोले और सीधे थे कि अपनी कमज़ोरी को नहीं पचा सके और रावण से कहा कि यदि वे अग्नि बाण से बचेंगे तो उनकी शक्ति को मानेंगे। रावण बहुत चतुर, कूटनीतिज्ञ और चालाक था। रावण ने अग्नि बाण मारा और गिद्ध जटायू का पंख उड़कर साफ हो गया। क्या आपने अपनी कमज़ोरी को दुनिया के सामने रखने का काम नहीं किया? ... (व्यवधान)

आगे हमारी क्या सोच है। इस देश में गरीबी, भूख और प्यास है। देश के रक्षा बजट पर कितना प्रावधान करना चाहिए, हमें इसके बारे में सोचना चाहिए। ... (व्यवधान) सुरक्षा के ठेकेदार तो आप ही बने हुए हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

आप उड़ने वाले हैं, लड़ने वाले हम लोग ही हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

यह श्रेय वैज्ञानिकों को जाता है कि हमने टेस्ट किया। यह वैज्ञानिकों की उपलब्धि है। ये उनको माला नहीं पहनाते और कहते हैं कि वहां शक्ति पीठ मंदिर बनाएंगे। वहां डा. कलाम द्वार बनना चाहिए, चिदम्बरम द्वार बनना चाहिए, उनकी टीम के साथियों का नाम मार्बल में खोदकर लिखा जाना चाहिए। इसमें सिंघल साहब की क्या जरूरत है? देश की रक्षा सर्वोपरि है, क्या इससे कोई मतभेद है। लेकिन हमने चिट्ठी लिखकर अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति को क्यों हिसाब दिया। क्यों बोलते हैं कि मोनोपली नहीं चलने देंगे? अब क्यों सफाई दे रहे हैं कि तैयार हो जाइए, आत्मनिर्भरता की जरूरत है, सजग हो जाइए। गरीबी, भूख और प्यास मिटाने के बारे में आपने खुद कहा कि भारत के पास प्रचुर समृद्धि है, इसका दोहन करना पड़ेगा। इसके लिए आप सारी पोलिटिकल पार्टीज के लोगों को बुलाइए और खड़े हो जाइए।

इकोनॉमिक सैक्शन, हम नहीं चाहते कि इंडिया भीख मांगे। भिखमंगे बनकर हम नहीं रहना चाहते। हम दुनिया में उनका मुकाबला करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन हमारी बात हवा में न रह जाये। हमारी यही उपलब्धि है कि हमारे वैज्ञानिक काम्प्यूटेंट हैं, इस देश के साइंटिस्ट काम्प्यूटेंट हैं। यह सबूत है कि हमें भारत के वैज्ञानिकों पर गौरव है। वे सब तैयार हैं, उनको साधन दीजिए और दुश्मन, कैपेसिटी और लक्ष्य निर्धारित करिये।

भारत निर्गुंटा का, भारत दुनिया का गुरु कैसे बनेगा? नॉन एलाइंड कण्ट्री बनकर हमने तटस्थता के सिद्धान्त को माना, पंचशील के सिद्धान्त को माना। आपने नेहरू जी का नाम लिया, हम उनका नाम विकास के लिए लेते हैं। आप दुनिया को मनाएंगे, पड़ोसियों से हमारे रिश्ते क्या हों, आपने खुद कबूल किया है तो यह परीक्षा हो गई कि हथियार बनाने के लायक हम हैं, यह हमारे वैज्ञानिकों की उपलब्धि हो गई। लेकिन जो बाकी का मुकाबला हमको करना है, इस मुकाबले पर आपको निश्चित रूप से ऑल पार्टी और राष्ट्र की सहमति जरूर आप लीजिए। बहुत गोपनीय बात को आप मत बताइये, हम आपकी गोपनीय बातें नहीं जानना चाहते हैं। मैं यहां अपनी बात समाप्त करते हुए कहना चाहता हूँ कि पोलिटिकल पार्टीज़ के कई आदमी बोले कि हमने यह कर दिया, हमने वह कर दिया, लड़ें सिपाही, नाम हवलदार का, माल खाये जिलेदार। कल आपको कहना चाहिए कि पोखरण में जो घर क्रैक हुए, पोखरण इलाके में गरीब लोगों के जो मकान थे, जमीन थी, उसको प्रणाम करिये। जिनकी छाती फट गई, जहां इरोजन हुआ उस राजस्थान की जनता को भी हम लोगों को बधाई देनी चाहिए कि जितने भी एक्सपेरीमेंट्स होंगे, वे यहां पर होंगे। राजस्थान की जनता को हम लोग बधाई देते हैं, क्योंकि वही इस धमाके को बर्दाश्त करने की कैपेसिटी रखते हैं।

इस समय देश की सुरक्षा, पड़ोसियों के साथ अच्छे रिश्ते बनाने का प्रश्न हमारे सामने है और अंतिम अस्त्र लड़ाई है। अगर यह नहीं होगा तो लड़ाई होगी, लड़ाई होगी। भारत ने अहिंसा के सहारे, बापू के सहारे अंग्रेजों को सात समुद्र के पार धकेल भगाया। उसमें आपका भी योगदान रहा, क्योंकि कुछ लोग आपमें भी फ्रीडम फाइटर हैं और बापू के बताये हुए रास्ते पर चलते हैं। स्वामी विवेकानन्द जी ने दुनिया में भारत का नाम रौशन किया। न्यूयार्क के शिकागो के हाल में दुनिया भर में विश्व बन्धुत्व का संदेश दिया कि सारी दुनिया के नर-नारी हमारे कुटुम्ब के समान हैं। आपको मांग करनी चाहिए कि जो पांच राष्ट्र हैं, जितने सारे आणविक प्रयोग किये हैं, उनको समुद्र में फेंको, समुद्र में डालो, भारत अहिंसा का पुजारी है।

प्रधान मंत्री जी, आपकी पार्टी में, एलाइज़ पार्टीज़ में, देश की समस्या में चारों तरफ बड़ा भारी भूकम्प मचा हुआ है, इसलिए ये लोग आपको गुमराह कर रहे हैं। यह जो बम फोड़ दिया है तो बस स्वीप कर दिया है, इस गलतफहमी में आप मत पड़िएगा। लड़के लोग बोलते हैं कि कैसा बयान लोग दिलवा देते हैं कि एक और बड़ा बम अभी फोड़ देंगे। अब बिहार में क्या हुआ, लड़के लोग बोल रहे हैं कि जब प्रधान मंत्री बम फोड़ रहे हैं, पुलिस नहीं पकड़ रही है तो हमको बम फोड़ने में क्या दिक्कत है। अब हम भी बम फोड़ें, यह काम मत करिएगा, यह आपको बताना है, इसको भी रोकिये।

">SHRI JAG MOHAN (NEW DELHI): Thank you very much, Sir, for giving me this opportunity. Let me, at the very outset, congratulate the Government most warmly for the courage and commitment they have shown in taking this momentous decision.

16.00 hrs.

Let me also congratulate our great scientists and technologists who have put India on the map of the world and who have done this nation proud. Let me also congratulate the Defence Forces which have played a pivotal role in organising the successful operation.

Now, Sir, there are certain points that are being raised and I would like to deal with them, one by one.

First is the issue of timing. Why should there be this timing? Let me first invite your attention. May I invite your attention?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI JAG MOHAN: May I invite your attention to the manifesto of the B.J.P. and what was also included in the National Agenda later on. The B.J.P. rejects the notion of nuclear apartheid and will actively oppose the attempt to impose the hegemonistic nuclear regime. We will not be dictated by anyone in matters of security requirements and in exercise of nuclear option. Now, there are four components of this. It clearly says that we will not allow hegemonistic power cartels to come in and dictate the world. It is not only the security requirement. We have also said that we will give priority to security requirement and we will be judged on the security requirements. No one else can judge what our security requirements will be.

We have also made it very clear that we will pursue this goal 'actively'. What does 'actively' mean? 'Actively' means that we will pursue it with utmost speed. When we found that it is in our national interest, we had, therefore, acted as quickly as we could. There is nothing wrong when we have also said that the initiative will be in our hands. We will not only be reacting to the events, but we will also take the initiative and determine and shape the events at the international level. We will just not play an reactive role. These are the basic issues which we must keep in mind and it is on the basis of this manifesto that B.J.P. has come into power. It was its duty, the

BJP's duty, because people have endorsed it and it has also find a mention in the National Agenda which has been endorsed by the ruling party. Therefore, it has the endorsement of the majority of the country.

After the tests, opinion polls have come which overwhelmingly support what has been done.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Four metropolitan cities.

SHRI JAG MOHAN : I did not interrupt you.

Anyhow, four metropolitan cities are not a small segment. They represent the views of the masses. If there is any other thing that you can mention.

The other point which I would like to make is that Shri Natwar Singh was at very great pains to mention about our security. What was the urgency about it? What new things had developed? I want to ask him whether this has developed all of a sudden. It is a continuous process.

In 1989, whether you are aware that Gen. Zia-ul-Haq had formulated, what was called, the TOPAC. In 1989 you were not prepared. Do you want something like Pearl Harbour to happen or do you want to be guided by the spirit of Munich. We must be prepared. We must be vigilant and that should be our main concern.

It has been asked as to why are we negotiating. On the one hand, we are saying that we are friends with China and so we are negotiating. On the other hand, we say this. In fact, there is no contradiction. It is because your successful negotiation will depend when you are on an equal footing. You cannot successfully negotiate national interest when you are in a position of weakness.

China has conducted 45 tests. It is still in position to conduct laboratory tests. We do not have any grievance or any intentions against China. We only said, "we want to remain prepared. Time, tide and events change suddenly and we must be prepared for all eventualities." That is the basic issue.

Then, what was the greatest advantage of India in security? That was the advantage of strategic depth. If anyone wants to harm us it could do upto a particular depth. We had advantage of depth. That advantage had gone as soon as this Ghauri missile was fired and lot of announcements were made that it could hit Mumbai and it could hit this and all that. All types of statements were made by Pakistan. We are aware of this. So the issue that has to be seen is that this is not something that we have decided to do suddenly. There are valid considerations for it, very strong justifications for it and you cannot say otherwise.

I want to ask Shri Natwar Singh, what was the security threat that India faced in 1974 when Shrimati Gandhi exploded the nuclear device? We all applauded it.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Can I answer?

SHRI JAG MOHAN : No, you can answer later on. Let me complete. I did not disturb you... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : You answer.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Is Shri Jag Mohan yielding?

SHRI JAG MOHAN : No, I am not... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is not yielding.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Why should he not? He has put a question, he should listen to the answer.

SHRI JAG MOHAN : I have put a question, but he can answer later... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You address the Chair.

SHRI JAG MOHAN : Sir, my point is that it will only interrupt my flow. He can answer later. I am not saying that he would not get the opportunity to answer... (Interruptions)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : He is not interested in listening positive answer... (Interruptions)

SHRI JAG MOHAN : We are interested in positive answer, but you may answer later on... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please stop interrupting him. You please continue, Mr. Jag Mohan.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Please yield!... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: He does not want to yield. I cannot compel the Member to yield.

... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: So far the debate has been going on well, let us continue it.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : This is not right. This is not the way to conduct a debate... (Interruptions)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : There was no security threat, just as there is no security threat now. The reason was that because in 1968, the NP Treaty had a clause that you could have peaceful nuclear explosions under the aegis of the NPT. Shrimati Indira Gandhi said, 'No, we will have our own NPT.' She did that. That was the reason... (Interruptions)

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH (BANKA): There was no security reason... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members may kindly take their seats. Shri Jag Mohan will reply to that.

... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.

... (Interruptions)

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : नहीं तो फिर उस दिन क्या था ?

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : What is the security threat today?

मेजर जनरल भुवन चन्द्र खण्डूरी, एबीएसएम : उस दिन जार्ज फर्नांडीज की रेलवे स्ट्राइक की वजह से ही आप लोगों ने एक्सप्लोजन किया था।... (

Interruptions)

That is why they did so in 1974... (Interruptions)

SHRI JAG MOHAN : Sir, that was the reason, I was not yielding... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt.

... (Interruptions)

MAJOR GENERAL BHUVAN CHANDRA KHANDURI, AVSM : Shrimati Gandhi wanted to stop him from doing that, that is why it was done at that time... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The whole country is watching us, let us not do like this.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI JAG MOHAN (NEW DELHI): Then, Sir, I was saying about Pakistan. Even before the Pokhran-I, that is in 1974, there were reports that Pakistan had been clandestinely trying to acquire nuclear atomic power. Even after 1972, when the Shimla agreement was signed, we magnanimously released all the prisoners and surrendered all advantages just to see that Mr. Bhutto was very liberally treated. What Mr. Bhutto did when he reached there, back in Pakistan? After a few days, he shot a letter to Gen. Tikka Khan. This was reported in his book also. He said: "This is only a temporary measure. Be prepared for a war. Upgrade your weaponry and we will teach them a lesson. We have always taught lessons to these people." That is the spirit against which we are functioning.

Now, when Mr. Aslam Beg, Mr. Nawaz Sharief and Mrs. Benazir Bhutto go on saying all type of things, all that we are saying is that we also want to be prepared. We are not using it. It is a measure of self-defence to remain in preparedness.

Sir, history teaches us. When you are weak, it tends the other fellow to come up. It whets the appetite of those people. If you want to keep some people away, you have to be vigilant and you have to be strong. Otherwise, someone will be tempted to take advantage of your weakness. We should never allow that. It is not an aggressive posture. It is the posture to remain vigilant and learn some lessons from history. As I said, we do not want the spirit of Munich to visit us and we do not want the spirit of Pearl Harbour to visit us.

There is one other justification. How do you upgrade your technology? How do you dovetail the new technology of missile with your explosions? You can do so only when you experiment, only when you actually test and find out whether your calculations are right or wrong. These five tests are the most sophisticated tests meant to integrate, apart from the technology of explosion, the missile technology with the explosive technology. This was absolutely necessary from the point of view of technological upgradation, from the point of view of improvement, from the point of view of strategy and from the point of use which come into being. This was a very important measure and a very timely measure. It has now put India on the map of the world. Now the world cannot take us for granted. Earlier what was being done was that just one-sixth of the human race was being ignored by the nuclear club and we were being dictated. They were saying: "This is good for us and not good for you." What is this? This great civilization and this great culture could be dictated by the nuclear club. Are we living in a democratic world or not? Is it not the violation of the United Nations Charter? It is our assertion against that undemocratic behaviour of this nuclear club or this power cartel. It is an assertion of our self-respect, we are counting advantages and we are counting costs. It will be a great inspiration to the nation and for generations and generations, our young people will draw inspiration from this and it will give self-confidence and courage, a new dynamism, a new drive and a new initiative to this nation. Previously we were just getting cynical, we were incapable of doing anything and anybody can come and turn around us. There is something deeper than that is not visible on the surface. We should not ignore this.

The other point which I want to make in this regard is the issue of giving credit. Our distinguished and a very senior colleague, Shri Indrajit Gupta, mentioned that we have taken the credit, nobody wants to give credit to us. It is the credit that belongs to our scientists and technologists. I agree that the scientists and technologists have their credit.

I give as much credit as anybody else would give. But you cannot deny this fact that for putting this into operation political courage and political commitment was needed. That was not forthcoming from the previous regimes and this credit and this commitment has been demonstrated on May 11 and May 13 by our decisions. In fact, I do not say that the political party, our political party alone has contributed. I do not say that the scientists alone contributed. Every streetman has contributed, every village man has contributed because, after all, it is with their taxes that we are financing these projects and we will have to show the credit. I salute all of them. You



have to give credit to a political party, I am sure you should not deny this. We are entitled to credit for this momentous decision. The political advantage has come to us. It has to come to us.

Our Prime Minister was very magnanimous and he said that it is a continuous national effort and what has happened is the culmination of that national effort. I entirely agree that this is a culmination of the national effort. But all of us have made a contribution. But the issue is you knew the answer. We knew the answer. But it is only we, who have written the answer on the pages of history. It is we who have written this answer, you did not write and so you should not grudge. Those who have written them will be remembered in the pages of history as those who have written. And even for all this effort, I would put it this way. You have passed the examination. Every political party has passed the examination. Some have passed in third division, someone has passed in second division and some in first division with distinction. I think we can claim that we have passed this examination with distinction. Thus the credit should come to us.

I would like to mention one more fact. It has been reported in the Press and I think there are reasonable grounds to believing it to be true that Shri Narasimha Rao at the time when the CTBT was under discussion or the NPT was under discussion was thinking of exploding the nuclear device. In fact, it has been stated that this file has been on the table of every Prime Minister. That was probably the time when China was exploding it or France was exploding. Before the turn for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty came, India could have exploded. Why did they not do it? Because that level of commitment and level of courage was not forthcoming. That was the time. That was the time and the courage was not forthcoming.

After all, for 24 long years you have neglected this. Obviously our technology remained undeveloped. The technology has been developed now. These decisions apart from the upgradation have also shown courage and demonstrated to the world that they cannot take us for granted.

Now there is another factor. If you test, if you encourage your scientists and engineers they will also sharpen their technology. They will learn from their experience. The technological and scientific base of the society would improve and we can achieve great many things in many other fields and I have with me an article written in The International Herald Tribune by an American. He writes about Dr. Abdul Kalam, our great scientist. He quotes him and says that at one stage Dr. Abdul Kalam was getting so frustrated that he was not getting an opportunity and political approval was not being given to him for testing -- and he was getting so frustrated -- that he wanted to leave the Government and go away and become a Vice-Chancellor of Madras University. That is what you are doing to your scientists and their morale!

And when the morale is down, then the scientific advancement cannot take place; technological advancement cannot take place. They have not given sufficient opportunities for 24 years to scientific and technological talents. That is why they could not prosper. Most of them have gone abroad, have joined IAS or have joined some other private firms. The best talent of this country should have been used for research and development. That has not happened.

There was a plan to create 10,000 m.w. of nuclear power by 1987-88. The provision was made and equipments worth Rs. 500 crore were purchased. They are lying unutilised. But, then, this programme was curtailed under pressure. The financial provision was not made and the poor scientists were told to go and borrow it from the market. There was a suggestion to float bonds by the Nuclear Power Corporation. But who will buy those bonds? They were starving of money. That is how the scientific base, the technological base of the society was damaged.

Now, we have got only a few top and budding scientists. We would have much greater talent if we had given them this opportunity to go on testing and proving and from the sharpening of the mind we would have also reaped many more things.

These are not the only parameters. There are larger parameters with dipper significance of what we have done. This is not only an assertion of our self-respect, of our knowledge, of our competence but also an assertion of the fact that we are willing to give concrete shape to our security requirements. This is a point to the world that they cannot ignore 1,000 million people. But this is not the only parameter; this is not the only significance. Another

significance is to tell the world that it is being dominated by the power cartel and we will not accept this domination of the power cartel. This power cartel is now having an advantageous position with regard to every sphere of activity.

Let me quote a Russian intellectual. He says, "All the issues of international relations; the issue of security; economics; international politics and so on are being dominated by the cartel. These issues are being effectively settled by a Directorate headed by the United States." Even what does Samuel Huntington says about it, I would like to quote:

"The West in effect is using these international institutions, its military power and economic resources to run the world that will maintain Western predominance, protect Western interests and promote Western political and economic values. That at least is the way in which the non-Western sees the new world, and there is a significant element of truth in this view."

What we have said is that we are not allowing this power cartel to continue with its dominance. We want to make the world opinion sensitive to this issue. We have asserted our right that we will not accept an unjust and unfair order.

Our former Prime Minister, who is a distinguished and international expert and also a Urdu Poet, is sitting here. I would remind him what Faiz Ahmed Faiz has said. I quote:

अरसा-ए-दहर की झुलसी हुई वीरानी में,

हमको रहना है तो यूं ही रहना है।

अजनबी हाथों का बेनामगर अम्बार सितम,

आज सहना है हमेशा तो नहीं सहना है।

So, what we want to tell is that all right you have dominated for quite long, but by this self-assertion, we have said that this power cartel is not acceptable to us. That is why, quite a lot of world opinion - maybe incipient world opinion - has really applauded the Indian efforts. It has applauded our efforts. I am sure that this step will revive the Nonalignment Movement. It will give a new strength to these independent people.

Shri Indrajit Gupta was saying that there is no power and water in Delhi and we are exploding bombs. One of the reasons of our poverty is that this international economic system is manipulating the system in such a way that very few resources are left for the poor people. This is happening all over the world. This is not happening in India alone, this is happening in all the developing countries.

I will just give you one statistics. After all the talk of UNDP, Brundtland Commission, Willie Brandt Commission, and various other Commissions were saying that they will give this much aid and they will do this and the poor should be helped. But what was the actual result? In 1960, the income disparity between the bottom 20 per cent of the world population and the top 20 per cent of the world population was 30 times. Now, it is 60 times. How is it that these disparities are growing? It is because what was earlier taken away by military domination, what was earlier taken away by selling of manufactured goods at a higher price, what was taken away by things like cheap labour and cheap raw materials is now being taken away by the manipulation of the international system and by the manipulation of price by exchange rates. They are maintaining this domination. Seventy or Eighty per cent of the world resources are cornered by 15 to 20 per cent of the people. When you have got the world's resources, you will have the best technology, you will have the best brains, you will have the best resources and you will go on increasing your strength.

They have established a very unfair world order and this test of ours is in a very humble way an assertion of the fact that we understand this and

now you cannot impose another unfair item through this unfair global system that you will have the monopoly of the nuclear power and no one else will have. This is what the issue is. We must understand that. We are not against anybody. We are only saying that the world should understand that this system will not work.

Now, let me state what our point is. This test is not only for our security, it is really for world peace because what we have demonstrated is that this monopoly power cannot be allowed and if you want real world peace, you must eliminate all weapons. We will not carry out any tests. You must have an international agreement that all nuclear stockpiles will be eliminated within a specified period and no test will be done in the laboratory or elsewhere. Now, once you have completed the tests and developed the technology, it gives you all the benefits of a laboratory test. Now, even in the laboratory, they are developing a warhead which can penetrate deep into the earth. They need not test now. On the one hand, they are acquiring more and more lethal and dangerous technology and on the other hand, they are telling us that we should not do anything. By doing this, they will be dominating the world completely by this technology. So, if they are really concerned with the world peace and international stability, then we must have a new and a genuine Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, a genuine control over the weapons. If they can have control over biological weapons or eliminate biological or chemical weapons, then why not the atomic weapons?

I will just go through the opinion of the International Court of Justice. Now, why are these cartels not sensitive to the unanimous view expressed by the International Court of Justice?

I will just quote one line from that. What does the International Court of Justice say? This is a unanimous view. There are some other views also. But so far as this aspect is concerned, this is a unanimous view. It says:

"There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and to bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

We will be the first party to this kind of an arrangement. Let everybody be equal. Let nobody has this threatening power in his hand.

Then, there are many new Commissions and there is the very famous Canberra Commission. I will read just one paragraph from its recent report. It says:

"The Canberra Commission is persuaded that immediate and determined efforts need to be made to rid the world of nuclear weapons and the threat they pose to it....Nuclear weapons are held by a handful of States which insist that these weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet reserve uniquely to themselves the right to own them. This situation is highly discriminatory and unstable; it cannot be sustained; it must be quickly changed."

Sir, what was India's stand in the International Court of Justice? What was our submission there? Our submission was that we stand by this that there should be a total, real and genuine disarmament as early as possible so that all the world resources could be devoted towards peace, progress and development. If there is equitable distribution of resources and a saving from disarmament, it would help development. Even now, the United States of America is spending \$33 billion only on maintenance of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and \$4 million every year just to have a sort of screening from the missile attack. So, trillions of dollars are being spent and they can all be saved. Why do these sensitive people who are now constituting the cartel not listen to the advice of the International Court of Justice and also to the advice of Commissions like the Canberra Commission?

Sir, President Clinton has said that India need not have done these tests. He also said that India is going to be a great power in the 21st Century. I would pose a counter question. America is a great country. It is a great civilization. We all respect them for their enterprise, for their initiative, for the great work that they have done and for the great achievements that they have made. But why are they being monopolists? Why do they want to act as a global constable? Why do they not agree to this opinion of the International Court of Justice or why do they not listen to the opinion of the Canberra Commission?

I would also like to remind President Clinton what their own former Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and former Defence Secretary McNamara had said. President Woodrow Wilson had said in 1915 that America was created to serve the humanity. Let me just quote a few lines from the address which he gave to the American nationals of foreign origin. He said:

"You do not love humanity if you seek to divide humanity in jealous camps...."

The present policy against which we are asserting ourselves is of dividing the world in jealous camps.

What does it say further? It says:

"America was created to serve the humanity and not to divide mankind."

Should President Clinton not take this message to the 21st Century? What did President Eisenhower say in his farewell address? The point that he made was that every atom bomb exploded will mean millions of hungry people and millions of waterless people. So, you must stop that. What was President Kennedy's message? He said that all these weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us. What was McNamara's message? He said: "The best security is development and without development there can be no security".

So, if all these principles are followed all over the world, the world will really become a great world in the 21st Century. We will make our contribution. We are a great civilization. Our value system is that we are one great family. That is our culture, that is our civilization and we would like to make that contribution. As Arnold Tony had said, the 21st Century belongs to India. What he really meant was that the value systems of India would dominate the new world. Let us all cooperate and create a peaceful and progressive world which is free from hunger, which is free from disease and India will contribute to that. India's contribution to that has always been very humble and at the same time, of high order.

I would once again say that this issue should be considered in the larger perspective and our technology and knowhow is really meant for our own self-defence and for peaceful purposes. Ultimately, we will convert all these for peaceful purposes.

I would again say that we are neither against Pakistan nor against China. We only want that when we sit at the negotiating table, they should not get the impression that we are a weak nation and we can be pushed around.

">

श्री चन्द्रशेखर (बलिया) (उ.प्र.) : सभापति जी, मैं प्रारंभ में ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं परमाणु बम की राजनीति के विरुद्ध हूँ। व्यक्तिगत तौर से मैं इस बारे में बहुत स्पष्ट हूँ कि परमाणु बम की राजनीति विनाश की राजनीति है, यह मृत्यु की राजनीति है, यह मानवता के संहार की राजनीति है, लेकिन परमाणु बम हमें बनाना चाहिए या नहीं यह अधिकार हमारा है। इसके ऊपर कोई रोक नहीं लगाई जा सकती। दुनिया के बड़े राष्ट्र इस पर रोक लगाकर स्वयं परमाणु बम बनाएं, यह स्वीकार नहीं किया जा सकता। इसी नीति को भारत ने इतने वर्षों तक अपनाया और उसे चलाया भी। हमने कहा कि हम परमाणु शक्ति के बारे में शोध करेंगे, उसको मानवता के विकास के लिए उपयोग में लाएंगे, लेकिन हमने हमेशा कहा कि हम संहार के लिए इसका इस्तेमाल नहीं करेंगे, देश की जरूरत होगी तो उस बारे में अपना विकल्प खुला रखेंगे। हम उस बात से अपने को अलग नहीं कर पाते हैं। जगमोहन जी के बड़े साहसपूर्ण और उत्साह भरे भाषण से मेरे मन पर कोई बड़ा प्रभाव नहीं पड़ा क्योंकि वह भाषण बड़ा बचकाना भाषण था -- बचकाना इस मायने में कि उन्होंने कहा कि हर प्रधान मंत्री की टेबल पर वह फाइल गई। दुनिया के लोग इसे सुनकर हंसेंगे। जगमोहन जी पढ़े-लिखे आदमी हैं, उनसे मैं अपेक्षा करता था। कौन फाइल किस प्रधान मंत्री के यहां जाती है, इसकी चर्चा तो मैं नहीं करूंगा मगर मैं भी थोड़े दिन प्रधान मंत्री था। मेरे पास प्रधान मंत्री की हैसियत से यह फाइल नहीं आई थी।

आप कुछ कहना चाहते हैं जगमोहन जी?

SHRI JAG MOHAN : I only said that it has been reported in the press that this decision was pending with every Prime Minister. I did not say that I believe in it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : It is totally wrong. No such decision was pending before any Prime Minister. This is totally incorrect. It is irresponsible. It is maligning the whole system of Government in this country.

मैं उस फाइल के बारे में नहीं कहता लेकिन आपको याद होगा श्री राजीव गांधी ने दुनिया के सामने कहा था कि दुनिया अणुशक्ति के हथियारों के बिना हो और जिस दिन दुनिया ने उसे स्वीकार नहीं किया उस दिन से भारत ने अपने विकल्प कभी बंद नहीं किये। उस दिशा में कदम उठते रहे और कदम चलते रहे। मैं इससे अधिक कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता। क्योंकि आज एक होड़ लग गई है कि हमने बम फोड़ा या किसी और ने उसमें सहायता की। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी को बधाई दूँ या धन्यवाद दूँ, क्योंकि उन्होंने कहा कि दूसरों ने भी कुछ उसमें हिस्सा बंटवाया। एक सदस्य ने, शायद इन्होंने ही कहा कि यह उनकी उदारता थी कि दूसरों के बारे में उन्होंने कुछ कह दिया। इस बात को मैं क्यों नहीं कह रहा हूँ, जैसा मैंने आपके सामने कहा कि अणुशक्ति को बढ़ावा देना, इसके बदले बम बनाने की बात करना आज दुनिया के सामने एक नासमझी की बात है और वह नासमझी दुनिया स्वीकार कर चुकी है। आज हमसे बार-बार कहा जाता है कि इससे हमारे देश की सुरक्षा पर जो खतरा है वह कम हो जायेगा। पहले तो मैं कहूँगा कि नटवरसिंह जी ने पता नहीं भूल से या अपनी पुरानी बात याद करके एक सही बात कहने का साहस किया। कांग्रेस पार्टी में, ऐसा साहस शायद, मालूम होता है, पिछले एक महीने तक नहीं था, आज यह साहस आ गया है। मैं इसके लिए उनको बधाई देता हूँ। मैं इसलिए कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सुरक्षा के ऊपर पहले कोई खतरा नहीं था और अगर खतरा था तो पोखरण के विस्फोट से कम नहीं हो गया, वह खतरा अपनी जगह पर है। क्या आप जानते हैं कि अमरीका के पास दुनिया में सबसे अधिक अणुबम हैं। अमरीका १२ वर्षों तक वियतनाम में लड़ता रहा, बे ऑफ पिग्स में दोनों फौजें आमने-सामने खड़ी रहीं। अमरीका के लोगों ने बम क्यों नहीं चला दिया। रूस के पास दुनिया में दूसरे नम्बर का अणुबम है। वह देश टूट गया, बिखर गया, उसके चार-पांच राज्यों के पास आज भी अणुबम हैं

... (व्यवधान)

बारह हों या ग्यारह हों, हम उसमें नहीं जाते। अणुबम से सुरक्षा नहीं बढ़ती। अणुबम की बात करके, सुरक्षा पर खतरा बंद करके, आपने देश के लोगों का मनोबल नहीं बढ़ाया है। देश के लोगो के सामने आपने अपना बाहुबल पुजवाने के लिए एक काल्पनिक खतरा पैदा किया है, यह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है।

राजनीति में यह भी कहा गया कि हमने इतिहास पर हस्ताक्षर कर दिये हैं। इतिहास पर हस्ताक्षर करने के लिए भारत के इतिहास के विकृत मत कीजिए, यह खतरनाक खेल है। क्योंकि इतिहास बड़ा क्रूर निर्णायक होता है। इतिहास कोई एक दिन में नहीं लिखा जाता, अखबारों के पन्नों से इतिहास नहीं लिखा जाता, लोगों के प्रशस्ति गानों से इतिहास नहीं लिखा जाता। मैं जानता हूँ और मैं यह बात इसलिए कह रहा हूँ क्योंकि एक ओर दुनिया के लोगों ने अणुबम के सहारे सुरक्षा की कल्पना को अस्वीकार कर दिया है। शायद आपको यह मालूम नहीं। आप बहुत नोट बनाकर ले आये थे। आज दुनिया यह भी मानती है कि हिरोशिमा पर बम गिराने की जरूरत नहीं थी, उसके पहले जापान आत्म समर्पण करने को तैयार था। आज अमरीका के लोग भी कहते हैं कि अगर वह बम नहीं गिरता तब भी वही हादसा होता, उस लड़ाई का वही फल होता, जो जापान में हुआ था। लेकिन आप भी उसी बात को कहते जा रहे हैं। मैं उन बातों को दोहराना नहीं चाहता जिनको नटवरसिंह जी ने कहा लेकिन कौन नहीं जानता पिछले ८-१० वर्षों में हमारे देश के चीन से रिश्ते अच्छे बने हैं। पाकिस्तान के साथ हमने संबंध सुधारने का प्रयास किया। हमारे मित्र गुजराल साहब आज बहुत दुखी होंगे क्योंकि उनकी गुजराल डाक्टरिन पता नहीं कहां चली गई। मैंने तभी उनसे कहा था यह डाक्टरिन मत बनाइये, यह डाक्टरिन बहुत दिन चलने वाली नहीं है। अटल जी मैं आज आपको भी कहता हूँ कि पुरुषार्थ का यह ढोंग पीटना देश के लिए खतरनाक होगा। यह आपके लिए भी लाभदायक नहीं होने वाला है क्योंकि यह एक खतरनाक खेल है। दुनिया में अगर यह होड़ लग गई और यह होड़ इस उपमहाद्वीप में लग गई है, जैसा आज दिखायी पड़ता है तो पता नहीं इस उपमहाद्वीप का क्या होने वाला है। अभी मैंने सुना कि हम दुनिया के इतिहास में अपना एक रोल अदा करेंगे। हम किसी से डरते नहीं, हमने अपना स्थान बना लिया - किसके सामने ये बातें कह रहे हैं।

आज सारी दुनिया हमारे बारे में जानती है। सभापति जी, मार्च १९९७ में हमारे देश पर ९१ बिलियन डालर का कर्जा था। १५ बिलियन डालर का कर्जा हमारे एन.आर.आई.ज. और दूसरे लोगों का था। १०२ बिलियन डालर का कर्जा लेकर आज हम दुनिया को एक नई राह दिखाने के लिए एक नये संकल्प के साथ चल रहे हैं। अणुबम से कोई फायदा हो या न हो, जिस दिन से आपने इस अणुबम को फोड़ा है रुपये की कीमत डालर के मुकाबले में दो रुपये कम हो गई है। २१२ बिलियन डालर का कर्जा आज इस देश के ऊपर और बढ़ गया है। क्या यह बात आप देश को बता सकते हो। यह २१२ बिलियन डालर भारतीय जनता पार्टी नहीं देगी, समाजवादी पार्टी नहीं देगी, चंद्रशेखर, गुजराल और शरद पवार नहीं देंगे। यह पैसा देश के गरीब लोगों की पॉकेट से आयेगा। कहते हैं कि पैसे की कोई कमी नहीं है। मैं नहीं जानता हमारे मित्र यशवंत जी कहां है। उनके ऊपर क्या गुजर रही होगी। अणुबम की सराहना करते-करते वह कहीं और सोच रहे होंगे कि बजट को कैसे संतुलित बनायें। यह एक समस्या है। आज यह समस्या सुरक्षा की नहीं है। अगर आज यह सुरक्षा की समस्या होती तो हम इस देश के मनोबल को ऊंचा करने की कोशिश करते। हमारे सामने वह एक उदाहरण था। दुनिया के लोगों ने कहा कि अणुबम डिटेरेंट हो या नहीं हो। वियतनाम के लोगों का मनोबल अणुबम का एक डिटेरेंट था, क्या उसकी ओर भी आपने कभी ध्यान दिया है। क्या भारत की जनता के भूखे-प्यासे लोगों की ओर भी आपकी निगाह जाती है। इस संसद में बैठकरके हम इस बात के लिए श्रेय लेना चाहते हैं कि हमारा भी उसमें थोड़ा कंट्रीब्यूशन था। हमने भी अणुबम बनाने में थोड़ा साथ दिया था और मुझे आश्चर्य होता है सरकारी पार्टी उसका श्रेय लेना चाहे तो ले। विरोधी पार्टी के लोग भी इसमें जैसे होड़ में लगे हुए हैं, यह एक खतरनाक खेल है और इस खतरनाक खेल में हम सारे देश को झोंकते जा रहे हैं। इससे हमें लगता है कि हमारा भविष्य एक भयावह संकट की ओर चला जा रहा है।

सभापति जी, मैं आपसे एक बात और कहना चाहूँगा इस उपमहाद्वीप में हम क्या चाहते हैं क्या हम एक दूसरे पर बम चलाकर अपने को विजयी घोषित कर सकेंगे। लाहौर पर जो बम गिरेगा तो अमृतसर का क्या होगा। हम कहते हैं हमारे मित्र जॉर्ज फर्नांडीज और हम लोग पुराने समाजवादी हैं। हम बोलने में बड़ा विश्वास रखते हैं और वाणी की स्वतंत्रता हम लोगों का जन्मसिद्ध अधिकार है। लेकिन हम लोग यह भूल जाते हैं कि कभी-कभी कर्तव्य के लिए वाणी को विश्राम भी देना चाहिए। इसलिए मुझे उनसे कोई शिकायत नहीं है। क्योंकि हम लोग उस परम्परा को भूल ही नहीं पाते हैं। वाणी खुली हुई हो, जो चाहे मौके-बेमौके जो बोलना हो बोल दें, चाहे उसका परिणाम जो भी हो। अटल जी ने एक बड़ा बम बनाया उसके बाद संतुलित हो गये। मैं उनको बार-बार गुरुदेव कहता हूँ, मुझे प्रसन्नता हुई जब वह संतुलित भाषा में बोले। लेकिन आडवाणी जी को क्या हो गया, वह भी ललकारने लगे। जैसे पुरुषार्थ की परम्परा इस देश में फिर से जग गई हो। हमारे मित्र भैरोंसिंह शेखावत पोखरण की मिट्टी लेकर घूमने लगे। वह चित्तौड़, हल्दी घाटी भूल गये, वह मीरा को भूल गये, वह अजमेर के ख्वाजा गरीब नवाज को भूल गये और वह राजस्थान की परम्परा भूल गये। इस मिट्टी को लेकर जिस मिट्टी में पता नहीं कोई विषाक्त कण ही पड़े हों, उसको लेकर वह कहां जाना चाहते हैं। इस तरह लोगों के मन में जज्बात पैदा करके इस देश में एक गलत होड़ पैदा मत कीजिए। हथियारों की होड़ पैदा करके दुनिया के अनेक देशों ने अनेक क्षेत्रों में बरबादी का माजरा देखा है और क्या इस देश में भी यही काम होने जा रहा है। क्या हुआ दुनिया के दूसरे गरीब देशों में, इन्हीं बड़े लोगों ने इस प्रकार के उत्साह उन लोगों के मन में जगाये और जगाकरके एक-दूसरे को लड़ाकर अपने हथियार बेचे। मैं नहीं जानता कहीं किसी कोने से कहीं कोई हमको भी न उकसा रहा हो। मैं किसी के ऊपर कोई संदेह नहीं करता। लेकिन एक ओर अणुबम का विस्फोट होता है और दूसरी ओर सी.टी.बी.टी. पर दस्तखत करने की भी बात चलती है तो मन में यह शंका पैदा होना कोई गलत बात नहीं होगी। लेकिन सभापति जी याद रखिये अब कोई इच्छा नहीं है कि सी.टी.बी.टी. पर हम दस्तखत करते हैं या नहीं करते हैं।

हम करें या न करें, लेकिन दुनिया हमारे इरादे को जान गई है, ऐसा अभी हमारे एक भाई ने कहा कि जो गुप्त था, जो लोगों की निगाह से छिपा हुआ था, उसको दुनिया के सामने रख दिया। जिसके खिलाफ हम यह काम करने जा रहे हैं उसको हमने एक बड़ा भारी अवसर दिया है। मैं नहीं जानता कि वही भूल हमारे नवाज शरीफ साहब करेंगे। अगर नवाज शरीफ साहब वह भूल न करें, तो आज जैसी स्थिति में वे हैं, उसका जवाब हमारे पास नहीं है। दुनिया के दूसरे देश उनको सारी सुरक्षा दे सकते हैं, उनको सारी सहायता दे सकते हैं, उनको सारा धन दे सकते हैं।

बेअकल लोगों की सलाह लेने से प्रधान मंत्री जी कभी-कभी हम खतरों में पड़ जाते हैं। कभी-कभी अतिउत्साह में काम करने से आदमी अपने विनाश की ओर चला जाता है। यह काम हमारे देश में हो रहा है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इससे आज ही विरक्त हों। मैं नहीं जानता कि आप कैसे विरक्त हो सकते हैं क्योंकि आपने एक ऐसा कदम उठा लिया है जिससे पीछे हटना शायद आपके लिए संभव नहीं है। मैं जानता हूँ कि ये कदम पुरुषार्थ के बल पर नहीं उठाए गए बल्कि अंदर से कांपता हुआ दिल और ऊंचे स्वरों में कुछ कहकर दुनिया को लुभाना चाहते हैं, दुनिया को यह दिखाना चाहते हैं कि हम असमर्थ नहीं हैं, हम अपंग नहीं हैं, हमारे अंदर शक्ति है, हमारे अंदर ताकत है, हमारे अंदर क्षमता है। तुलसी दास ने कहा है-

सूर समर करणि कहि न चलावहिं आप

विद्यमान रण पाहि के कायर करहि प्रलाप

यह प्रलाप, सामर्थ्य का द्योतक नहीं है। यह प्रलाप कमजोरी है, यह मन का डर है। इस मन के डर को अपने मन से निकालिए। हमारे जैसे बड़े देश की सुरक्षा के लिए अगर खतरा है, तो वह खतरा परमाणु बम से दूर होने वाला नहीं है। उस खतरों को दूर करने के लिए देश के एक-एक व्यक्ति को जगाना होगा, देश के लोगों में एक नया आत्मविश्वास पैदा करना होगा।

मैंने अभी एक बड़े नेता का भाषण अखबारों में पढ़ा। उसमें उन्होंने कहा कि अच्छा हुआ जो हमारे ऊपर सैनिकान लग रही हैं। विदेशी लोग हमारे ऊपर सैनिकान लगा रहे हैं। अगर हमें बाहर से पैसा नहीं मिलेगा, तो हम स्वदेशी और स्वावलंबन का नारा लगाएंगे। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि स्वदेशी और स्वावलंबन का नारा कोई विवशता का नारा नहीं है। यह आत्मविश्वास का नारा है। यह लोगों के प्रति श्रद्धा का नारा है। इसको विवशता का नारा मत बनाइए। स्वदेशी का नारा विवशता का नारा नहीं लगाते। स्वदेशी का नारा गांधी लगा सकता है। स्वावलंबन का नारा वह लगा सकता है जो आधी धोती पहनकर, गरीबों के साथ एकात्म कर के उन करोड़ों लोगों को ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ खड़ा कर सकता था। दोनों बातें नहीं चलेंगी। एक तरफ उदारिकरण की नीति को चलने देने का बात कहते हैं और दूसरी ओर आप परमाणु बम विस्फोट की बात कहते हैं। आप अमेरिका का मुकाबला करेंगे या दुनिया के बड़े देशों का मुकाबला करेंगे और विश्व बैंक को चुनौती देने की बात करेंगे और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्रा कोष की कोई परवाह नहीं करेंगे, तो कैसे काम चलेगा। एक ओर बम विस्फोट और दूसरी ओर उदारिकरण की नीति, ये दोनों बातें कैसे चलेंगी। यह किस राष्ट्रनायक की भाषा है? अगर आप जानते हैं कि हम बम विस्फोट कर रहे हैं, दुनिया के लोग सैनिकान लगाएंगे, तो उदारिकरण की बात छोड़िए। तमाम दुनिया के देशों के सामने अपनी परिस्थितियों को रखें, अपने दृष्टिकोण को रखें, देश के लोगों को तैयार करें।

कौन नहीं जानता, हमारे मित्र नटवर सिंह जी ने अभी बड़े जोरों से कहा था कि अगर परमाणु बम विस्फोट के कारण हमारे देश पर सैनिकान लगती हैं, तो हम आपका समर्थन करेंगे, हम खड़े हो जाएंगे। कहां खड़े हो जाएंगे? मुझे मालूम नहीं। श्रीमान उदारिकरण आपकी ही सरकार ने स्वीकार किया था। उसका फल भुगतने के लिए देश तैयार है। वैसे यह देश उसका फल आसानी से भुगतता, लेकिन हमारे नए प्रधान मंत्री महोदय, हमारे गुरुदेव ने बम विस्फोट करके उसके फल भुगतने के लिए वातावरण जल्दी तैयार कर दिया। इस बात से आपको गुरेज नहीं होनी चाहिए। उन्होंने तो आपकी ही सहायता की है।

सभापति महोदय, हम लोग तो चले जाएंगे, लेकिन आने वाली पीढ़ियों को हम क्या छोड़कर जाने वाले हैं? इतनी जल्दी-जल्दी काम करके हम लोग स्वयं उसको भुगतना चाहते हैं, यह अच्छी बात है। नहीं, तो इसी भ्रम में देश की जनता रह जाएगी कि शायद उदारिकरण से कोई बड़ी भारी सफलता मिलेगी, बड़ा भारी विकास होगा, बड़ा भारी उत्थान होने वाला है और उस उत्थान के बल पर देश एक नई दिशा की ओर जा रहा है।

सभापति महोदय, मैं बहुत विनम्र शब्दों में कहूंगा, मैं आलोचना नहीं कर रहा हूँ, मुझे एक भयंकर भविष्य दिखाई पड़ रहा है। मुझे ऐसा लग रहा है कि हम जाने-अनजाने उस दिशा में जा रहे हैं जिसका ज्ञान हमें नहीं है। यदि हमने दुनिया के इतिहास में झांक कर देखा होता, जरा रुक कर अगर हमने सोचा होता, अगर यह सोचा होता कि इन २४ वर्षों तक ये विस्फोट क्यों नहीं किए गए, तो शायद हमें उन्हीं फाइलों के पन्नों में यह मिल जाता कि विस्फोट करना आसान है, लेकिन उसके परिणाम भुगतना कोई आसान काम नहीं है और उसकी जरूरत क्या है?

क्या वह विस्फोट जरूरी था? क्या अर्थशास्त्र में हमको सामर्थ्य देने के लिए उसकी जरूरत थी। हमारे वैज्ञानिक जो कार्य कर रहे हैं, उसके लिए वे बधाई के पात्र हैं। लेकिन आजकल एक और नयी बात चल गयी है कि केवल हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ही वक्तव्य नहीं देते, हमारे रक्षा मंत्री ही वक्तव्य नहीं देते बल्कि सरकारी अधिकारी भी वक्तव्य देते हैं और वे अधिकारी इस तरह का वक्तव्य देते हैं जैसे वे लड़ाई के लिए कल ही तैयार हैं। जनतंत्र में यह कैसे हो गया। हमने श्री आडवाणी जी का भाषण अखबारों में पढ़ा कि वह राष्ट्रपति प्रणाली लागू करना चाहते हैं। पता नहीं राष्ट्रपति प्रणाली कब आयेगी लेकिन अटल जी ने अपने कार्यालय में राष्ट्रपति प्रणाली लागू कर दी है। सरकारी ऊंचे पद पर एक पार्टी के सदस्य को बैठाकर उन्होंने एक नयी परम्परा को लागू किया है और उस सदस्य ने शपथ ली हो या न ली हो, उससे कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता। उनका जब टी.वी. पर भाषण सुन रहा था तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उस जोश

से आडवाणी जी भी नहीं बोल सकते जिस जोश से वे बी.जे.पी. की सराहना कर रहे थे और कह रहे थे कि हम दुनिया को दिखा देंगे कि हमारे पास कितनी सामर्थ्य है। मत कीजिए आप इस काम को। जब संविधान में संशोधन कर लेंगे, तब राष्ट्रपति प्रणाली आ जायेगी, और जब वह सिस्टम इस देश में लागू हो जायेगा तब इन सरकारी कर्मचारियों को अधिक उत्साह के साथ खुलकर बात करने की छूट दीजिए, मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं होगा। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि इस सिस्टम को नीचे-नीचे आप कुरेद देना चाहते हैं। इस सिस्टम को आप नीचे-नीचे तोड़ देना चाहते हैं। यह खेल अगर बहुत दिनों तक चलता रहा तो इसके परिणाम बुरे होंगे। यह मत समझिये कि हमारे वीरता भरे भाषणों से दुनिया पर कोई प्रभाव पड़ रहा है। दुनिया हमारा मखौल उड़ा रही है, हम पर हंस रही है। जो लोग

आपकी तारीफ कर रहे हैं, वह इसलिए कर रहे हैं कि हम इस बर्बादी के रास्ते पर और तेजी से चलें। मैं यहां पर यह कहने के लिए आया हूँ ताकि आप अब भी समझिये। बम नहीं बल्कि लोगों का मनोबल बढ़ाने की कोशिश कीजिए। उसी पर भारत का भविष्य निर्भर है। इस रास्ते से जितनी जल्दी आप विरत हो और देश को जितनी जल्दी इन ज़जबातों की दौड़ से छुटकारा दिला सकें तो हमारे लिए, देश के लिए एक नये भविष्य का सूत्रपात होगा। धन्यवाद।

">SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM (SIVAGANGA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this debate, I believe, is not about the testing of the nuclear device. Neither this House nor the people of this country are divided on that issue.

A few days ago, the Government was good enough to ask scientists to brief some of us on what we accomplished technically and scientifically through the tests. Some of the reasons were quite convincing. They said "We want to validate on the field, on the ground what we had accomplished through computer simulation. We want an opportunity to pass on to the next generation of scientists the knowledge and the skills involved in the simulation as well as tests."

Sir, we have tested some nuclear devices. We pay fulsome tribute to the scientists, technologists and the engineers. We are proud that we have demonstrated our capability in this area. We are happy that these skills, acquired in 1974, have been updated and are preserved. On that, there is no quarrel. If that is all that this Government wanted to do, much of the cacophony that has followed the testing would have been absent.

This debate is about the consequences of the action that you, Mr. Prime Minister, took on 11th May and 13th May. Has this Government thought through the implications of its action?

Testing is the first step. Next is weaponisation. Yesterday, the Defence Minister is reported to have said that weaponisation is complete. The day after the tests, a Cabinet Minister was quoted as having said in Bangalore that the next step is mounting warheads on missiles.

17.00 hrs.

On the day the two scientists told the nation that weaponisation is underway, that same evening, the Political Advisor to the Prime Minister appeared on the Star TV and said, "no decision has been taken on weaponisation." The Prime Minister proclaimed that India is a nuclear weapons State. What does that mean? Have we weaponised? Have we made weapons? And after you weaponise, the next stage is stockpiling. Have you thought through what stockpiling means? How many weapons will be in an active state and how many will be in a passive state? And after stockpiling, will you induct it into the armed forces? After inducting it into the armed forces, will you mount it on missiles or other platforms? Has the Government thought through all these steps? I find no evidence of any such thinking in the Prime Minister's short statement or in the Prime Minister's long statement. I suspect, he first intended to read the long statement but then he decided that discretion is the better part of valour and he read the short statement.

This debate is about a cynical, manipulated agenda behind this testing. We, therefore, question the motives of this Government in testing at this point of time and we also question the absence of rigorous thinking on the part of this Government on the consequences of testing and the consequences of weaponisation. The Prime Minister disclaims that he has any intention of entering India into an arms race. He may have no intention. But what he has done and what the Defence Minister said yesterday, "is being done", means that we are well into an arms race. We have bombs and they are not in the basement any more. We have weapons now. What will we do with that? We will have to either mount them on missiles or mount them on aircraft. You have made both your major neighbours sworn enemies as a result of what you did on the 11th and 13th May. What will they do? They will acquire air defence systems, as the scientists conceded to us. Some of your scientists told us that they can get over their air defence systems, which means, they will then acquire air defence systems which can get over their missiles, which can get over your current air defence systems. They will acquire surface to air missiles, they will acquire air to air missiles. They may even ask the superpowers to provide them a nuclear umbrella. Then what will you do? You will then acquire missiles which can get over their new air defence systems. This is precisely the kind of arms race which marked the cold war for 30 years. This is precisely the scenario of star wars which the world debunked, criticised and condemned. What you are doing in this South Asian theatre is a smaller version of star wars in which Soviet Union and US were engaged for 30 years and which invited the condemnation of the whole world. It is not simple. We do not make a bomb to keep it in the basement.

Shri Jagmohan asked Shri Natwar Singh: "What was the difference between 1974 and 1998?" The difference is this. When Shrimati Indira Gandhi tested it, she did not utter a word about weaponisation. You tested it and before the mushroom clouds die down, your Ministers were talking about weaponisation, about mounting warheads on missiles, about the unfinished agenda, about hot pursuit and about a fourth war. Where is he going away? Does he not want to know the date and place of the fourth war? What is this we are doing? These are the questions the people of India will ask. And what are you doing from your Party? Anyone who asks this question is being painted as unpatriotic or a traitor. That is the cynical manipulative agenda that we question.

One hundred and seventy-five scientists headed by some of the most reputed minds from the Institute of Mathematical Science and other institutions all over the world have come out and spoken against what you have done.

A couple of days ago in Jaipur, a number of scientists have said that this Government has put India on a perilous path. For these questions, we need answers. And, I am afraid, Mr. Prime Minister, that there are no answers to these questions in your short or in your long statements.

A number of friends asked from this side, why did you test now? What was the provocation? Please remember that many, who were in Government, are still in this House. There are, in this House, three former Prime Ministers. The last two Prime Ministers are Members of this House. The person who occupied that high office until the 18th of March to which you succeeded on the 19th of March, is a Member of this House. Some of us are aware of the threat perceptions and threat assessments. We are not all in the the dark. We are not all children. We are not all ignorant of what is happening around us.

You promised in your National Agenda although you denied it in the Outlook interview, and the Outlook Editor either has misquoted you or he has committed a great misdemeanor on which you should take action against him. He asked you the question that the Government in its National Agenda had promised a strategic Defence review before inducting nuclear weapons. Why was this not done? Your answer, Mr. Prime Minister was and I quote:

"There was no such promise in the National Agenda."

Either you have been misquoted by the Editor or your answer was plainly wrong because in parenthesis he extracts what your National Agenda says. And, let me read that for the record. Your National Agenda point no. 26 released by the Prime Minister on March, 18 states:

"We will establish a National Security Council to analyse the military, economic and political threats to the nation, also to continuously advise the Government. This Council will undertake India's first ever strategic Defence review. To ensure the security, territorial integrity and unity of India, we will take all necessary steps and exercise all available options. Towards that end, we will re-evaluate the Nuclear Policy and exercise the option to induct nuclear weapons."

If this was your agenda, you promised to set up a National Security Council, you promised to analyse the military and political threats to the nation, you promised to undertake the first ever strategic Defence review, you promised to re-evaluate the Nuclear Policy and you promised that at the end of the exercise, you will exercise the option to induct nuclear weapons. Do you seriously want us to believe that all this was done between the 19th of March and the 8th of April when you told Dr. Kalam and others to go ahead with the tests?

Your case, Mr. Prime Minister, is most unconvincing. Your case is extremely weak. It is built on very shallow foundations and I would urge you to share with us, what did you discover between the 19th of March and the 8th of April which Shri Gujral did not discover on the 18th of March? What analysis, what evaluation did your experts make and tell you by the 8th of April which they did not tell Shri Gujral or Shri Mulayam Singh or others who were in the Cabinet Committee on Security?

Sir, my conclusion is that the Government has not discovered a new threat. It invented one. Shri George Fernandes first reported to a startled nation that there was a helipad in Arunachal Pradesh and when we asked



him what was the source, he said the Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh in which event the Chief Minister of Arunachal Pradesh should be the Defence Minister of India. Then, he reported that along the line of control between India and China, a road was being built and when the Press asked him what was the source, he said the Chief Minister of Orissa.

Why does he not pick on Chief Ministers of BJP? Why does he pick on the Chief Ministers of the Congress Party? Then he dreamed up this great theory that in Coco Islands the Chinese had set up missiles which were targeted against India. I have searched the newspapers for the last 17 days, there is now no mention of Coco Islands. Just like the great argument between potato chips and computer chips was thrown over board after you assumed power, Coco Islands seems to have been thrown overboard. It seems to me, wittingly or unwittingly, the Defence Minister was used as a pawn to invent a threat. Having invented a threat, the Prime Minister, backed by his Home Minister, comes and says 'here is our nuclear bomb, beware the whole world, India is now a conquering nation.' This is the worst service that you can do for India. What you have done is to create a new axis, as my friend Shri Natwar Singh has said, between the United States, China and Pakistan.

China was no threat to India. The last war with China was fought 36 years ago. The circumstances under which that war began and concluded are still surrounded in controversy. The last war with Pakistan was fought 27 years ago. Only last year, I was present when Prime Minister Gujral engaged Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in two meetings in New York and in Edinburgh. He engaged President Clinton in a dialogue at the end of which President Clinton said 'I understand your concerns and I will visit you and we will continue the talk.' He engaged Prime Minister Tony Blair in a dialogue in Edinburgh and when there was so much talk about Britain mediating, thanks to a Junior Minister's thoughtless remarks, Prime Minister Tony Blair quite candidly said 'Britain had no intention of mediating between India and Pakistan and this was a bilateral issue.' I was present when these dialogues took place. I am sure, when he intervenes in the debate tomorrow, Shri Gujral will throw more light on it.

In our judgment, and I say this with firm conviction, China was no threat on the 18th of March, China was no threat on the 19th of March, China was no threat on the 8th of April, China was no threat on the 11th or the 13th of May. You have invented a threat in China.

We understand that there are difficulties with Pakistan. But how are you going to resolve these difficulties? If you want to throw the Gujral Doctrine overboard, please do so, but substitute it by the Vajpayee Doctrine and not by the Advani Doctrine. There is a vast distinction between the Vajpayee Doctrine and the Advani Doctrine. Shri Advani, for whom I have great respect, said that the geo-political situation had changed in India's favour after the 11th of May. He has to explain that statement. What does he mean by that? Does he mean that India weaponising a nuclear device has changed the geo-political situation? Does he mean that India will use that weapon as a weapon of offence? What does your statement say? The statement says the nuclear weapons will be used only in self defence. We asked this question to scientists. Shri Jaswant Singh was present, Shri Pramod Mahajan was present. It was unfortunate that no elected Minister was present at the meeting. I asked them as to what is this nuclear weapon as a weapon of self-defence. I can understand a tank being used as an offensive weapon or a defensive weapon. If a tank enters enemy territory, it is an offensive weapon. Or you can fall back to defend an Indian position in which case a tank becomes a weapon of defence. I can understand an aircraft being an offensive weapon or a defensive weapon. If an aircraft strikes at enemy territory this is a weapon of offence. You can fall back again and defend your own cities, defend your own targets, and it becomes a weapon of defence. But how is a nuclear bomb a weapon of self-defence? Where will you explode this nuclear bomb? If you use it as a weapon of offence, you will explode it in the enemy territory. If it is a weapon of self-defence, where will you explode it? I ask you a further question. I dare you to stand up and say Mr. Prime Minister that you will ever use this nuclear weapon.

This nuclear weapon can never be used. It was last used in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. For the last 57 years, no country in the world has dared to use this nuclear weapon. Saddam Hussein of Iraq was not frightened by the nuclear arsenal of America. Whether he was right or wrong, that is another matter but he was not frightened by America's nuclear arsenal. Vietnam, that brave little country, which fought a war for twelve years was not frightened by the United States of America. Afghanistan was not frightened by either the Russian nuclear

weapon or the American nuclear weapon. Cuba, for thirty years boycotted, is not afraid of the American nuclear weapon.

Weaponisation, induction of these weapons into the Armed Forces, mounting weapons on missiles and aircraft and developing missiles to deliver them into enemy territory are very serious subjects on which I do not believe that your Government has a mandate to take a unilateral decision. On testing, we stand with you. As a demonstration of our scientific and technological capability, as a reaffirmation of our scientific skills, as an opportunity to pass on such skills and knowledge to succeeding generations of scientists, we stand with you. We hail India's scientists.

I am doubly proud that I share the name of a great scientist. I feel quite honoured about it. I think, we should record that three of the four scientists - Dr. Kakodkar, Dr. Santhanam along with Dr. Abdul Kalam and Dr. Chidambaram - belong to my State. I am doubly proud - as an Indian and as a Tamilian. But, that is where we must draw the line. Until then, we are with you. If anybody threatens you with sanctions, we are with you; if anybody threatens you with consequences, we are with you. The point of departure is: 'What will you now do?' Will you go the Advani way in hot pursuit in changing the geo-political situation? Will you go the George Fernandes way and weaponise? Will you go the Murli Manohar Joshi way and mount weapons on our missiles and aircraft? What will you do? You have not told us anything. That is where we question the motives and intentions of this Government.

The Prime Minister has said that we will now be a very responsible nation, we will act with great restraint. I accept your word. Sometimes, the poet in you who wrote that famous poem against nuclear weapons finds his way into the statement that you are drafting as Prime Minister. But possessing nuclear weapons is simply inconsistent with the moral authority that India had acquired over the last thirty years to tell the world that our goal is a nuclear weapon-free world. If you seriously believe in a nuclear weapon-free world, I most humbly urge you to abjure weaponisation until there is a full and proper debate in this country and in this Parliament on the need to acquire nuclear weapons and to induct them into the Armed Forces. It is simply inconsistent - and it cuts at the root of our commitment to a nuclear weapon-free world - to acquire a whole arsenal of nuclear weapons.

I will say a word about sanctions. I am not worried about the indirect cost of economic sanctions. As a nation, we will pay any price and bear any burden to withstand those sanctions. I am concerned about the direct costs of weaponisation. I think, you have been poorly advised on the costs of weaponisation. The costs will be exponential. As you weaponise and as what you perceive are enemies acquire arms and equipment to confront your weaponisation, you will push India into an arms race and the direct consequence of weaponisation and that arms race will be simply unbearable. I caution you, Mr. Prime Minister to do a re-evaluation of the direct costs of weaponisation.

Finally, what saddens me most is that for the first time in independent India's history, India's foreign policy and nuclear policy which hitherto have enjoyed unprecedented consensus stands fractured.

For the first time, on elements of foreign policy we are divided; and for the first time on the nuclear policy we are divided. This Government has divided us by its thoughtless action and even more by thoughtless statements following that action without taking us into confidence. My fear is that from this point of time this Government can take one of the three roads. One is the road to a local, limited war. I think there are people in this Government who would actively canvass to travel down this road. The other is the road to sign the CTBT. There are statements by a number of people including the Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister that we are willing to negotiate and accept some aspects of the CTBT. I think we should have a full-scale debate on the meaning of that statement. The CTBT is not open to negotiations. It is only open to signature and 149 countries have already signed it. You can sign it up to September, 1999. It does not provide for negotiations. Who will you negotiate with? Who has offered to negotiate CTBT with you? The second road, therefore, means the road which France and China took -- do a few tests, acquire some political advantage and quietly sign the CTBT which means all the carefully constructed statements of the last five years that we will not sign the CTBT lie in a shambles.

The third road is the road to elections. Since I do not believe that you have the courage to take us to a war and since I do not believe that you have the skills to negotiate the CTBT, I am afraid you are cynically taking us to the road to elections.

MAJOR GENERAL BHUVAN CHANDRA KHANDURI, AVSM : Why are you afraid of elections?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : We are not afraid. We are only sad. ... (Interruptions)

That is your real agenda. Why did the Prime Minister declare that there was no intention of holding elections? Who asked him that question to make that answer? Obviously some of you must have posed that question to him. Obviously some of you must have planted that idea in his mind. So, he has to answer saying 'No'. ... (Interruptions)

I therefore submit that this Government owes a great deal of explanation to this country; this Government owes a fuller statement to this Parliament; and this Government owes a great deal of explanation on the various statements made by various Ministers in the last fifteen or sixteen days.

While we support and hail the scientists and technologists who have demonstrated India's scientific skills, I on behalf of my party would like to place on record that we are opposed to weaponisation; we are opposed to building a nuclear arsenal; and we are opposed to taking India into an arms race. As the world enters the 21st century, as nations which were as poorer as our country twenty years ago march towards prosperity, India would have taken a perilous road and India would have incurred an unbearable cost just to satisfy the vanity of a political party which has acquired power after the elections.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Next to speak is Shri George Fernandes. Before I call him, I would like to bring to the notice of the House that at 5.30 p.m. we have to take up the Matters under Rule 377.

... (Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Let him conclude and then we will take up Matters under Rule 377. ... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was decided by the hon. Speaker that it would be taken up at 5.30 p.m. As many as 24 hon. Members have given notice under Rule 377. Is it the pleasure of the House to postpone it for tomorrow or should they be laid on the Table of the House today?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Then, we will take it up tomorrow. Is it all right?

... (Interruptions)

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The House has agreed to take up the Matters under Rule 377 tomorrow.

Now, Shri George Fernandes.

">

रक्षा मंत्री (श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज़): महोदय, मुझे एक बात पर खुशी हुई कि हमारे वैज्ञानिकों के कामों पर इस सदन में सब की राय एक है, उनका यहां सभी ने अभिनन्दन किया है। मुझे एक ही बात से थोड़ी सी तकलीफ हुई जब हमारे मित्र श्री चिदम्बरम ने पहले उन १७५ वैज्ञानिकों की बात की, उन्होंने हम लोगों के पोखरन में किए हुए कार्य की निन्दी की है। अगर पोखरख नहीं होता, हमारे वैज्ञानिक नहीं होते, न १९७४ वाला पोखरन इस राजनीति से जुड़ा था, तब भी वैज्ञानिकों को पूरा श्रेय था। पोखरन का ११ मई और १३ मई, १९९८ का परीक्षण भी उन्हीं वैज्ञानिकों के काम, उनकी बुद्धि और काबलियत की उपलब्धि रहा। हम भी सबसे पहले उन वैज्ञानिकों का, विशेषकर डा. अब्दुल कलाम, डा. चिदम्बरम, डा. काकोड़कर, संतानम जी तथा उनके सैकड़ों सहयोगी जो उसमें शामिल रहे,

केवल उनके सहयोगी मात्र नहीं, बल्कि इस काम में जो भी टैक्नीशियन शामिल थे, जो इन्जीनियर इस काम में लगे, जो सेना के जवान इसमें लगे, उन सब का आज के दिन इस सदन में अभिनन्दन करना चाहते हैं।

महोदय, आज सुबह जब यहां प्रधानमंत्री जी का वक्तव्य रखा गया, जब उन्होंने अपना वक्तव्य पेश किया और उसके साथ एक दस्तावेज भी रखा, कि कैसी परिस्थिति में इस प्रयोग को वहां किया गया, वह सब यहां सभापटल पर रखा गया। तब मैंने सोचा था कि इस पर कोई विवादास्पद बहस नहीं होगी, चूंकि प्रधानमंत्री जी ने बहुत स्पष्ट बातें रखी हैं। उनके सभापटल पर रखे गए वक्तव्य में, किसी भी प्रकार की न दलीय, न किसी एक समूह का श्रेय वगैरह लेने की कोई बात है। पंडित नेहरू से लेकर उन्होंने आज तक इस पर किए हुए सारे काम की भी चर्चा की, लेकिन बहस में जरूर कुछ विवादास्पद मुद्दे आने स्वाभाविक थे और उसमें कोई आपत्ति भी नहीं करनी चाहिए। १९७४ में जब विस्फोट हुआ था- पोखरन-वन, तब मैं दिल्ली की तिहाड़ जेल में बंद था। १ मई की रात को दो बजे लखनऊ के रेलवे स्टेशन पर मेरी गिरफ्तारी हुई थी और उसी रात को तीन बजे मुझे यहां हवाई जहाज से पहुंचा दिया गया था। जब १८ मई को वहां विस्फोट हुआ था और हम उस रात को सोए नहीं थे। हमने एक पचास रातभर लिखा था। इसका जो नाम बाद में छपा गया, वह था- ‘

## India's Bomb and Indira's India."

हम अणु हथियारों के मात्र नहीं, बल्कि उन सारे हथियारों के विरोधी रहे। हालांकि इमर्जेंसी में हमने भी थोड़ी बहुत हरकत की थी, लेकिन उसकी चर्चा यहां पर नहीं हुई। मैं इसलिए इस बात को कह रहा हूँ कि विरोध या अपनी-अपनी इस मामले में राय, कहां तक होनी चाहिए, कहां तक नहीं होनी चाहिए।

बम बनना चाहिए, नहीं बनना चाहिए, हथियार बनने चाहिए, नहीं बनने चाहिए, इस पर राय हो सकती है और राय यहां पर आ जाती है तो उसमें हमें कोई शिकायत नहीं करनी है। लेकिन मुझे परेशानी इस बात की है कि यहां बार-बार पूछा गया, बार-बार यहां टोका गया कि यह कब आपको महसूस हुआ कि कोई ऐसी परिस्थिति है जिससे कोई कदम उठाना जरूरी है और यह अभी क्यों हुआ? यह प्रश्न ठोस रूप में इंद्रजीत जी ने उठाया था कि यह अभी क्यों हुआ? साथ ही शायद ही किसी ने इस बात को यहां पर न जोड़ा हो कि ऐसी कौनसी आपके सामने परिस्थितियां निर्मित हो गयी थीं जिनको लेकर ऐसे निर्णय पर आपको आना पड़ा। यह भी सबूत यहां पर रखा गया, जैसे नटवर सिंह जी ने सदन में विदेश मंत्रालय की ओर से दिए हुए एक-दो वक्तव्यों को कहा कि ‘बातचीत जारी है’, ‘अच्छे रिश्ते हैं’। इस बात से कोई इंकार नहीं करता है कि बातचीत जारी है और बातचीत जारी रहनी भी चाहिए और बातचीत चलती भी रही है।

मैं सदन का समय अनेक दस्तावेजी सबूतों को यहां पर रखकर खराब करना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन कुछ दस्तावेजों का उल्लेख-मात्र करना चाहता हूँ ताकि जो बहस दो दिन चलने वाली है उसमें हमारे माननीय सदस्य और अन्य लोग, जिनको इस मामले में दिलचस्पी है, उन दस्तावेजों का थोड़ा सा अध्ययन कर लें। सबसे पहले मैं तीन दस्तावेजों का जिक्र कर रहा हूँ जिनको लोग देखें और पढ़ें। रक्षा मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार की वार्षिक रिपोर्ट १९९४-९५ का पन्ना नम्बर तीन अवश्य देखें। वह लाइब्रेरी में मिल जाएगा। दूसरा, रक्षा मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार की वार्षिक रिपोर्ट १९९५-९६ का पन्ना नम्बर दो, तीन, चार देखें। तीसरा, रक्षा मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार की वार्षिक रिपोर्ट १९९६-९७ का पन्ना नम्बर दो, तीन और छः अवश्य देखें। ये पन्ने आपको बता देंगे कि भारत सरकार के एक नहीं दो रक्षा मंत्रियों का नाम इसमें है। एक तो पी.वी. नरसिंह राव का, जो १९९३ से १९९६ तक रक्षा मंत्री भी रहे और दूसरा मुलायम सिंह यादव का, जो एक जून १९९६ से कुछ दिनों पहले तक रक्षा मंत्री रहे। उनके हस्ताक्षर उस पर नहीं हैं चूंकि सरकार की रिपोर्ट है लेकिन उनका नाम है।

... (व्यवधान)

शरद जी उसके पहले थे। यह सरकारी रिपोर्ट है, जो लाइब्रेरी में है। देश भर में जिसको पढ़ना हो, पढ़ने के लिए उपलब्ध है। यदि पहले इनको देखा होता तो मैं समझता हूँ कि बहस की दिशा कुछ और ही होती। मैं वहीं तक नहीं रुक रहा हूँ। मैं तीन और रिपोर्टों का भी हवाला देना चाहता हूँ। स्टैंडिंग कमेटी ऑन डिफेंस -१९९५, दसवीं लोक सभा की अगस्त १९९५ की पांचवीं रिपोर्ट; मार्च १९९६, सातवीं रिपोर्ट और मार्च १९९६, आठवीं रिपोर्ट। रिपोर्ट खोजने में समय और परेशानी न हो, इसलिए मैं यह बताना चाहूंगा कि कौनसा पन्ना देखा जाए?

पांचवीं रिपोर्ट का १६ नम्बर का पन्ना देखा जाए। इसमें कमेटी के चेयरमैन का नाम पता नहीं कहां लिखा है?

... (व्यवधान)

१९९५-९६ में शरद दिग्गे इसके चेयरमैन थे और अमल दत्ता, हन्नान मोल्लाह और इन्द्रजीत गुप्त सदस्य थे। इस रिपोर्ट को देखा जाए क्योंकि वह पढ़ने लायक है। चूंकि मैं इस बहस को यहीं तक सीमित रख रहा हूँ। सातवीं रिपोर्ट का नौ और दस नम्बर का पन्ना देखा जाए। नौवें नम्बर का अंतिम पैराग्राफ शुरु होता है और दस पर समाप्त हो जाता है। आठवीं रिपोर्ट का चार और ग्यारह नम्बर का पन्ना पढ़ा जाए। इसी सदन ने, इसी लोक सभा ने स्टैंडिंग कमेटी के जरिए सारे देश को आगाह किया। उसने सारे देश को आगाह किया कि क्या चुनौतियां हैं, क्या होना चाहिए, किस रूप में होना चाहिए? चिदम्बरम साहब अभी स्टार वार्स तक ले गए। उन्होंने बताया कि किन-किन चीजों की जरूरत पड़ेगी, मिसाइल यहां से वहां और वहां से यहां कैसे उड़ेंगे? उन्होंने इसकी एक तस्वीर पेश की। हम चाहेंगे कि आप भी इसको जरा पढ़ लें। क्या-क्या चीजें होनी चाहिए? इसमें सब सिफारिशें हैं।

सभापति महोदय, अब सवाल यह है कि इस समय क्यों हुआ? वह इसलिए हुआ कि अभी तक नहीं हुआ था। मैं इस बात को गम्भीरता से कह रहा हूँ। हमारे जैसे कुछ लोग इसके विरोधी रहे। मैं इस सदन में १९६८ से इसके विरोध में रहा लेकिन जब १९९६ में गुजराल जी देश के विदेश मंत्री थे और देवेगौड़ा जी देश के प्रधान मंत्री थे, उस समय जब सी.टी.बी.टी. का यहां मामला आया, तब मैंने यहां खड़े होकर कहा था कि मैं जीवन भर इसका विरोध करता रहा लेकिन आज हम इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचे हैं कि हमारे देश का भविष्य, हमारे देश की सुरक्षा और जिस तरह हमारे देश के ऊपर कुछ ताकतों का क्लब है, वे उनके जरिए हावी होना चाहते हैं। अगर हम इस भूमिका को आगे ले जाना नहीं चाहते तो जो हमारी अभी तक सोच थी, मैंने वे बातें बड़ी पीड़ा के साथ कही थीं। मैंने भाषण का अंत करते हुए महात्मा गांधी की कही बात को उद्धृत किया था। महात्मा गांधी जी ने कहा था कि

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

यह बात कह कर मैंने कहा था कि मैं अब कोई भी ऑप्शन लेने के लिए तैयार हूँ। अलग-अलग लोगों की अलग-अलग समय पर भिन्न-भिन्न सोच रही है। सोच बदलती रहती है। मुझे विश्वास है कि आज जिन लोगों के मन में इन बातों को लेकर तकलीफ है, उनकी वह तकलीफ मेरे भाषण के बाद दूर हो जाएगी। मैं चन्द्रशेखर जी की तकलीफ को समझ सकता हूँ क्योंकि हम लोगों की भी वही तकलीफ रही है। मैं उनकी बातों की इज्जत करता हूँ। हम उनकी बात किसी को नहीं कहेंगे। मैं जरूर इस बात को मानूंगा कि कुछ चीजें आज के दिन देश की सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से आवश्यक हैं। उसको देखते हुए हमने सही कदम उठाया।

सभापति महोदय, कुछ टोका-टाकी मेरे बारे में हो गई। वे होनी भी चाहिए। इसकी शुरुआत इन्द्रजीत गुप्त ने की। उन्होंने मेरा कुछ इतिहास भी बता दिया लेकिन अनेक मामलों में वह ठीक बोलते हैं लेकिन इस मामले में उनकी याद कुछ ठीक नहीं रही होगी या वह मेरे ऊपर इतने गुस्से में रहे होंगे कि वह सब कुछ भूल गए।

चूँकि उन्होंने कहा कि, **Socialist International is based in Amsterdam,**

चाइना बेइटर है और जार्ज फर्नान्डीज़ उस सोशलिस्ट इंटरनेशनल का नेता है।' मैं १९७३ से लेकर १९७७ की १ मई तक सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का अध्यक्ष था, जब जनता पार्टी बनी। उसमें से पूरे एक साल मैं भूमिगत था। लगभग एक साल मैं जेल में था और १ मई को हमारी सोशलिस्ट पार्टी, भारतीय जनसंघ, मोरारजी भाई तथा अशोक मेहता की कांग्रेस पार्टी, चौधरी चरण सिंह का भारतीय क्रांति दल और बाबू जगजीवन राम की कांग्रेस फौर डेमोक्रेसी, सबने एक होकर जनता पार्टी बनाई थी। सोशलिस्ट पार्टी १९७६ के अप्रैल महीने से १९७७ की १ मई तक सोशलिस्ट इंटरनेशनल की बाकायदा एफिलियेट थी। मैं उसमें कोई पदाधिकारी नहीं था। पार्टी का अध्यक्ष था, लेकिन इंटरनेशनल का मैं कोई पदाधिकारी नहीं था और जिस दिन सोशलिस्ट पार्टी जनता पार्टी बन गई, उस दिन हमारा एफिलियेशन समाप्त हो गया। आज हिन्दुस्तान में एक पार्टी जरूर उससे एफिलियेटेड है और उस पार्टी के नेता भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री श्री इंद्र कुमार गुजराल हैं। सोशलिस्ट इंटरनेशनल कार्डिसिल की बैठक इसी राजधानी में जब आप गृह मंत्री थे और वे प्रधान मंत्री थे, तो विज्ञान भवन में, लगभग एक साल पहले हुई थी और उसमें जार्ज फर्नान्डीज़ कितना नालायक है, इस पर वक्तव्य हुए थे जो अखबारों में छपकर आए थे, जिस पर अग्रलेख लिखे गये थे। उस सोशलिस्ट इंटरनेशनल का मुख्यालय ऐम्सटर्डम में नहीं है, लंदन में है और हमेशा लंदन में रहा है। इसलिए मुझे सोशलिस्ट इंटरनेशनल से कोई मतलब नहीं है। अभी चंद दिन पहले, आठ-दस रोज पहले उसकी इंटरनेशनल कार्डिसिल की बैठक स्टोकहोम में हुई और जनता दल के एक पदाधिकारी, एक ज़माने में राज्य सभा के सदस्य रहे -- श्री बापू कालदाते, प्रतिनिधि के तौर पर वहां गए। वहां एक प्रस्ताव हुआ जिस प्रस्ताव में हम लोगों के देश की निन्दा नहीं हुई लेकिन पोखरन की निन्दा हो गई। हमारे जो भी मित्र हैं, उन मित्रों से संपर्क करके हमने कोशिश की कि हम लोगों पर बहुत हमला न हो और वहां से हमको लिखित जानकारी आ गई कि इतनी मेहनत करके यहां तक उसे रोक दिया। उस सोशलिस्ट इंटरनेशनल की आज विश्व के २० राष्ट्रों में सरकारें हैं। जहां भी हमारे मित्र हैं, हम अपना फर्ज मानते हैं कि हमारे देश के ऊपर जहां भी किसी भी प्रकार का शाब्दिक या अन्य किसम का हमला हो तो वहां हम अपनी मित्रता का इस्तेमाल करें और जहां हमारे ऊपर यानी मेरे देश के ऊपर होने वाली चोट को रोक सकते हैं या कम कर सकते हैं वह हम करें और वह मैंने किया है। इसलिए आपने जो बात कही, उस पर मुझे खुलासा देना बहुत जरूरी था।

जब यह बात चल रही है कि क्यों इसी समय यह हुआ, कुछ लोगों का कहना है कि सबको विश्वास में लेना चाहिए था, मुझे नहीं मालूम कि १९७४ में कितने लोगों को विश्वास में लिया गया था, और मैं यह भी नहीं जानता कि विश्व में किस देश में यह संभव है कि इस प्रकार का कोई भी काम, जिसमें सैक्शन आने वाले हों, पता नहीं कहां-कहां से क्या-क्या हमले होने वाले हों, तो सबसे विचार-विमर्श करके सारे विश्व को उसकी खबर देकर, हम लोग उस काम को करें। मुझे नहीं मालूम क्या यही सरकार में रहे हुए लोग हैं जो डिप्लोमेसी और फौरेन पौलिसीज़ के मामलों में इतनी बुद्धि और जानकारी रखते हैं क्या उनकी यही डिप्लोमेसी है कि सारे विश्व को बता दो कि हम फलां चीज़ करने जा रहे हैं और आप रोकना चाहते हैं तो रोकिये? हम नहीं समझ पाए और उनका तर्क मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है।

लेकिन सभापति महोदय हम लोगों ने जब यह निर्णय लिया तो उस निर्णय के पीछे अगर मैं अंग्रेजी शब्द का इस्तेमाल करूँ तो परसैप्शन्स, थ्रेट, परसैप्शन्स, सिक्वोरिटी परसैप्शन्स, यहां पर कहा गया है कि मैंने चीन को एनिमी नम्बर वन कहा। सभापति जी, मैं बोल-बोलकर थक गया कि मैंने ऐसा नहीं कहा। एक मुलाकात हमसे किसी ने टेलीविजन के लिए की थी तो उन्होंने हमसे पूछा '

Do you consider China as enemy No.1?"

मैंने कहा 'नहीं'। उन्होंने आगे जाकर पूछा कि फिर आप क्या समझते हैं, तब मैंने कहा कि हम इतना तो जरूर मानेंगे

in terms of threat perceptions.

हमारी उसके बारे में एक समझ है, मैंने यह कहा। इससे अधिक मैंने कुछ नहीं कहा लेकिन उसका अर्थ यह भी नहीं कि चीन से हमारा टकराव होना चाहिए या चीन से हमारी मित्रता नहीं रहनी चाहिए।

मैं अभी दो महीने सात दिन से मंत्री हूँ। हमारे यहां चीन की पीपुल्स लिबरेशन आर्मी के सिपहसालार जनरल झू आये थे। उनसे हमारी मुलाकात हुई, अच्छी बातें हुई। बातचीत करके रिश्ते बनाये रखने का प्रयास करना, रिश्ते जहां बिगड़ते हों, उसको सुधारना, ये सारे काम चलते रहने चाहिए। इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती। मेरी भी नहीं हो सकती और न सरकार की हो सकती है क्योंकि मैं यहां कोई अपनी व्यक्तिगत बात नहीं रख रहा हूँ। लेकिन मेरे ऊपर यह भी आरोप है कि मैं चाईना बेइटिंग का कोई व्यक्तिगत एजेंडा लेकर मैदान में आया। मैंने बताया कि इसको पढ़ने के बाद आप महसूस नहीं करेंगे कि मैंने अपना कोई व्यक्तिगत

एजेडा चलाया। मेरी सरकार के रक्षा मंत्री के नाते जो जिम्मेदारी है, उस जिम्मेदारी को ईमानदारी से निभाने के लिए देश को क्या-क्या चीजों की आवश्यकता है, कहां-कहां हम लोगों को किस प्रकार के कदम उठाने चाहिए, इसके बारे में जो हमारी जिम्मेदारी है, हमने केवल उसी जिम्मेदारी को निभाया। कहां-कहां हमने किन-किन का नाम लिया और क्या-क्या चीजें कहीं, कुछ नाम हमने लिये और बाद में वे नाम गायब हो गये। ये सब चीजें बतायी गयी हैं।

मैं एक दस्तावेज की ओर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ और इसलिए आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ चूंकि गुजराल साहब यहां पर बैठे हैं और उनके कुछ विचार इस दस्तावेज में हैं। यह दस्तावेज लाइब्रेरी में नहीं मिलेगा। लेकिन हम इसको रखने के लिए तैयार हैं। दिल्ली में एक अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन हुआ था। उस सम्मेलन में गुजराल साहब का दिया हुआ यह वक्तव्य है और इसके पढ़ने के बाद चिदम्बरम साहब आपके जितने प्रश्न हैं, उनका जवाब मिल जायेगा। आप इसको पूरा मत पढियेगा। बहुत लम्बा भाषण है लेकिन जो पढ़ने लायक बातें हैं, उसको हमने मार्क करके रखा है। हमने जो भी कोई बातें छोड़ी हैं, उसकी जानकारी आपको मिल जायेगी।

सभापति जी, मैं इसको इसलिए नहीं पढ़ रहा हूँ चूंकि मैं किसी को परेशानी में नहीं डालना चाहता हूँ।

... (व्यवधान)

नहीं-नहीं मैं नहीं पढ़ूंगा। रक्षा मंत्री के द्वारा दस्तावेज को पढ़ने पर

... (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please let him speak.

श्री जॉर्ज फर्नान्डीज: रक्षा मंत्री द्वारा इसको पढ़कर किसी को परेशानी में डालना ठीक नहीं है, इसलिए मैं नहीं पढ़ रहा हूँ। लेकिन मैं केवल बता रहा हूँ कि आप इस दस्तावेज को देखने के बाद आप यह महसूस करेंगे कि हमने अपना कोई व्यक्तिगत एजेंडा नहीं चलाया। हमारा एजेंडा हमारे राष्ट्र का एजेंडा है, आज के दिन हमारी सरकार का एजेंडा है। इसके अलावा हमारा कोई एजेंडा नहीं है। जिस पद पर मैं बैठा हूँ, उस पद पर व्यक्तिगत एजेंडा हो ही नहीं सकता, इसको मैं बहुत स्पष्ट रूप से इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

महोदय, अब जहां तक अन्य बातें हैं, मुलायम सिंह जी यहां पर बैठे हुए हैं। इस बारे में उनके अनेक भाषण हैं। १९९७ के अक्टूबर महीने में तय हुआ था कि परमाणु बम का विस्फोट करेंगे, लेकिन उन्होंने इसलिए बटन नहीं दबाया कि चुनाव का ऐलान हो चुका था और वे नहीं चाहते थे कि चुनाव पर उसका असर हो। एक नहीं अनेक वक्तव्य हैं।

गुजराल साहब का इस संबंध में बी.बी.सी. को दिया हुआ एक वक्तव्य है। हम लोग तो रेडियो नहीं सुनते, टेलीविजन नहीं देखते, लेकिन हमने पढ़ा है। बी.बी.सी. से उन्होंने कहा था कि कि हम तो बिलकुल तैयार थे, लेकिन चुनाव आ गया।

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL (JALANDHAR): I beg to contradict it.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Okay. I am only saying that neither I hear radio nor do I see television.

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL : It is totally incorrect.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I would be most happy if it is incorrect.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : He has denied it.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: That is what I am saying. I shall be most happy .. (Interruptions) I am saying that I am most happy that he has denied it.

हमने तो अखबारों में यही बात पढ़ी है। अखबारों में तो यही छपा है। यह अच्छी बात है कि आपने इस प्रकार की कोई बात बी.बी.सी. को नहीं कही कि हम तैयार थे, लेकिन विस्फोट नहीं हुआ। खैर अब आप इस बात का खंडन कर रहे हैं लेकिन मुलायम सिंह जी तो इस बात को कबूल कर रहे हैं, यह तो अच्छा रहा।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (सम्भल): हम कोई झूठ बोलने वालों में थोड़े ही हैं।

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज: सभापति जी, मुझे खुशी है कि मुलायम सिंह जी ने इस बात को स्वीकार किया है। मैं केवल इतनी ही टिप्पणी करना चाहता हूँ कि यह तय करना अकेले रक्षा मंत्री के हाथ में नहीं है कि परमाणु बम का विस्फोट किया जाए। अगर तैयारी थी, अगर मन था और अक्टूबर के महीने तक तैयारी थी, तो यह संभव नहीं है कि प्रधान मंत्री की जानकारी में यह बात न हो। प्रधान मंत्री की जानकारी के बगैर ऐसा फैसला होना संभव नहीं है। मैं इस मामले में बस इतनी ही टिप्पणी करना चाहता हूँ। इससे ज्यादा मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता।

सभापति जी, अब चर्चा है कि इसमें कितना खर्च हुआ। दिल्ली में बिजली नहीं, पानी नहीं, इसके अलावा इसके बीच में अनेक चीजें आ गईं। हमने भी ये सब चीजें अपने उस परचे में लिखी थीं जो इस बारे में छपा था। हमने उसमें ये सब चीजें कही हैं। हमारी यह राय रही है, लेकिन जहां राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा का प्रश्न आता है, वहां ये सब चीजें गौण हो जाती हैं। अगर आप इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचते हैं कि हमें अपने राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा के लिए कुछ त्याग करने की जरूरत है, क्योंकि हमारी सीमाओं पर रोजाना जवान मर रहे हैं और उसके दाम कोई भी तय नहीं कर सकता है, तो जब पैसे की चर्चा आती है, तो मुझे बहुत दिक्कत होती है। क्या हिन्दुस्तान के ५० साल के इतिहास में दिल्ली में बिजली, पानी नहीं मिल रहा है, तो क्या यह परमाणु बम के कारण हुआ है। अब हम नौवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना पर आ गए हैं। नौवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना का जो प्रारूप इस देश में बना था, उस पर इस सदन में बहस नहीं हो सकी। उसके पेज ९ पर एक जुमला था, सारे राष्ट्र में पिछले पांच सालों का नहीं बल्कि, तीन, साढ़े तीन साल का हिसाब था, उसके बाद जो जानकारी हासिल हुई, उसके आधार पर मैं बता रहा हूँ कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान में आठवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में औसतन फी आमदनी २० प्रतिशत बढ़ी। उत्तर प्रदेश में एक प्रतिशत और बिहार में २० प्रतिशत नीचे गई। यानी बिहार में पहले के मुकाबले आमदनी २० प्रतिशत कम हो गई। क्या यह सब परमाणु बम की वजह से हुआ? हम नहीं जानते, लेकिन पैसे की बात हम कर रहे हैं। इस देश में १० लोगों की सुरक्षा के लिए करोड़ों रुपए खर्च हुए। एक-एक व्यक्ति की सुरक्षा के लिए एक-एक साल में कितने-कितने करोड़ रुपए खर्च किए गए और जब राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा की बात आती है, तो पैसे की बात कही जाती है? इसलिए सभापति जी, मैं बहुत तकलीफ के साथ कह रहा हूँ। मुझे यह बात कहने में अच्छी नहीं लग रही है।

लेकिन चूंकि यह बार-बार देश भर में चर्चा होती है। वैज्ञानिकों की एक तरफ तारीफ और दूसरी तरफ यह बात है कि इस खर्च का क्या असर होगा? पानी नहीं मिलेगा, बिजली नहीं मिलेगी, मकान नहीं बनेगा। ५० सालों में जो कुछ हुआ, वह अणु बम के चलते नहीं हुआ। वह १९७४ के पोकरण के चलते नहीं हुआ, ऐसा गलत नीतियों के चलते हुआ और अन्य कारण तो अभी इस बहस में दोहराने की जरूरत नहीं है। इसलिए खर्च वाली जो बात है, उसके बारे में हम चाहेंगे कि वह चीज इस बहस के अंदर न लायें। राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा को केन्द्र बिन्दु में लाकर जो भी बातें पक्ष और विपक्ष की हैं, वे जरूर हो जायें।

मैं श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्ता को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने अभी जो नैम का सम्मेलन कांतीजेना में हुआ और वहां सभी लोगों ने एक आध अपवाद को छोड़कर हिन्दुस्तान की जो तारीफ की, उसका यहां पर उल्लेख किया। यह बहुत जरूरी था क्योंकि विश्व में नैम में जो देश हैं, वे अमीर देश नहीं हैं बल्कि गरीब देश हैं। तीसरी दुनिया के देश नॉन एलाइनमेंट मूवमेंट जो खास तौर से तीसरी दुनिया का है और जब वह मानते हैं कि आपने जो किया है, वह ठीक किया है। चूंकि वे सब शक्ति को महसूस कर रहे हैं। मैं चन्द्रशेखर जी की बात को काट नहीं रहा हूँ कि यही शक्ति नहीं है। इसके पीछे कुछ और शक्ति की आवश्यकता है। वह तो सारी दुनिया को कबूल करना पड़ता है कि अंततोगत्वा जो बात है, वह यह है कि हम लोग आर्थिक स्थिति में कितने मजबूत होंगे। हम लोगों में राष्ट्रीय एकता कहां तक बनी रहेगी। हम लोगों में विभाजन, विघटन वाली जो बातें हैं, वे हम कहां समाप्त करेंगे और जो एक राष्ट्र है, एक जमात है। अगर जब हम खड़े हो जायेंगे तब वैज्ञानिकों का किया हुआ काम और हमारी सरकार के लिये हुए निर्णय का महत्व होगा। मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ मगर नैम में बैठे हुए, अपवाद छोड़कर बाकी देश गर्व से बोलें कि ठीक किया तो कहीं न कहीं इन लोगों ने महसूस किया कि दुनिया में रोआब दिखाने वाली जो ताकतें हैं। उनका सामना करने के लिए कोई सहारा नहीं था लेकिन आज एक सहारा मिल गया। भारत उनका सहारा बन गया। यह बात उनके दिमाग में नहीं आती है और यह अब केवल नैम तक सीमित नहीं है। पाकिस्तान ने, अब किसी का नाम लेना ठीक नहीं है लेकिन वह ओ.आई.सी., आर्गनाइजेशन ऑफ इस्लामिक स्टेट्स या अन्य स्थानों पर कोशिश करता है। लेकिन इस बार यह भी देखा कि अरब राष्ट्रों ने ऐसी कोई भूमिका नहीं अपनाई जिसमें किसी प्रकार की ऐसी बात आने नहीं दी, जिससे हिन्दुस्तान ने, हम लोगों के लिये हुए निर्णय को कोई गलत माने। अनेकों ने ठीक ही करके कहा तो कुछ ने तो कुछ भी नहीं कहा। लेकिन निंदा करने वाले ऐसे कोई खड़े तो नहीं हो गये। इसलिए हम यह मानकर चल रहे हैं कि हम लोगों का यह फैसला, अभी चिदम्बरम जी ने जो बात छोड़ी कि कौन सी स्ट्रेटजी का फर्क हो गया है तो हम यह मानते हैं कि एक अणु विस्फोट से ऐसा कोई फर्क नहीं होना है। लेकिन विश्व ने यह महसूस किया है कि भारत अब दबकर रहने वाला नहीं है। वह अपनी बातों को दुनिया के मंच पर मजबूती से रखने वाला है, यह बात आज विश्व ने कबूल की है और इसके कबूल करने की पीछे सबसे बड़ा जो कारण है, वह यह है कि क्या सँकशन होनी है, क्या आपत्ति हम लोगों पर आनी है, कहां कहां से हम पर वार होना है, इन सब आवश्यक चीजों की जानकारी रखते हुए भारत ने जब वह निर्णय लिया, श्री अटल जी ने इस फैसले को ले लिया तो फिर दुनिया इस कार्य को साहसी नहीं माने तो और क्या मानेगी।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, the time is 6 o'clock. How much time will you take, Mr. Fernandes? We have to extend the time of the House. Is it the will of the House to extend the time.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF TOURISM (SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA): Sir, let us extend it by one hour.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR (BARAMATI): No Sir.

18.00 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is a statement to be made by the hon. Home Minister. We shall take it up after his speech. Till then, the House will continue.

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज़ : मैंने कुछ समूहों का नाम लिया लेकिन मैं दो देशों का नाम लेना भी जरूरी समझता हूँ और वे हैं - फ्रांस और रूस। उन्होंने जो भूमिका अ पनाई है, हम ऐसा मानते हैं कि वे भी इस चीज को मान्यता देते हैं कि भारत ने कुछ साहसी कदम उठाया है और उसकी इज्जत होनी चाहिए। फिर हम लोगों का क्या होना है।

नीतियों की जो बातें छोड़ी गईं, वे सब प्रश्न प्रधानमंत्री जी के सामने रखे गए हैं और वे निश्चित तौर पर उनका जवाब देंगे। लेकिन मैं १-२ बातें कहना चाहता हूँ। अभी चिदम्बरम जी ने यहां अनेक लेखकों के, अनेक विचारकों के नाम लिए और नटवर सिंह जी ने भी अनेक लोगों के लेख आदि का यहां पर उल्लेख करके बताया कि किस-किसने क्या-क्या किया है। जिन लोगों ने कहा है, उसके विपरीत जिन लोगों ने कहा है, मैं उसको नहीं कहने जा रहा हूँ लेकिन उन्होंने शायद श्री जे.एन. दीक्षित और श्री मुचकुन दूबे का भी नाम लिया।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री शरद पवार : श्री शारदा प्रसाद का भी नाम लिया।

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has mentioned three names -- Shri J.N. Dixit, Shri Dubey and Shri Sharada Prasad.

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज : हमने श्री जे.एन. दीक्षित का नाम सुना। मैं इसलिए उनका उल्लेख कर रहा हूँ।

सभापति महोदय : आप कृपया संक्षेप में बोलिए।

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, I am not entering into any controversy. I am referring to that name because I am trying to connect it.

मैंने इसलिए उनका नाम लिया क्योंकि श्री जे.एन. दीक्षित ने अक्टूबर के महीने में फील्ड मार्शल करिअप्पा मैमोरियल लैक्चर दिया था। यदि उनके लैक्चर की प्रतियां इस सदन के सभी सदस्यों के हाथ में पहुंचा दी जाएं तो उससे बड़ा फायदा होगा क्योंकि उस मैमोरियल लेक्चर का मुख्य मतलब यही था कि देश की सुरक्षा केवल सेना बल, हथियार बल तक सीमित नहीं है, देश की सुरक्षा में लोगों का शामिल होना, लोगों का हर स्तर पर सेना के साथ, सुरक्षा बल के लोगों के साथ रिश्ता बनाए रहना अत्यावश्यक है। यह उनका कहना है और वह कहना हम भी मानते हैं।

मैंने उनका भाषण अभी-अभी पढ़ा, जब यह सारा विवाद शुरू हुआ तो हमने इधर-उधर कुछ और पढ़ने की कोशिश की तो उनका भाषण मेरे हाथ में आ गया।

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : I mentioned Shri J.N. Dixit's name in the context of the Joint Working Group, its details and not in the context of quoting him. It was specifically on the Working Group. Some of your statements had thrown, what it had achieved, in the dustbin.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: That is right. I was reminded about him because I have got his lecture here.

आपका जो वक्तव्य था, उसे मैंने इसलिए जोड़ा क्योंकि आपने ज्वाइंट वर्किंग ग्रुप वगैरह की जो बातें छेड़ीं, उससे जुड़ी हुई अनेक बातें उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कहीं। लेकिन उनके भाषण का मुख्य लक्ष्य लोगों और सुरक्षा बलों का रिश्ता, दूसरा, लोगों के बीच में, देश के सामने सुरक्षा के मामले में जो चुनौतियां हैं, उन चुनौतियों को लोगों तक पहुंचाना और उसकी आवश्यकता है। ये बातें उन्होंने रखी हैं। मैंने इसलिए उनका उल्लेख यहां पर किया है।

मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता। जो मोटी बातें मैंने कहनी थीं, वे कहीं हैं। नीति-विषयक बातें प्रधानमंत्री जी बताएंगे, लेकिन मैं एक आखिरी वाक्य कहना चाहूंगा। प्रधानमंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी द्वारा ५ अप्रैल, १९६८ को इसी सदन में हुई नॉन प्रौलीफरेशन ट्रीटी पर बहस के दरम्यान कहे गए एक वाक्य का उल्लेख किया है। यह पांच नम्बर पैराग्राफ है।

"The Lok Sabha debated the issue, that is whether to sign NPT or not."

On 5th April 1968 Prime Minister the late Shrimati Indira Gandhi assured the House: "We shall be guided entirely by self-enlightenment and the considerations of national security."

मैं इस सदन को और देश को यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब अटल जी की सरकार ने, अटल जी ने यह निर्णय लिया, तब

we were also guided entirely by our self-enlightenment and the considerations of national security and nothing else.

श्री मदन लाल खुराना: सभापति जी, जैसा मैंने पहले बताया, वक्ताओं की जो सूची है, उसमें हमारे दो फोर्मर प्राइम मिनिस्टर भी हैं, वे बोलना चाहते हैं। कांग्रेस के मित्र भी हैं, हमारे यहां से, एलाइज़ में से कुछ लोग बोलना चाहते हैं। लिस्ट लम्बी है, इसलिए मेरा निवेदन यह है कि एक घंटे के लिए सदन का समय बढ़ा दिया जाये।

">SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER (TENALI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, while the incident of test made the nation proud of its scientific capacity and capability, the Bharatiya Janata Party, its sister organisations and some of the Ministers



have made a complete mess of the situation with grave fall out on socio-political and economic lives of the people of this country.

At the outset, our hearty congratulations to the scientists, engineers and the technologists who have shown their skills and have made the nation proud.

The achievement is the result of an encouragement that has been given to the scientists and the technologists by successive Governments over the decades. What has failed to impress any of us despite what has been said by certain friends on the other side is as to what is the credit that the Government is taking for ? The Government has come into power on the 19th of March and Dr. Abdul Kalam and Dr. Chidambaram both on the 14th of May have said in a Press Conference that they got the clearance on the 11th of April. What great things have been done by this Government within 22 days so that they could claim the credit? Sir, I come to the point.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): The decision was taken.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER : The decision could be a misadventure also. I will come to that point slightly later.

18.17 hrs (Dr. Laxminarayan Pandey in the Chair)

So far as the substantial part of the scientific work is concerned, this Government can in no way take the credit. They have only taken the decision for the clearance and for that, they would like to have the credit. To me, it appears that so far as the threat perceptions are concerned which have been sought to be made out either in the letter of the Prime Minister to President Clinton or letter to the Heads of the Governments of G-8 countries, that threat perception either from Pakistan or from China does not seem to be either here or there. The situation that prevailed earlier to 19th of March prevailed even on the 11th of April. No new circumstances developed which should force this Government to take the decision and say that there is a threat perception from Pakistan and China. To me, it appears that this is a clear case of bravado approach on the part of the Government leading to misadventure, leading to untold consequences which might affect the socio-political economy of this country. While I will go into the details little later, it appears to me that this decision has been taken to silence the various allies of the Government who had been raising different issues from time to time and secondly, to divert the attention of the people of this country temporarily from the problems that beset them so that the entire nation is diverted towards a euphoria which this Government sought to create on the basis of the tests that have been carried out.

It has already been said that the Governments in the past have not given the clearance. They have referred to 1983 and 1995. I would not like to go into the reasons but certain obvious compelling reasons must have forced the Government of the day to take a decision not to go ahead with the test. Shri Deve Gowda who had written the letter immediately after the test to the Prime Minister has categorically said and I quote:

"I declined to give clearance for demonstrating India's nuclear capability not because of the adverse reaction from the international community but on account of my concern for improving the economic situation."

He was more concerned with the poverty of the people and he was more concerned to raise the standard of living of the people. He thought that it would be a case of misadventure at that time. He did not permit it because it had its own reactions and fallouts.

Where we find fault with the present Government in giving the clearance is firstly the clear lack of perception evolved before the test of the diverse fallouts that are possible in the wake of the test. Secondly, it is the manner in which those in the Government and the sister organisations of the Bharatiya Janata Party have tried to communalise the issue.

Thirdly, the irresponsible utterances on the part of various persons in the Government and outside leading to corrode the atmosphere in the region.

Fourthly, the lack of a substitute policy on the nuclear doctrine which we had been pursuing for a long time and without any substitute policy, a plunge has been taken, creating a chaotic situation which has a tremendous effect on the larger interest of the nation. When the question as to why the clearance was given to the test was posed, two personalities - one to the Political Advisor to the Prime Minister and the other was the first speaker on behalf of the Treasury Benches - they said: 'you must first explain as to why you chose to go ahead with the test in 1974'. While certain answers have been given, I would like to make the position absolutely clear as I see it.

In 1971, Pakistan forced war on us. Bangladesh was created. After the creation of Bangladesh, we had gone for the Shimla Agreement. My friend, the first speaker from the Treasury Benches has said that notwithstanding the Shimla Agreement a lot of sabre-rattling was going on on the part of the Pakistani leaders which he himself tried to explain. We had Parliamentary elections. Then we also had Assembly elections in 1972.

At that time, we should not forget that when the war was going on, President Nixon had sent the Seventh Fleet into the Bangladesh waters only to threaten us or to show their power and to see that India gets afraid of that action. Under such circumstances, when the political leaders in Pakistan were taking the stance of sabre-rattling when President Nixon had shown his strength and tried to browbeat us by sending the Seventh Fleet into the Bangladesh waters, it was absolutely necessary and, in that background, we had made our position absolutely clear that the test was for peaceful purposes. Now, forgetting the part of 'peaceful purposes', I take their argument that it was a similar test, that is, the one that was conducted on the 11th May as also on the 13th May. Taking that argument as true, in the background of what I have stated -- the manner in which the Pakistani leaders were behaving, as spoken to by the first speaker from the Treasury Benches, and also the manner in which President Nixon tried to show his strength and tried to browbeat our nation -- it was necessary that in self-respect we should show what we were capable of doing, and Shrimati Indira Gandhi asked the scientists to proceed ahead with the preparations for that. When our scientists were ready in 1974, a deliberate test was undertaken so as to show our capability to the entire nation and to tell the big power that tried to browbeat us in 1972 that they need not browbeat us and that we are also a power to be reckoned with.

But such a situation does not prevail now. What is the situation today? On the 11th May and 13th May, there was no such situation. What prevailed in March 1996 and 1997 prevailed on the 11th April also and, therefore, there was nothing new. That is why, I said that it was the indulgence of a bravado spirit or a total misadventure on the part of the Government which might place the nation in great jeopardy economically, socially and politically.

I would like to bring to your kind notice that the Government, in my view, has not taken any review before they came to this conclusion of giving clearance as to the military strategy that has got to be decided. The diplomatic offensive was absent and the economic fall out in any form was never taken into consideration. The United States of America, Germany and the Nordic countries like Denmark, Netherlands, Japan and U.K., have now come forth with sanctions. Yesterday, Russia had condemned the tests; they have been keeping quiet all along, but yesterday they came forth with this statement. What is the fall out of what I call our misadventure? The result of this fall out is that, as Shri Chandra Shekhar rightly pointed out, the value of our rupee has gone down. Already, it has crossed Rs. 41 per dollar. The inflation is rising and it has already crossed the figure of six points.

The exports are dwindling. This year it was said that it is only 2.6 per cent growth as compared to last year. The exports are already dwindling and the GDP growth is the least for the last five years.

Hon. friends must have read this morning in newspapers that the World Bank Agenda of power assistance of one billion dollars which was to be considered yesterday, has been postponed and the newspapers say that the postponement means postponement for ever.

A book has been published possibly under the directions of the Government by the Parliament Library. They have given us this book for reference. The Economic Times, New Delhi dated 15th May, 1998 categorically says that the fall out is not going to be a chicken feed. It is to the tune of 21 billion dollars. The sanctions etc., are going to affect the nation to the tune of 21 billion dollars.

Equally on the question of the sanctions by the United States, they have given a pitiable report. The Economic Times has gone on record to say that it might affect the entire economic system of our nation.

The various companies which are trying to work out their own schemes in this country may totally stop the flow of money.

Along with that, it has also been analysed beautifully in The Economic Times again on 19th May, 1998 that it will not only hit the rupee, but it will affect very badly the inflation and also the interest rates. Those details have been given that The Economic Times of 19th May, 1998 makes the analysis beautifully. (Interruptions) I have already said that. If you have not heard it, please hear me further.

If this is going to be the fall out economically of the sanctions that have been imposed or that are continuing to be imposed, what happens to the masses of this country? What happens to their lives, the lives of the teeming millions? What happens to the socio-politico-economic lives of the people? It will be badly shattered. It will be tremendously affected. That is why, I said it appears to be a case of total misadventure which has been undertaken in a bravado spirit.

The manner in which this issue of test has been sought to be analysed is rather unfortunate. I have already said that it is more to silence the rumblings in the allies of the Government that this misadventure was undertaken. The BJP's partisan euphoria, as a result of which they unnecessarily try to hijack the credit of the country for the last four decades old programme and the manner in which their Party has tried to take advantage by saying that they celebrate it as a shourya Divas shows that not even their allies were taken into confidence. As Shri Chandra Shekhar has rightly said, the Chief Minister of Rajasthan has gone on record to say that the Pokhran soil would be taken and he would go ahead with a rath yatra and the soil would be deposited in all the principal townships of the country.

Is it not communalising the issue? A national issue is sought to be communalised. It is not only this. What about the VHP, the sister organisation of the BJP? This organisation has said that it will go ahead with a temple called the Shakti Peeth and for the consecration of such a temple, the waters would be carried from different religious places. Has anybody from the Government condemned this? That is where I said that the sister organisations are going ahead in such a manner that it will affect the national interests. This is where the whole thing is sought to be communalised. Shri Singhal, who happens to be a live-wire in the VHP, has gone on record in his Press Conference in Patna which has been extensively quoted and I am quoting it from the report:

The Vishwa Hindu Parishad Chief, Ashok Singhal, has described the recent nuclear tests by India as an emphatic assertion of Hindu pride and favoured constitutional amendment to declare India a Hindu nation."

Did anybody condemn this type of utterances? It has happened more than a week. This is the 24th of May, 1998 newspaper. These things are going on. The issue which is, in fact, a matter of national rejoicing, is being communalised. These are the instances that if you would like to communalise then, what is the fall-out of this? I have already said as to how the economic life is sought to be affected.

Now, the leaders are trying to communalise it. What happens to the other communities? Many a community will sulk back. It will de-energise or disappoint. Even a person like Dr. Abdul Kalam who is the live-wire in this whole testing; one of the greatest scientists we have been able to have. Nobody tries to say even a word about this type of misadventurous expressions which are coming from the sister organisations.

The Prime Minister in his letter to Mr. Clinton has categorically brought out that the threat is from China and Pakistan and has gone on record to say in his letter that the series of tests are limited in number and pose no danger to any country which has no inimical intentions towards India. He was trying to write a letter to Mr. Clinton. Obviously he wanted to give a certificate to the United States of America that we have no problems so far as that country is concerned. Equally, when the Prime Minister has been pleased to write the letter to the Heads of the G-8 countries. There also he said that India was surrounded by countries having nuclear weapons and the threat perception, he refers to, was from Pakistan and China.

I am not surprised about it. I will just read out a paragraph from the statement made by the Prime Minister today.

सभापति महोदय : माननीय शिवशंकर जी, मैं आपको रोक नहीं रहा हूँ लेकिन याद दिला रहा हूँ कि आपके दल के और भी सदस्य बोलने वाले हैं।

श्री पी. शिव शंकर : मैं बहुत जल्दी अपनी बात खत्म करूंगा।

... (व्यवधान)

The Prime Minister's statement says that these tests were not directed against any country. On the one side, you say that these tests are not directed against any country, on the other, you letters categorically say that there is threat perception from these countries and, therefore, Government had to proceed with the test. Which statement has to be accepted? The Prime Minister may have to steer the position clear as to what exactly is his intention. Why have they gone for the test?

As I said, if the threat perception was there, then what was there in 1996-97, that remained on the 11th of April, 1998 when Government gave the clearance. There is no deterioration in the situation so as to call for an immediate test. It is there where the explanation is needed. This Government has to explain only a small portion as to why they have taken a decision for the tests and the fall out thereof. Have they taken a clear perception as to what is going to be the fall out? What measures have they taken for the purpose of meeting out the situation economically, communally and socially? There is a social divide by virtue of the fact that it has been sought to be communalised. Then politically also, because of the communalisation of the situation, perceptions change. Therefore, what exact measures are sought to be taken and what exact measures were taken earlier? What was decided upon and how would you like to act upon are the issues that have to be explained to the nation so that the people are satisfied of your intentions being genuine.

Having said this, I would like to refer to one aspect. So far, our policy has been slightly different. The Home Minister has only referred to Pakistan. The Defence Minister has referred to China. And even today's newspapers also have made a reference to China. It has already been said yesterday that a weapons system has also been developed and it will be made available to the army. This has come in today's newspapers. In view of this, when there is a pointed reference to China and Pakistan as the main source of threat to the country's security, it completely upsets the contemporary dimension of the non-alignment which we had been pursuing for quite a long time. We consistently avoided a reference to Beijing and Islamabad as the only source of threat to the nation and to our security. We always expressed India's concern about the nuclear US base in Diego Garcia, Central Asia and the Gulf. What I would like to know from the Prime Minister is whether those perceptions have changed. If they have been changed and if the concentration is only on China and Pakistan, to what benefit are we addressing ourselves to? In fact, have we not forced the country into an arms race? A delegation has already gone to Pakistan and notwithstanding that, Pakistan seems to be preparing itself for the test. Leaving aside the test part of it, do you not think that in this region, we have generated a race for spending on defence?

If we are also calling upon to invest huge money on Defence, what will happen to our Development and what will happen to the poverty stricken people? It is because 42 per cent of our population is living still below the povertyline. What will happen to our various developmental activities?

Sir, this is a matter of concern to the nation. That is why I was saying that either it was a case of misadventure or in bravado spirit, the action has been taken without foreseeing the consequences which might flow from the action that has been resorted to on 11th and 13th of May, 1998.

Sir, we have been following a clear Nuclear Policy for the last 50 years. The Prime Minister has made a very pithy reference about a policy that has been adopted by the successive Governments for the last 50 years. He has traced the history right from 1947. Actually, the whole policy is based on the struggle for Independence based on non-violence. Non-violence does not mean cowardice and that is where Shri George Fernandes has rightly quoted Mahatma Gandhi.

The Policy that we have been pursuing, as late as in 1995, before the International Court of Justice on the status of nuclear weapons in the International Law is significant. We have categorically placed certain principles. Six principles have been laid. I need not read them out. But those are the cardinal principles which enable us to

remain a non-nuclear power but nonetheless have the authority to make use of the weaponry if and when we needed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please wind up.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER : Yes, Sir.

Sir, this country has been having its international voice being heard in the international fora because of its moral authority and not because of any military power. We were not the military power and merely because we have now become the nuclear power State, that does not mean that we are going to enhance our authority in the international fora. We remain what we were. On the contrary, I feel that our stock will come down.

Now, what will happen to our policy which we have adumbrated before the International Court of Justice on the status of the nuclear weapons in the International Law? Have we changed that? Equally, as late as in March, 1996, in the plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament, the Indian Foreign Secretary was telling the delegates and I quote:

"We do not believe that the acquisition of nuclear weapons is essential for national security. We are also convinced that their existence diminishes the international security. We, therefore, seek complete elimination."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Shiv Shanker, please conclude. You have already taken 40 minutes.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER : I will conclude within a minute, Sir.

This has been our consistent policy for the last 50 years. Today's newspapers have categorically said that the nuclear weapons are being made available to the Army. If this be the situation, has the entire approach of ours changed? If so, to what effect? It is unfortunate that the route that we are adopting is a route for destruction.

With these words, I conclude.

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री तथा पर्यटन मंत्री (श्री मदन लाल खुराना): सभापति जी, आप सुबह से देखें, छः वक्ता उधर से बोल चुके हैं, उन्होंने टाइम भी पूरा लिया है, लेकिन इधर से केवल दो वक्ता ही बोले हैं। मैंने अध्यक्ष महोदय से बात की थी उन्होंने यह कहा था कि अब एक इधर से बोलेगा और एक उधर से बोलेगा। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि जो अध्यक्ष महोदय ने मुझसे कहा था उस पर अमल करें।

... (व्यवधान)

>THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS AND MINISTER OF FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (SARDAR SURJIT SINGH BARNALA): Mr. Chairman Sir, I will take some time and will not be able to conclude my speech before 7 o'clock. If you intend to further extend the time of the sitting, you must decide it now.

माननीय सभापति जी, आज प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने हाउस में जो बयान दिया, उसके ऊपर ख्याल यह था कि कोई एडवर्स वायस नहीं होगी, लेकिन ऐसा डैमोक्रेटिक सिस्टम में नहीं होता। इस सिस्टम में तो हर बात का विरोध करना होता है। इसलिए विरोध करने की कोशिश होती रही है। कोई न कोई नुकता निकालने की कोशिश होती रही है कि किसी न किसी बात पर विरोध किया जाए। साइंटिस्ट्स की तारीफ की गई, टैक्नीशियन्स की तारीफ की गई। उनकी तारीफ सभी दलों के लोगों ने की। उन्होंने बहुत अच्छा काम किया और यह भी सभी ने कहा कि यह काम कोई आज का काम नहीं है। यह काम बहुत पहले से होता चला आ रहा है। उसका थोड़ा बहुत क्रेडिट कांग्रेस पार्टी ने भी लेना चाहा है कि यह तो हमारे समय से होता चला आ रहा है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी अपनी स्पीच में यह कहा था कि यह कोई मेरा प्रोग्राम नहीं है। यह तो पं.जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी के समय में शुरू हुआ था। स्वतंत्र भारत की जब पहली सरकार बनी, तभी से यह कार्यक्रम शुरू हो गया था।

सभापति महोदय, जब जापान के हिरोशिमा और नागासाकी शहरों पर अमरीका ने एटम बम गिराए, तो तबाही हो गई। उस समय एटम बम सिर्फ अमरीका के पास ही थे। रूस के पास नहीं थे। जर्मनी एटम बम बनाने की तकनीक के बहुत नजदीक पहुंच गया था, लेकिन बना नहीं सका था। जब हमारा देश आजाद हो गया, तो हमें भी इस बात की चिन्ता होने लगी। हमारी आजादी से पहले ही रूस के पास भी एटम बम की टैक्नालोजी आ गई थी और विस्फोट कर दिया था। इसलिए हमारी सोच इस तरफ बढ़ी कि दुनिया में हमें परमाणु शक्ति अपनी सुरक्षा के लिए और शान्ति पूर्वक कार्यों को करने के लिए बनना चाहिए। इसी सोच को लेकर १९५४ में पं.जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी ने इसी हाउस में जो अपनी स्पीच दी, उसमें उन्होंने कहा कि परमाणु शक्ति का इस्तेमाल नहीं होना चाहिए और ये वैपन नहीं बनने चाहिए और इसके खिलाफ कुछ ऐसा करना चाहिए जिससे इनके ऊपर रोक लगे, लेकिन हमारी आवाज इतनी बलुंद नहीं थी और हम कोई रुकावट नहीं लगा सके। १९६४ में आकर चीन ने विस्फोट किया। दुनिया देखती रही। कुछ नहीं कर पाई। किसी तरह रोक नहीं सकी। कोई ऐसी ताकत उनके हाथ में नहीं थी

कि चीन को रिस्ट्रेन करती और परमाणु बम विस्फोट करने से रोक पाती। चायना ने कहा हमें जरूरत है, हम करना चाहते हैं और उन्होंने परमाणु बम का विस्फोट कर लिया।

पं.जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने कुछ देशों को इकट्ठा किया जिन्हें नान-अलाइन मूवमेंट के नाम से जाना जाता है जिनकी सोच यह थी कि किसी ढंग से परमाणु बमों के प्रसार को रोका जाए। उन्होंने भी यत्न किया कि नान-प्रोलीफरेशन एग्रीमेंट हो जाए। नान-प्रोलीफरेशन ट्रीटी की बात, बाद में आई, लेकिन उनकी भी चली नहीं। उसके बाद एन.पी.टी. की बात होने लगी क्योंकि दो-तीन देशों के पास परमाणु हथियार हो गए थे। उन्होंने कहा कि यह हो जाना चाहिए। हमने उस वक्त भी इंकार किया और कहा कि सारी दुनिया में जिन देशों के पास ये हथियार हैं वे पहले नष्ट होने चाहिए, तब हम उस पर दस्तखत करने के लिए तैयार हैं, लेकिन वैसा नहीं हुआ। इसलिए हिन्दुस्तान ने मना कर दिया कि हम एन.पी.टी. पर दस्तखत नहीं करेंगे। समय गुजरता गया। हमें महसूस हो रहा था कि इस न्यूक्लीयर पावर की जरूरत हमें पड़ेगी। एक समय ऐसा आया कि १९७४ में हमने पोखरान में उसी मुकाम पर पहला परमाणु परीक्षण किया जहां अब किया गया है। उसका जिक्र इधर से भी किया गया और उधर से भी किया गया।

कई बातों में उस विस्फोट को जायज करार दिया गया कि हां वह तो करना ही था क्योंकि वह श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के समय में हुआ था। उन्होंने किसी को कंसल्ट किया था या नहीं, मुझे इस बात का इल्म नहीं है। दूसरी साईड में बैठे हुए कुछ लीडर्स को शायद पता हो लेकिन उन्होंने बताया नहीं है कि किसी और को कंसल्ट किया या नहीं किया। हमें जानकारी यही मिली थी कि यहां पोकरण में एक विस्फोट हुआ। दुनिया में कुछ चर्चा हुई कि यह क्यों हुआ, कैसे हुआ, यह नहीं होना चाहिए था, यह बहुत बुरा हुआ लेकिन इससे हमारा कुछ कांफीडेंस बना कि हम भी कुछ कर सकते हैं। दूसरों के मुकाबले हम भी कुछ करने के योग्य हैं। इससे देश में कुछ कांफीडेंस बना। समय फिर गुजरता गया। सी.टी.बी.टी. की बात चल गयी। इस बात को चलते दो साल हो गये। हिन्दुस्तान ने उस वक्त भी कहा था कि हम इस पर दस्तखत कर देंगे लेकिन तभी करेंगे जब सभी देश, उन्होंने अपनी जो विस्फोटक सामग्री तैयार कर रखी है, जो बड़े-बड़े बम बनाकर रखे हैं, उन सबको नष्ट कर देंगे और यह भी कहेंगे कि हम आगे को और नहीं बनायेंगे, विस्फोट नहीं करेंगे तो हम इस पर दस्तखत करने के लिए तैयार हैं लेकिन उस वक्त तक उस पर दस्तखत नहीं करेंगे और यह पालिसी सारे देश ने मंजूर की। सारा देश इसके पीछे खड़ा हुआ और मैं समझता हूँ कि एक बहुत ही ठीक दिशा थी और ठीक दिशा में ही हमने फैसला ले लिया। आज का समां आ गया। हम किसी बंधन में नहीं बंधे थे। एन.पी.टी. में नहीं बंधे थे। हमने दस्तखत नहीं किये थे। सी.टी.बी.टी. पर दस्तखत नहीं किये थे। आज भी हम किसी बंधन में नहीं थे। हम विस्फोट कर सकते थे लेकिन सवाल यह हो रहा है कि अब क्यों कर दिया। इस मौके पर क्यों कर दिया। सारा झगड़ा इसी बात का है कि श्री वाजपेयी जी के समय में क्यों हो गया। वह कोई क्रेडिट लेना चाहते हैं। इसमें क्रेडिट की बात नहीं है। इसमें किसी को क्रेडिट नहीं लेना चाहिए। इसका तो देश को क्रेडिट लेना चाहिए कि भारत देश ने किया है। भारत देश को इससे लाभ होने वाला है। जो विस्फोट हुए, उसके बारे में यहां चर्चा चली कि राय नहीं ली गयी। हमसे भी नहीं ली गयी और अपने साथियों से भी नहीं ली गयी। मैं आपसे सही कहता हूँ कि हमसे कोई सलाह-मशविरा नहीं हुआ और मुझे ऐसा मालूम हुआ है कि दूसरी पार्टियों से भी किसी तरह का सलाह-मशविरा नहीं हुआ। ऐसी बातों पर मशविरा होता भी नहीं है क्योंकि यह कोई भी नहीं चाहेगा कि जरा सी भी बात निकल जाये। संसार में इस बात की कितनी तारीफ हुई है कि पहली दफा हिन्दुस्तान एक सीक्रेट रख सका। एक ऐसी बात खुफिया रख सका जिसका किसी को पता नहीं चला। जब यह विस्फोट हुआ तभी पता चला कि यह तो तीन हो गये। एक के बाद दूसरा हो गया और दूसरे के बाद तीसरा हो गया, इस तरह तीन हो गये। सब लोगों ने खबरें ही पढ़ीं। मैंने भी खबर ही पढ़ी कि ऐसा हो गया। मेरा तो मन खुशी से उछल पड़ा कि बहुत बढ़िया बात हो गयी। यह देश के लिए बहुत प्राप्ति की बात है लेकिन उस पर भांति-भांति टिप्पणी हुई है कि यह देश के लिए हानिकारक बात है। बहुत बढ़िया बात नहीं है। इस तरह से नुकसान हो जायेगा। ऐसी बातें करने की यहां पर कोशिश की गयी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे जो विरोधी लोग हैं, वे तो इसको बुरा ही कहेंगे। उनके साथी और उनके जो हिमायती हैं, वे भी इसको बुरा कहेंगे। इनको यह नहीं भाता कि हिन्दुस्तान के पास ऐसी ताकत हो। दूसरों के पास हो जाये, वह बढ़ाते चले जायें, उन पर कोई दबाव नहीं, कोई रुकावट नहीं। चाइना ने कई विस्फोट कर दिये लेकिन उन पर कोई रुकावट नहीं है। पाकिस्तान हमारा पड़ोसी है, कई बातों में उनका नाम लेना पड़ता है, उसने भी मिसाइलें दागनी शुरू की। कभी गज़नी दागी लेकिन इंटरनेशनल लैवल पर कोई बहुत चर्चा नहीं हुई। हम थोड़ा सा परेशान थे क्योंकि हमारे पड़ोस में यह हो रहा था, बाहर नहीं हो रहा था। उस वक्त किसी ने नहीं कहा कि यह क्या कर रहे हो।

19.00 hrs.

यदि ऐसा करेंगे तो हम भी सैक्शन लगाएंगे। ज़बानी जमा खर्च कई करते रहे लेकिन किसी ने बंद नहीं किया। उन्होंने भी बंद नहीं किया। उन्होंने अपना काम जारी रखा। उनको जहां-जहां से टैक्नोलौजी मिल रही थी, वहां से ली, चाहे किसी देश से भी मिली। वे अब तक अपनी टैक्नोलौजी नहीं बना सके। बाहर से टैक्नोलौजी हासिल करके एक बड़ी मिसाइल बनाई और दुनिया से कहा कि यह १५०० किलोमीटर की दूरी तक जाती है और हिन्दुस्तान का हरेक शहर इसकी मार में आ जाता है। नाम भी उन्होंने बहुत खतरनाक गौरी और गज़नी रख दिया। ढूँढ-ढूँढकर उन्होंने नाम रखे, आप जरा ध्यान दीजिए। हम घबराए हुए थे कि यह क्या हो गया, यह विस्फोट क्यों कर दिया। जितने पहले हिन्दुस्तान पर हमलावर हुए, फिर बार-बार हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करते रहे, उनके नाम पर ही उन्होंने मिसाइलों का नाम गौरी और गज़नी रखा। ऐसा जान-बूझकर किया गया। नाम तो बहुत होते हैं लेकिन जान-बूझकर हिस्टैरीकल नाम रखे गए ताकि वे हमें चुभें। यह सारा कुछ हमारे लिए हो रहा था। वह मिसाइल उन्होंने दाग दी। उसकी थोड़ी-बहुत कहीं चर्चा हुई लेकिन बात खत्म हो गई। किसी ने सैक्शन की बात नहीं की कि यह आपने बहुत गलत काम किया। आपके पास टैक्नोलौजी भी नहीं थी, बाहर से लेकर आपने यह चला दी है। देखने में ऐसा आया है कि सिवाए हमारे किसी को कोई घबराहट नहीं हुई। मैं इर्द-गिर्द के सभी देशों का जिक्र कर दूँ लेकिन उसमें समय लगता है। किसी ने नहीं कहा कि आपने इतनी बड़ी मिसाइल बनाकर गलती की है, ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिए था, इससे आर्मस रेस बढ़ेगी, एशिया में ऐसे हालात पैदा हो जाएंगे, ईस्ट एशिया में हालात बिगड़ जाएंगे, यह आपने क्या कर दिया।

सभापति महोदय : बरनाला जी, सदन का समय एक घंटा बढ़ाया गया था लेकिन जब तक आप बोलेंगे तब तक सदन बैठेगा।

सरदार सुरजीत सिंह बरनाला : मुझे अभी थोड़ा समय लगेगा।

सभापति महोदय : आप पूरा कर लीजिए।

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री तथा पर्यटन मंत्री (श्री मदन लाल खुराना): ये कल कंटीन्यू कर लेंगे।

सभापति महोदय : बरनाला जी, आप कल कंटीन्यू कीजिए।