

nt>

Title: Raised a discussion regarding recent developments affecting India's foreign policy and on the statement made by the Prime Minister on his recent visit to Colombo in connection with SAARC Summit.

11.30 hrs

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard the statement just now made by the Prime Minister on the most recent up-to-date position of foreign policy. But I do not think I could make out much about the clear policy of the Government. I would like to submit that one of the foremost developments during the last quarter of the current century has been the sea change that has overtaken international relations. Today military might is not necessarily the right way to further our international relations, rather it is the economic right or economic might which has become the driving force.

Today's international relations are not necessarily on the basis of military might which is evident even from the actions of the super power countries like the United States of America. In spite of its military might in Somalia, a couple of dozen casualties made the United States withdraw from there.

The United States withdrew from Lebanon because of the blowing up of the marine barracks in Beirut inflicting 250 casualties. It means, 250 US lives were considered to be more valuable than Lebanese regime of the day.

Thirdly, the United States could not accept 50,000 casualties to keep Vietnam out of the Communist bloc. When we look at the erstwhile USSR, the military might of the USSR could not keep their country united. In spite of its military power, the country disintegrated. Therefore, it clearly shows that it is not the military right or the military might which matters today. What matters today is the economic might. If you look at the policy of the United States of America towards Asia and South-East Asia, we find President Clinton going to Beijing keeping aside all ideologies. What for? I remember when Mr. Brown, who unfortunately died in a plane crash, was the Commerce Minister of the United States of America, he was asked by the media at Beijing that whether he was going to talk about human rights, he answered thus, "I have not come here to preach values. I have come here to make quick bucks. I have come here to make business". Therefore, all over the world, it is the economy which is becoming much more important; it is commerce which is becoming much more important, and not nuclear weapons and military might.

After having said this, naturally, I have to link it to the recent nuclear tests that we had conducted. I do not want to go into the merits of it because in the last debate I had already spoken about the nuclear tests.

I only like to know how the Government so far has handled the fall out of the nuclear tests. I must charge this Government that this Government has completely failed in the diplomatic area. Today, the country does not know who is running the Foreign Ministry. I personally do not know who is running the Ministry of External Affairs. Is it the PMO, is it the Planning Commission, is it the South Block, or is it the Home Ministry? Today I find beautiful statements by the Minister of Home Affairs on foreign policy. Who is actually running the Foreign Ministry?

Our former Foreign Secretary, Shri J.N. Dixit had cautioned that the parallel foreign policy mechanism was not desirable for our country, which is what is actually happening now. Can we ever imagine that at a time when we are facing complete isolation by the international communities, the greatest democracy of the world, India does not have a Foreign Minister? If they are not able to handle other problems, I do not think that the induction of a Foreign Minister would have been a difficult job.

Today we find that Shri Nareshwar Dayal is being sent to the Gulf countries on behalf of the Government of India. We find that Shri Brijesh Mishra, Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister is going on behalf of India all over the world. Of course, the Minister of State, Shrimati Vasundhara Raje, legitimately has gone -- I know -- to Singapore, Manila and to Hanoi. And then we find that Shri Jaswant Singh, the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission is going round the world and what is the position of the Ninth Five Year Plan today? Who is caring for the Ninth Five Year Plan?

I do not think that it is good for the country and we do not know what has happened to the visit of Shri Nareshwar Dayal. I have great respect for that gentleman. He must be a very good diplomat. But can he substitute for the Foreign Minister of India?

I know Shri Jaswant Singh very well. I have travelled with him. I have met Heads of State and Heads of Government in many parts of the world along with Shri Jaswant Singh. I know his capability. But the fact remains that he is not the Foreign Minister. Why can he not be made the Foreign Minister? Where is the difficulty? (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, please take your seat. He is not yielding.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA : I am not yielding. This is a serious debate.

I would like to remind that generally Governments with sound foreign policy treaties do not take casually to be dealing with functionaries other than those of accredited Missions or those having a constitutional status.

I know it very well. I was myself a victim of that situation. In 1985, when late Rajiv Gandhi, the then Prime Minister, held the portfolio of Commerce with him and I was made the Minister of State for Commerce, practically, I had to look after the Ministry of Commerce. But my counterparts, the Commerce Ministers of other countries refused to meet me. They were saying: "Who is he?" They were just pushing me to a junior Minister. Is it good for the country? It is not good for the country. And we do not know what has happened to those visits of Shri Jaswant Singh. He went to Washington and met Mr. Talbott, I suppose. And what happened there! They agreed to meet at Frankfurt. And what is the outcome of the Frankfurt meeting! They agreed to meet in New Delhi. Then Mr. Talbott comes to New Delhi and has a talk. And what is the outcome! They agree to meet again in Washington. I do not know from Washington where they will agree to meet. Is it the way to run the foreign policy?

The Prime Minister has just now told us that on 29th, he had "long meeting" with his counterpart, the Prime Minister of Pakistan. The Prime Minister further informs the House that that long meeting was "cordial and constructive". Very good! But unfortunately, the Prime Minister of Pakistan does not agree to that. When the Prime Minister of Pakistan was asked what was the outcome of their meeting, he is reported to have said "Zero". And our Prime Minister says "cordial and constructive"! Again, when the Prime Minister of Pakistan was asked: "If you had a long meeting and the outcome was zero, why did you spend so much time?", he is reported to have said: "Yes, it was a waste of time". The Prime Minister of Pakistan, after meeting the Prime Minister of India, the greatest democracy in the world, has had to say that his meeting with Prime Minister was a waste of time. Is it the way they are handling their foreign policy?

SHRI CHETAN CHAUHAN (AMROHA): This is one of the most irresponsible statements which has come from the Prime Minister of Pakistan...(Interruptions)

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA : Yes, it may be...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Chauhan, please take your seat.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA : Sir, I think, I must appreciate the efforts of the Government in trying to project India's position. The only thing is that the method they are adopting is wrong. I must appreciate the efforts that the Minister of State herself is making. But all these efforts have not borne any fruit for our country. In spite of all these diplomatic activities, the fact remains that we have not been able to carry conviction to the so-called key interlocutor, and the result is isolation. There are many reasons why we are not able to carry conviction, but I shall point out only two at the moment. The first reason why we are not able to carry conviction is inconsistency between our call for disarmament and our nuclear testing. On the one hand, we are calling for complete disarmament and, on the other, we are going in for weaponisation.

The second inconsistency is much more important. The inconsistency is between the nuclear testing on the one hand and the image in reality of India as a land of illiteracy, unemployment, poverty and malnutrition on the

other. We have so much of money to spend for nuclear weapons, but we are not able to give food to our countrymen.

They are talking about national security. I agree that we must do everything for our national security. But can national security be preserved, protected and enhanced with a nuclear weapon? I do not agree. There can be no national security without food security. There can be no national security without job security. There can be no national security without health security. There can be no national security without social security. The emphasis that we have to give is to provide to the people of India, food security, health security, social security etc. I do not want to name everything. But what are we doing in that direction?

Everybody knows what is the status of our economy today. I want to give more time to my colleague, Shri K. Natwar Singh to speak on issues of P-5, G-8, FMCT and CTBT. So, I am not going into those aspects. I want to confine myself to the theory of economic race as a matter of foreign policy. Where do we stand today? After the BJP Government has taken over, Sensex has nose-dived by 600 points only, rupee has depreciated to somewhere between 42 and 43 per dollar and according to Meryll Lynch, it is bound to reach 46 per dollar. FIIs and operators have been pulling out their money from India; and they are taking decisions to withdraw money from India to London offices. The direct investment in the country has virtually stopped and the rate of inflation is increasing. The rise in the Consumer Price Index for industrial workers has crossed ten per cent. Exports are dwindling and have dropped by over 17 per cent. Trade deficit has been mounting to 1.85 billion dollars as against 840 million dollars. Our credit rating has been downgraded. Inflation has reached eight per cent. There has been a deterioration of Balance of Payments. Fiscal deficit has come to six per cent of the GDP which is an increase by 3,500 crores of rupees. Foreign exchange reserves have fallen, the latest figure which I read yesterday, by two billion dollars. That is the position of our economy today.

The country has no time to think about how to handle this economic problem and we are very busy with weaponisation and all that. The Prime Minister is not here. I have been saying very often that I have a lot of respect for our Prime Minister. People had a lot of expectations from our Prime Minister, but I am afraid that the Prime Minister and his Government have failed the people.

Please do something. The Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is known as a person who has a lot of concern for the poor people, for humanity. I happened to come across a poem - I want to conclude with that, because I want to give time for others - written by the hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (BOLPUR): Not as Prime Minister.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA : Yes; not as Prime Minister. This poem is about Hiroshima and Nagasaki and its title is "Hiroshima ki peeda". I do not know whether I will be able to read it in Hindi. I have the English translation also with me. But let me try to read it in Hindi. I will read the first and last stanzas. It says:

'किसी रात को मेरी नींद अचानक उचट जाती है

आंख खुल जाती है मैं सोचने लगता हूँ कि

जिन वैज्ञानिकों ने अणु अस्त्रों का अविष्कार किया था:

वे हिरोशिमा-नागासाकी के भीषण नरसंहार के समाचार सुनकर

रात को सोये कैसे होंगे ?'

"On a certain night my sleep is disturbed.

I wake up and start thinking;
how the scientists who developed the nuclear weapons,
hearing the news of mass annihilation of mankind in
Hiroshima and Nagasaki, would have slept".

That is Shri Vajpayee. I do not know on the 11th of May whether he had his sleep or not. I do not know that. (Interruptions) Well, I think, he had a sound sleep. I do not want to read the entire poem. It is a quite long and very emotional poem. But I want to read the last paragraph. It says:

‘क्या उन्हें एक क्षण के लिए सही,

ये अनुभूति हुई कि उनके हाथों जो कुछ हुआ,

अच्छा नहीं हुआ?

यदि हुई तो वक्त उन्हें कठघरे में खड़ा नहीं करेगा!

किंतु यदि नहीं हुई तो इतिहास उन्हें कभी माफ नहीं करेगा।’

He asked the scientists:

"Did they think even for a second whatever
they achieved was not good for humanity?"

It is a very right question.

"If it occurred, time will not give opportunity to defend, and
if it did not occur, history will never pardon them,
will never forgive them".

I want Shri Vajpayee to return to his own self.

श्री मोहन सिंह (देवरिया): वह कवि वाजपेयी है, यह प्रधान मंत्री वाजपेयी हैं।

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA : I want the Pradhan Mantri Vajpayee to return to his own self and look at the suffering humanity, look at people who have no two square meals to eat, look at people who have no drinking water, look at people who are illiterate and do something for them. Your nuclear weapons will not solve our problem. The problem lies elsewhere and that is how they were handling the situation.

Sir, I thank you for the time you have given me.

">SHRI JAG MOHAN (NEW DELHI): Sir, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. Before I elucidate my main points, I would like to mention that I expected a different type of speech from Shri Sangma as he is such a senior leader, such a distinguished leader, and he had been such a distinguished Speaker also. I was not even aware that I had to speak today. When I heard him, I was wondering whether I was sitting in the

Pakistan National Assembly or in the Indian Parliament. His reference to the Prime Minister of India was in a manner as if he was eulogizing a stand taken by the Prime Minister of Pakistan and the stand taken by us was wrong. He did not say a single word whether our stand was justified or not. Should we have yielded on Kashmir? Should we have yielded on our national policies? What was his stand? He should make it clear what does he mean when he says that the outcome was zero. I think, the outcome should have been zero if they did not change their stand and if they become unreasonable. Pakistan came with a pre-determined mind to wreck this dialogue. From the very beginning, their attitude was hostile and the very language they used - 'zero' and 'waste of time' - is a reflection on their culture. On our side, there was dignity, and there was a balance. This is what Indian sanskriti means and this is what we stand for. I congratulate the Prime Minister for being firm, clear and for sticking to the Indian values. I must remind him that in the world affairs our contribution has not been like this. I must remind him what Swami Vivekananda said. He said that the contribution of this great race has been life spiritual. It has given dignity, grace, balance, harmony and peace to this world. It has not taken anything. It has never conquered or undertaken aggression against anyone. It is the non-acquisitory, non-aggressive and peaceful instincts of India which we are proud of. But we will not yield an inch.

Then, Shri Sangma said that the economic growth is the real strength of a country. Who disputes this and who ever disputed this? Does our Party ever say that economic strength is not the strength of a country? But I would like to tell you who made this economic strength for the last 50 years. Today, India has got the largest number of poor people in the world. Sixty-one per cent people are living below the poverty line. Who has created that situation? Why have we got so many uneducated people? It is 50 years of your rule that has created this situation. It is these 50 years of your rule that has created all this economic weakness... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: We are discussing a very serious subject.

... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, please understand. This is a very serious subject.

SHRI JAG MOHAN : In the end, let me take that point which Shri Sangma very poetically quoted from the poems of our Prime Minister and then he was trying to make a fun of it. That he is the Prime Minister who was thinking like this, and what he has done.

12.00 hrs.

I would remind him that this was the noble sentiment expressed by every peaceful citizen in the world.

When this first atomic weapon was tested in New Mexico, at that very time, what did the scientist, Mr. Openheimer, say? After seeing the destructive capacity, he went to Truman and said, "Kindly bring this under the control of the international agency. Kindly share your secret with U.S.S.R so that there is no arms race. Tomorrow or day after tomorrow, U.S.S.R will discover the technology; let us share the secret with them and let us have a real nuclear control." Mr. Openheimer was heard patiently by Truman and he asked him to go and see Winston Churchill. It was Winston Churchill who shot down the proposal. Thereafter the atomic bomb was used against Japan. It has been rightly pointed out that this was not necessary at that time, but it was used. Even after dropping of this bomb, the then Secretary of War, Mr. Henry Simpson, went to Truman and said, "Kindly stop this policy of exclusivity. Otherwise, it will lead to arms race." Mr. Truman did not listen to him second time because at that time, the Secretary of State said, "We must have this policy of exclusivity." What was his argument? His argument was that "If we have got the atomic weapon in our hip-pocket, it would help us at the negotiation table, and we will be able to mould the world according to our design."

Today, the developing countries are running around, and the United States which is the richest country in the West has moulded all the international institutions according to its design because it always had the atomic weapon in its hip-pockets. It is this which our Prime Minister wanted to stop at the negotiation table -- these people who have got this power to mould and change. We want a non-nuclear world. Our stand is, what is good for you is good for us, and is good for everybody else. What is bad for you is bad for us, and it is bad for everybody else also.

Shri Sangma, what did Mr. Gorbachev say? He said, "Security in this world is indivisible. What is security for 'X' nation is also security for 'Y' nation." Even after this explosion, in America, an opinion is coming around which says "What will be our fate or what will be our stand if somebody else had the atomic bomb and we did not have it. How would we feel about it?" I can quote the Canberra Commission's opinion, and I can quote the International Court's opinion which says that it is the moral and legal obligation of all concerned to go in for non-nuclear world. Why is the United States not listening to it? We are all saying that we would like to have a non-nuclear and peaceful world. What noble sentiments Shri Vajpayee had expressed in the poem, he wants to realise them in actual practice. They will not come about, if the monopolist regime remains. What is the justification for the five nuclear powers to have a power cartel? Is it democratic or is it in the spirit of the United Nations' Charter? It is not.

The great work which India has done is to make the world cautious of this fact. Afterwards, many opinions have come which show that we should go in for this. We exposed the hypocrisy of these people, we exposed the double-standards of these people, we have shown that we have the technological advancement and that if they do not fall in line, then there will be an arms race. We told them to learn from history. In 1945, when they wanted to have the exclusive power, ultimately it resulted in a cold-war and building up of arms for so many years.

What do you want to say? Why is China being preferred to you now? Why has it been told to us that even in India, when Pakistan raises this issue, China will have its say? It is because they have power.

Shri Purno A. Sangma, you have not tackled many other issues. What about Kashmir? What about all these issues of China? I would like to tell you what should be our policy with regard to this. What is happening in Kashmir? Last time also, Shri Sangma spoke and he talked of Pakistan's relationship and its dialogue. But he did not say a single word about ten years of terrorism and subversion in Kashmir. How many calamities have occurred? How many innocent people have died? At Colombo, at the informal as well as at the formal meetings, the success of the Indian Prime Minister was that the nuclear issue was linked with the nuclear disarmament issue and not with anything else. The world is now accepting this doctrine. Now China may differ with us. They do not want us to become a nuclear power. They do not want us to be powerful. What America did? There is a new doctrine of what is called Brezezinski doctrine. Why China is being preferred and why we should strengthen ourselves? If we do not strengthen ourselves, where will we go? You have already seen this during Mr. Clinton's visit to China as also during the period of previous Presidents, as most of you might be knowing, Mr. Brezezinski was a Security Advisor. He wrote a few pieces. I would like to read out to you the sum and substance of his writings. He is making out a case that China and America are natural allies in the new pattern that is emerging. He says and I quote: -

"China's growing interest in Central Asia constrains Russia's ability to achieve a political reintegration of the region under Moscow's control. In this connection and in regard to the Persian Gulf, China's growing energy needs means it has a common interest with America in maintaining free access to, and political stability in, the oil-producing regions. Similarly, China's support for Pakistan restrains India's ambitions to subordinate that country while offsetting India's inclination to cooperate with Russia in regard to Afghanistan and Central Asia.

The bottom line is that America and China need each other in Eurasia. Greater China should consider America a natural ally for historical as well as political reasons. Unlike Japan or Russia, the United States has never had any territorial designs on China" and so on.

What he is trying to make out is that China will be the regional ally and strong power in this region, an able ally of America. As Western Europe is serving the end purpose there, China will serve the purpose here. So, this is what we are.

1209 hrs (Shri Raghuvansh Prasad Singh in the Chair)

So, we want to have our security concern and to acquire nuclear technology, but we are not going to attack anybody. We do not want to remain weak so that nobody is tempted to treat us in the manner we have been treated so far. This is what I want to say.

Then the issue is of Kashmir which Pakistan wants to highlight and to create trouble and, that is why, all these incidents are being manipulated. Every time an international issue comes up, Pakistan would create trouble in Kashmir.

That is exactly what they are doing in Doda; and that is exactly what they are doing somewhere else. But I have heard some criticisms these days. Shri Sangma has made a speech today. On the same lines, quite a number of write-ups are coming in the newspapers saying that India, by nuclear testing, has highlighted the Kashmir issue and internationalised the Kashmir issue. It is not correct. It is not borne out by the facts. The correct position is entirely different. Do not forget. It has always been the game of the United States of America; it has always been the game of its Western allies to have a finger in the Kashmir pie.

Now, I will give you a number of instances. As early as 1992, there were a number of think tanks which were floated in America. What was the thinking of those think tanks or what were the views they were propagating? Their views were very clear. It was to put pressure on India to sign the NPT, to sign the CTBT. And what was Mr. Cohen, who is a member of the think tank, and a virtual member of the Foreign Policy establishment of America, saying? He has been saying that the road to NPT lies through Kashmir meaning thereby that you take advantage of the Kashmir problems, the Kashmir difficulties and force India to sign the NPT. His propaganda is: "The road to NPT lies through Kashmir." That was propagated ten years ago. That is why, all these troubles were being created. Please see the Carnegie Foundation Report of 1993. What do they say? They say that the nuclear issue and the Kashmir issue should be seen simultaneously and should be brought to the table simultaneously, and all these issues should be considered concurrently. What was the position then? At that time, there was no nuclear explosion by India. But it is they who wanted to twist India's arm taking advantage of our problems in Kashmir. Ms. Robin Raphael was not making all types of statements saying: "We do not consider Kashmir as a non-disputed area. We want this and we want that." It was not for nothing that Mr. John Mallot came here and made a statement saying: "Oh, it is a disputed area. We will view to like this." It was only to pressurise India. We must understand this game. This game has been going on for the last ten years. It is not now after the nuclear tests that this has been going on. It has always been there. We did not succumb to the pressures then. So, we should not succumb to the pressures now also.

In this connection, I will remind you that even when the Hyderabad problem was on, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Butler and all of them were creating a lot of difficulties for India. At that time, Saradar Patel stood up and said: "Look, this is not a two-way process. It is a one-way process. If you behave like this, we also know how to behave. We are also a strong nation and a large nation. You cannot afford to ignore us." Then, both Mr. Butler and Mr. Churchill went the way, of which we all know in the history. Then, the Hyderabad problem was solved. If we remain firm, if we take a cue from that line, I am quite sure that our problems in Kashmir will be solved and the Pakistani game will be frustrated. And this, I think, is a very clear signal which our Prime Minister has given in Colombo saying that we will not cede an inch on that. ... (

व्यवधान) आप दूसरी बात सुनना चाहते हैं, सच्ची बात सुनना नहीं चाहते हैं। मैं सिर्फ इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि

... (व्यवधान)

All right, I will not go on like this...(Interruptions)

सभापति महोदय : शांति। क्यों बाधा डाल रहे हैं ?

... (व्यवधान)

श्री रामनारायण कोटा (कोटा) : सभापति महोदय, सत्ता पक्ष के माननीय सदस्य जगमोहन जी उलाहना दे रहे हैं कि कश्मीर समस्या के जनक कौन कौन हैं। वह इस बात का भी खुलासा करें।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : शांति। जब आपको मौका मिलेगा, तब बोलियेगा।

SHRI JAG MOHAN : Now the other argument given by Shri Sangma is: "We are a poor country and it should not be done." My point is that we are poor because we do not have this power that the world can twist us in any way they like.

The other point is, why did we do it at this time? Everybody goes on saying this as if something has happened. Last time, when I spoke on the nuclear issue, I gave many reasons why this time was chosen. I will not repeat any one of them. But I will like to point out that the option before India was to exercise the option or to lose the option - to use it or to lose it. You remember very well that when the CTBT was there, when the deadlock was there, it was taken to the General Assembly. A constitutional trick was played on India. Now when the entry of force came which should have come back in early 1999, at that time again, the things would have been manipulated; India would have been debarred from even exercising that option. So the option was there only to a limited extent and we had to exercise it or lose it. Now did you want to lose it? It was all along our policy that we keep the exercise open and we had to exercise it. So, this is a very important reason why we did it at this time. After all many problems would arise in this world. I understand that whenever you touch the vested interests, there will be a hue and cry. But if we remain firm, the world will accept our position either to have totally non-nuclear world, a weapon free world or to accept this principle that all nations have equal rights and equal obligations and then share equal responsibilities. You cannot have a discriminatory world. This is what we are asking for and nothing more than this. The problem will arise. We are a poor country. We will have to face sanctions. Many things will happen. But there is one very great line of Iqbal:

तुंद ए वादा-ए मखालफ से न तू घबरा ए आका,

ये तो आती हैं तुम्हें ऊंचा उठाने के लिए।

If we face these difficulties firmly, we will become a stronger nation. But I am very sorry to point out that instead of becoming firm, strong, clear and united, we are showing signs of disunity and dismemberment. This is what Kashmir problem really is. I can tell you one thing. I do not say that today people are being killed in Doda by Pakistanis or their agents alone. It is also a contribution made by a number of people and forces which are operating within this country. How is it that the Kashmir problem is raised every time? When hon. Shri Balram Jakhra was speaking on the Doda massacre, he was trembling with rage. He said, "What has happened to us as a nation? Can we be strict?" Whenever anybody took a stand, he was shouted down and he was removed from the post. I remember when I was sent second time as the Governor of Jammu and Kashmir in 1990, the State had been virtually taken over by the militants. With a great deal of difficulty, the problem was controlled, otherwise, on the 26th January, the declaration formally would have been got made at the Idgah with 15 lakh people and all those things. I do not want to repeat it. I want to ask one thing. When I acted in that manner, there was no Blue Star, there was no Tiananmen Square. But people here did not say, "Jag Mohan has done it without Tiananmen Square or Blue Star." They started shouting shouting, "he has become a Halaku, he has become Chengez Khan." They actually doing what Shrimati Benazir Bhutto was saying. What did Shrimati Benazir Bhutto say? She said, "Jag, Jag, Jag." Why was she saying so? Why was she getting hysterical? She was getting hysterical because she had come to know that here was a man who had understood the game of the ISI and he would put the civil administration back on the rail if he did so, then the problem would be solved, the ISI game would be over and millions and millions of Kalashnikovs ammunitions which had been brought here, would be recovered.

Instead of doing that, what did they do? As I say, you wrongly said, there is no Indo-Pakistan cooperation. On the one hand Benazir Bhutto was trying to tear me, on the other you were tearing me. She did not utter a word against the President of India or the Vice-President of India or the Prime Minister of India or the Home Minister of India. She made a target of 'Mr. Jag Mohan' while she came to POK. This is all on record. It was seen on television. She said, 'if this man goes out, the Indian will not fight, they will run away.'

But this is what has happened today! I even ask our our Home Minister why 'Doda' is happening again and again, and why it will happen again and again. This is because you have not constructed the Civil

Administration on the ground level. When I was there, in Doda, the first thing I did was -even when Kashmir was in flame totally and there was no one to help me, even states own police was not there to help me -- that I sent Special Commissioner to Doda, Special Commissioner to Poonch and Special Commissioner to Rajouri. The Civil Administration must be constructed on the ground level otherwise it will become the same thing as it is happening daily. You have to take preventive action. In this country, anybody who takes preventive action, he is not taken care of at all. You take this in the other way round.

Today I ask and I will ask even the Union Home Minister to publish a White Paper on this. How many casualties were there when I went there, and how many casualties are happening daily now? The bloodshed of those innocent people, Muslims as well as Kashmiri Pandits on our Indian soil is the result of the negative politics and minilist politics. You cannot say that it is only due to Pakistan. We equally are to blame, and I always say:

‘खौफ़ तो मुझे गुल से है इस चमन को कहीं जला न दे’

It is our negative politics which has built all this vote bank politics, poor politics which has carried on this. I am not a great admirer of what happened in Tiananmen Square, China. You remember this. Some people say, in Tiananmen Square, six people were killed and some say 600 were killed. Nobody knows the truth. Let us say, they took 600... (Interruptions)

सभापति महोदय : ठीक है। अब कन्क्लूड कीजिए।

SHRI JAG MOHAN : I have already said that in this House, very few people want to listen to me. All right, I will conclude. In fact, I did not want to speak even. In any case, I will conclude. I have no desire to inflict anybody. I am just concluding on this point. The only point that I am making is that we have to set our house in order. We have to take a very clear, consistent and united stand in this hour of difficulty. Our Foreign Policy today is facing the most critical challenge, and that challenge must be met by all of us unitedly. We should not try to score debating points here and there. Whatever has happened in the past, let us today resolve that in view of the very aggressive and very bellicose attitude adopted by Pakistan. We will have a very dignified but firm stand. And, we will not go by small considerations of elections or electoral politics. We will face the challenge unitedly and we will not be oblivious of the new nexus that is developing in China and America. We should take due care of it. Our viewpoint will be duly appreciated. There are already people in America who are appreciating our stand. We should appeal to those people who have got regard for equality, who have got regard for India's democratic traditions. We should not rub anybody on the wrong side. We should remain peaceful. We should remain poised and dignified. That is our main concern.

So far as Kashmir's internal problem is concerned, we should try to rebuild the Civil Administration there, if we really want peace there. I do not know, why immediately all these Special Commissioners from Doda and other places, because the situation had been brought under control, were removed. There is a total failure of the intelligence agencies there and I have no hesitation in saying this because Doda is not a border district. Pakistan border does not meet there. People do not understand this. Sir, they are already there and going all around. Why our intelligence cannot spot them. Then there are smaller hamlets. They can be grouped for purpose of safety.

If you cannot give safety to everybody in small hamlets, then you can give it in groups. This can always be done.

We have to take a fresh look at our internal and external problems. This is what I wanted to say.

1225 hours

">SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this 125-day old Government led by the BJP has caused immense damage to this country: the damage caused to our economy; the damage caused to our secular democracy; and the damage caused to our composite culture. But the damage caused to our age old foreign policy has been isolating us from the international community.

Over the years, since our Independence, through earnest and sincere endeavour, we had built up our foreign policy based on consensus. Suddenly, a minority Government - the BJP has the support of less than 25 per cent of the people of this country - which has no mandate to reverse this national consensus has actually caused a reversal which ultimately has landed this largest democracy in serious difficulties on the domestic front and also in the international arena.

My Party, immediately after the Pokhran-II tests, had expressed a serious apprehension that this misadventure of the BJP-led Government was meant mainly to divert the attention of the people from the serious deteriorating economic situation as also to cover up the failures of this Government in several fronts and to prop up the RSS brand of nationalism. This misadventure would ultimately ruin many of the things that we have built up. We find uncertainties on the economic front: the industrial slow down; the stock market position; the downgrading by the credit rating agencies; the steady reduction in the external value of the rupee; and the economic sanctions.

Of course, I must remind this House that the US has no right to impose such economic sanctions. They cannot sermonise us. The same people had been accumulating and stockpiling weapons and intimidating others. We had opposed this hegemonistic attitude of the big powers, particularly the US Government. But we had also expressed this apprehension that the economic sanctions in the long run, though not immediately maybe after two or three years, will have an adverse effect on our economy. This Govt. has given a handle to us and its allies as they have weakened our position by diluting our friendship with neighbours like Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal and even Pakistan and China. This is changing our position.

The previous UF Government has made a major contribution in correcting our relationships with our neighbouring countries. The visit of the Chinese President to India was a remarkable event. After decades of bitter and deteriorating relationship with our big neighbour with whom we do have many things in common: historical, cultural and many other things. The President of China had come.

There was a remarkable change in their attitude, not only with respect to Kashmir. They have given a suggestion that we should keep aside the issues which cannot be taken up and resolved immediately and take up issues on other fronts like economic, commercial, cultural, people to people contact etc. This was the message given to the Government of Pakistan also. We were in the process of strengthening our relationship with China and Bangladesh. The historic river treaty with Bangladesh was signed; and the historic treaty with Nepal was signed. Positive steps towards improving our relationship with Sri Lanka and many other countries were taken which actually brightened our position in the eyes of developing countries who always wanted to see us as the champion of the developing countries and the champion of NAM. We were distressed to find that even the President of South Africa, the great friend of India, was disappointed with our country after the Pokhran-II tests. It happened just before NAM meeting was going to be held soon. Due to this the serious deviation from the path undertaken by this country as a heritage of our national liberation movement built up brick by brick by so many of our leaders since our Independence has been damaged.

South Africa also had nuclear knowledge. But they preferred to leave it and announced to the world that their option is that they should never go for the blasts. We are isolated even amongst our friends and amongst the developing countries whom we require the most in the new emerging economic order, at the WTO and many other places.

As far as our relations with Pakistan are concerned, we agree that they also contribute negatively by encouraging terrorism and other things. When the United Front was in power, by taking positive steps unilaterally, which sometimes called the Gujral Doctrine, we had been improving our relations through trade, people to people contact, visits of artists, artisans etc. Their artists and artisans have been coming to India and our artists were going there. Business community was showing interest in improving trade relationship. In WTO, at least on three or four occasions, Pakistan sided with India against the hegemonistic designs of developed countries.

In Europe you find countries like France and Germany who were locked in disputes and who were engaged in battles and animosities of different sorts for centuries are coming together. If France and Germany can come together and build up a common market and a common currency with others and become one of the most powerful trade blocks in the world, why can India and Pakistan not come together and do the same? Some

people think that in the times to come Euro may be more powerful than Dollar. When many other countries which were divided as a result of imperialist conspiracy as it happened to India could settle their disputes, why can India and Pakistan not find a way out? This does not mean that we should support whatever Pakistan is doing.

This does not mean that what they are doing could be supported. We must condemn the way they are encouraging terrorism in the border and condemn many more negative stances that they are taking done; more could have happened there, more than the long meeting that the two Prime Ministers had, or more than the announcement or the declaration that the two Foreign Secretaries will take up the matter and continue the dialogue. Some more positive things could have happened, if we - on the Indian side - had a clear thinking on what is to be done.

But they are confused. Even the previous speaker, speaking on behalf of the BJP, has indicated how confused they are. In the last part of his speech, he was speaking about unilateralism, continuation of the UF Govt's policy towards Pakistan, etc. Prior to that, he was saying something differently. This only shows that our foreign policy is in a shambles. This Government, as a result of the Pokharan-II misadventure, has landed this country in serious difficulties and has caused isolation. Now, they do not know how to find a way out of this.

They did not consult the political parties. Even when they did not have the mandate, they had reversed and damaged the accepted Foreign policy; they did not have even the courtesy to seek the viewpoints of the several political parties which had valuable contributions in building up bilateral relationship and in improving relationships with other countries.

We, as a Party, can claim that we have had a very consistent stand regarding the role of this country vis-a-vis the struggle of developing countries and against the hegemony of the US and such other powers, inside the NAM and outside the NAM also.

The rationale given for those blasts was that there was a sudden change in the security perception. But there was no such thing. It was never convincing. We also find that the Defence Minister was pointing to about the northern neighbour China as enemy number one. We thought that the Prime Minister had a different perception, because we have the experience of working in the Committees with him and some ideas of his views regard. Even a few months ago, he said something differently. But we are amazed to see that the very same Prime Minister had written a letter to Mr. Bill Clinton mentioning about our northern neighbour as the main enemy or the enemy number one.

What happened after the Pokhran blasts? Instead of a successful move to convince - since they had nothing to convince others about; there was no convincing arguments either - we found jingoism and bellicosity. Some Minister went to the border and said something. It was on 18th May. It was our great Home Minister. What did he say?

Shri L.K. Advani linked the issue of finding a lasting solution to the Kashmir problem to India becoming a nuclear weapon State. The Defence Minister was saying something and the Home Minister was saying something else. What authority does the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission has in saying something on this, I do not know. Some people say that the Presidential form of Government has started working. Shri Brajesh Mishra, Shri Jaswant Singh - they are all Prime Minister's emissaries.

They had damaged what had been built, not only in the content, in the style and in the structure, but also in all other ways.

What are our Missions doing? Are our Missions able to convince the public opinion in all those developed countries? Public opinion is more important.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (BOLPUR): You did not mention what Shri Khurana has said. He said about fixing the time and place of war.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL: I am sorry, I did not mention about Shri Khurana.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He said fix a time and place to fight a war with Pakistan. He said that they are ready. Where has he gone now?...(Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I was mentioning about the surreptitious move to switch over to the Presidential form of Government. Some people say it. It is because all are PM's emissaries. Some diplomats have written openly as to what our Missions are doing. They want more funds for bigger external publicity. They want to be convinced. You may find it if you read between the lines of the utterances made by the former diplomats and even important diplomats working in different fields. We know the reaction of even Ms. Arundhati Ghosh who had been engaged in the whole process of CTBT. We know the reaction of defence experts. But this Government has not learnt any lesson from what is happening in the outside world. Will it help us in getting a permanent seat in the Security Council? Will it help us to strengthen our position, to fulfil the demand for democratisation of the United Nations system and to strengthen the General Assembly? Will it help us in the NAM so that, in the coming days, we can have a better share in the global economic arrangement at the WTO and elsewhere? No. Sir, this jingoism and bellicosity have further damaged our position.

Now there is capitulation to US pressures. We have weakened our position as a result of the isolation. When we have lost our friends and friendship that we had earned over a decade with our great and small neighbours, we find the present BJP led Govt is capitulating in the economic sphere giving more and more concessions to the MNCs in the power sector, telecom sector and in many more areas. We find that in the economic cooperation which would have helped us amongst our neighbours, the small gesture like removal of restrictions in import of 2000 items is not going to help us a lot. Such steps had already been taken but with insignificant results. I am going to give one last example.

There is confusion even after the agreement for allowing Indian the corridor to Nepal but Nepal is not being allowed to move our articles and goods to Bangladesh through Indian corridpr. India has failed to achieve what Our scientists are suffering humiliation. Our HRD Minister has said that they will be given protection and facilities. But, Sir, when our great scientists are suffering such humiliation, the world global scientific community is coming out in protest against US action...(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Our HRD Minister is swinging.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : But this Government has not even got the guts to condemn. The US action against Indian Society.

Those people are daily sabotaging human rights, democracy and all these things. The US administration has been doing in a planned and deliberate fashion. They are humiliating our respected scientists. They should be condemned.

Hon. Shri P.A. Sangma was reading a poem by our Prime Minister.

श्री सोमनाथ चटर्जी : वह 'अप्रोहिबिटेड' हो गया है।

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : The Prime Minister might have forgotten Hiroshima after he became the Prime Minister. But the people of India remember it. On 6th August at Calcutta and between 6th and 9th August, in many other parts of the country, there will be peace rallies - anti-war rallies - by the people of India. The participants in those rallies will be scientists, diplomats, educationists, workers and peasants. On the Hiroshima day the voice of the Indian people will be heard. Ultimately the people of this country bring about a change in the foreign policy in the interests of this country and in the interests of the suffering humanity, the downtrodden of not only the developing countries of this world but also of the whole world .

सभापति महोदय : यदि सभा की सहमति हो तो आज भोजनावकाश नहीं किया जाए क्योंकि माननीय सदस्यों की सूची लम्बी है, इसलिए भोजनावकाश को बहस में ही लगा दिया जाए।

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त (मिदनापुर): बहस कितने समय तक चलेगी?

सभापति महोदय: मोटे तौर से दो घंटे बहस होती है लेकिन सदस्यों की सूची और रुचि दोनों पर ही निर्भर करता है।

">SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I extend my thanks to you for giving me this opportunity to take part in this important debate on India's foreign policy. When I was listening with rapt attention to hon. Shri Sangma, I was terribly disappointed. He is a very great speaker. Although we may not agree with the perceptions and views of Shri Sangma, yet he always used to highlight the line of argument. But today, I do not know why his speech was a very futile attempt.

I thought that Shri K. Natwar Singh would initiate the debate from that side. Suddenly, Shri Sangma was asked to take part in it. At the very outset, when Shri Sangma initiated the debate, he levelled a charge that there was no Cabinet Minister for External Affairs. He asked, "Where is the Minister for External Affairs as Shrimati Vasundhara Raje is only a Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs?" Shri Sangma has conveniently forgotten one basic fact that great Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was handling the portfolio of External Affairs for many years. Shri Sangma has also conveniently forgotten that when Shri Rajiv Gandhi was the Prime Minister, he was handling the portfolio of External Affairs. At that time, my great friend, Shri K. Natwar Singh was the Minister of State for External Affairs. So, there is no point in that argument.

He is the first speaker from the Congress Party. The next point was "What have you achieved by deputing the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, Shri Jaswant Singh, to hold talks with Ms Strobe Talbott in the United States?"

He jocularly stated that our next meeting point would be Frankfurt; after the meeting at Frankfurt, the next meeting point would be Delhi; and after the meeting at Delhi, our next meeting point would be the United States.

Sir, questions have been raised about the gains that we have made by deputing Shri Jaswant Singh to hold talks with Mr. Talbott. I would like to emphasise the significant gains that we have made in this regard. In the ASEAN Regional Forum, the Anglo-Saxon countries, supported by Japan, tried to pass a Resolution of Censure, a Resolution to condemn the Pokhran nuclear tests. It is because such a Resolution was passed in the meeting of the P-5 countries as well as in the meeting of the G-8 countries. They wanted to pass the same type of a Resolution in the ASEAN Regional Forum as well. The gain that we have made by holding talks with Mr. Talbott of the United States is that -- the United States of America which sponsored such a Resolution at the meetings of the P-5 and the G-8 countries and which was behind the move to bring a Resolution of Censure in the Security Council of the United Nations -- the United States of America this time did not support such a move in the ASEAN Regional Forum. This is the gain we have made through our diplomatic efforts and strides. We were not isolated because of this.

What happened in the ASEAN Regional Forum? An attempt was made by the Anglo-Saxon countries -- Canada, Australia, New Zealand -- supported by Japan to move a Resolution. But the Third World countries, the South East Asian countries have supported India's position. It was a great achievement. I would like to point out that countries like Laos, Malaysia, Singapore and Vietnam supported India. These countries were totally opposed to any such move to censure India because of its having conducted nuclear tests at Pokhran. Of course, China tried their level best to pass a Resolution of Condemnation. Finally, without accepting their failure to have done so, they prevailed upon the Chairman to make a statement of disapproval. This is the diplomatic achievement we have had.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, just now I was referring to a Resolution (No. 1172) passed by the Security Council of the United Nations. By passing such a Resolution, the Security Council has behaved in a high-handed manner and has violated all accepted norms and practices. It is because article 31 of the Charter says and I quote:

"Any member of the United Nations, who is not a member of the Security Council, may participate, without vote, in the discussion on any question brought before the Security Council whenever the latter considers that the interests of that member are specially affected".

Sir, India drew the attention of the member-countries of the National Assembly and the General Assembly that the Security Council disregarded the provisions of the Charter by not giving India an opportunity to participate in the discussion on this.

Shri Sangma criticised saying, by conducting the nuclear tests at Pokhran, the Government has deviated from the path of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the foreign policy enunciated in the previous decade.

At this juncture, it would be pertinent to quote Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I would like to quote the remarks of Pundit Jawahar Lal Nehru, made on June 26, 1946 in Bombay. He said:

"As long as the world is constituted as it is, every country will have to device and use the latest scientific devices for its protection. I have no doubt that India will develop its scientific research and I hope Indian scientists will use atomic power for constructive purposes. But if India is threatened, she will inevitably try to defend herself by all means at her disposal. I hope India in common with other countries will prevent the use of atomic bomb."

The question being asked is, what necessitated India to go for the nuclear test. Our hon. friend from Marxists Party has stated that there was no necessity for this nuclear test. There is no threat from anywhere. There is no threat from China. I would like to draw the attention of the House, through you, towards the Reports of the Standing Committees on Defence of the previous Lok Sabha. Those Reports have clearly indicated that there is a threat to our security from our neighbour China. The Committee was headed by the great Parliamentarian, for whom I have the greatest respect, Shri Indrajit Gupta.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You are talking about which Report?

SHRI VAIKO : I am talking about the Report of the Standing Committee on Defence. In that Report, there is a specific remark, substantiated by the evidence, that there is a security challenge from China. We understand that there is a security challenge from China with whom we raised the slogan of Panchsheel, the peaceful coexistence in the Fifties. We were betrayed in the year 1962. We realise the impending danger that that country is supplying missile technology or the nuclear technology to Pakistan. Is it not the duty of this country to protect its security? Therefore, India, the most populous democracy of the world, the cradle of one of the ancient civilizations of the world, India consisting of many ethnic races and civilizations, that country under the stewardship of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee drew the attention of all the capitals of the world - of course, very hoarse reaction, hoarse criticism - when it conducted Pokhran test in the month of May. Is it not hypocrisy that the United States of America has imposed sanctions? Is it not hypocrisy that the United States of America has condemned nuclear tests and is preaching sermons of nuclear proliferation?

Shri Sangma was quoting a poem of hon. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee on the disaster which took place in the year 1945 in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Of course, it was the US which dropped bombs to annihilate thousands and thousands of people and even today it is the United States of America... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI VAIKO : I have not yet started.

SHRI MURLI DEORA (MUMBAI SOUTH): If you have not yet started, where will you end?

SHRI VAIKO : I was just replying to the points raised by Shri Sangma. I am at the mercy of the Chairman.

It is the United States which is going to conduct underground sub-critical nuclear tests.

13.00 hrs.

It is the United States of America which has conducted the Earth Penetrating Capability Tests in the month of March in Alaska without giving a forewarning to the native residents of Florida. It is the United States of America which has test-fired four times, missiles which could carry eight nuclear warheads at the same time. It is the United States of America which condemned China, imposed sanctions on China, when it held its tests at

Lopnur. It is the United States of America which conducted the maximum number of, 1,037, tests. The very same United States of America gave the Most Favoured Nation status to China for commercial gains when they were looking for the martyrs for their business. It is the United States of America which condemned the Tiananmen Square episode and now Mr. Bill Clinton has gone and stood on the Great Wall of China posing for photographers.

In the United States of America, when they wanted a martyr for their commercial goods they gave the Most Favoured Nation status to China. Now discussion is going on in the United States' Congress. The Republican Senator from the State of Kentucky, which was represented by Mr. Abraham Lincoln once, introduced the legislation to lift sanctions. Senator Mitch McConnell stated in the American Congress that they should not sacrifice American interests in their effort to put the nuclear genie back in the bottle. This is their approach.

Two months ago, there was severe criticism from many countries. Because of the commendable steps taken by this Government, we are not isolated today on this issue. We have got the support of the Asian countries, the Third World countries. The world is fast changing today. The perceptions are changing; the concepts are changing because we are discussing the international situation related to our foreign policy. The dawn of the millennium witnessed the Great October Revolution in Soviet Russia. On the eve of the dusk of this millennium, our hearts bleed to see what has happened in Soviet Russia. The statue of Lenin, the great champion of socialism, the great revolutionary of this millennium, was demolished. And what has happened three-four weeks back? The skeletal remains of Romanov, the Czar Nicholas, his wife and children were taken from some distant place, were given a royal reception at the palace and royally cremated in the graveyard of the palace. Such things are happening today. The world is changing. New countries are emerging on the map of the world. With one stroke of pen, Czechoslovakia was divided into two countries. There are 15 independent States today in the erstwhile Soviet Union. The United States of America, all of a sudden, says that it recognises the demand for a separate State of Palestine.

Mr. Nawaz Sharief said, I raise this point because Mr. Sangma referred to it, that it was simply a waste of time, and the result of dialogue was nothing but zero. The whole world was watching what was happening in Colombo. Our hon. Prime Minister demonstrated his compassion and mature statesmanship to the world. At the same time the jingoistic approach of Pakistan and Mr. Nawaz Sharief has been exposed to the world.

Sir, Kashmir issue cannot be a negotiable issue. Kashmir is not negotiable. But in order to substantiate this time that through bilateralism this issue cannot be solved, Shri Nawaz Sharif tried to say that bilateralism is not acceptable to them. But India has proved once again that Kashmir is not negotiable. At the same time, Sir, India played its role very well in the relations but not for compromising the interests of the country. We have demonstrated that the weapons of mass destruction should be totally eliminated. That is the position we have taken. Therefore, this Government deserves every applause and congratulations for all the steps despite very heavy odds and harsh criticisms from many quarters of the world.

SHRI MURLI DEORA : He would become the Foreign Minister of India.

SHRI VAIKO : I do not want to become the Minister.

SHRI MURLI DEORA (SOUTH): We will help to make you Minister.

SHRI VAIKO : Therefore, once again, India stands with all polity and we stand erect as a mighty power and as a nuclear weapon State. In Manila Conference, we have established that we are, India is a nuclear weapon State. That status is not at all irreversible.

">

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (सम्भल): सभापति जी, आज प्रधान मंत्री जी कोलम्बो से वापस आने के बाद सरकार की तरफ से बयान पढ़ रहे थे। वह लिखित वक्तव्य था। उस वक्तव्य में कुछ भी नहीं था। उसमें निराशा ही निराशा थी। अगर कुछ था तो निराश वक्तव्य था। उसकी भाषा भी निराशाजनक थी और जब प्रधान मंत्री जी बोल रहे थे तो वह स्वयं भी निराश थे। जब वह भारत वापस आए तो हवाई अड्डे पर उतरते ही उन्होंने ऐलान कर दिया कि शिखर सम्मेलन में हम लड़ाई जीत कर आए हैं। किस बात की? हम दुनिया में अलग-थलग बताए जाते थे, अब विश्व में एक स्थान बना कर आए हैं। दूसरे ही दिन, शायद उसी शाम को पाकिस्तान

के प्रधान मंत्री श्री नवाज शरीफ ने कह दिया कि वहां कुछ भी नहीं हुआ। आज देश के सामने प्रधान मंत्री जी गैर जिम्मेदाराना बयान दे रहे हैं। मैं इसकी आलोचना करता हूँ। वह प्रधान मंत्री पूरे देश को गुमराह कर रहे हैं जो विदेश मंत्री भी रह चुके हैं। ऐसा भी मौका आया था, जब वह नेता विरोधी दल थे तो प्रधान मंत्री श्री नरसिंह राव जी ने उनको एक प्रतिनिधिमंडल के अध्यक्ष के रूप में विदेश भेजा था। वह इतने समझदार थे कि उनकी विदेश नीति के रूप में एक छवि थी। उन्होंने सम्मेलन से लौटने के बाद जैसे ही हवाई अड्डे से वक्तव्य दिया, उनकी छवि नाम की कोई बात नहीं रह गई है - चाहे वह कितना ही डिंबोरा पीटें, लेकिन असलियत असलियत है।

सभापति जी, हमारे देश की विदेश नीति १९४७ से पहले तय हो गई थी। १९३७-३८ में डाक्टर राम मनोहर लोहिया जी ने गांधी जी की देखरेख में ने जो नीति बनायी थी, वह अभी तक लगातार चली आ रही थी - चाहे किसी की सरकार आई हो, कोई प्रधान मंत्री बना हो, लेकिन हमारी विदेश नीति कभी बदली नहीं। उसी का परिणाम था कि हमने अपने बुनियादी मुद्दों को नहीं त्यागा और उन्ही बुनियादी मुद्दों पर भारत की विदेश नीति टिकी रही। भारतीय विदेश नीति आम सहमति पर आधारित रही है।

लेकिन भाजपा सरकार ने, पक्ष हो या विपक्ष हो, किसी को विश्वास में नहीं लिया। इस सरकार ने उस विदेश नीति को छोड़ दिया जो भारत की मूल नीतियों व सिद्धान्तों पर आधारित थी, भाजपा सरकार ने विपक्ष को विश्वास में लेना तो दूर रहा, अपने सहयोगी दलों को भी विश्वास में नहीं लिया। अभी श्री वैको बड़-चढ़कर बोल रहे थे, शायद मिनिस्टर बनने की लालसा होगी। आप नहीं चाहते लेकिन हम चाहते हैं कि आप मिनिस्टर बन जायें। क्या आपको विश्वास में लिया गया था? सभापति महोदय, किसी भी सहयोगी घटक दल को विश्वास में नहीं लिया गया। मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि आज भारत की विदेश नीति एक-दो नेताओं के पाकेट में बन्द है इससे अन्तराष्ट्रीय छवि धूमिल हो रही है। आज आम सहमति की विदेश नीति नहीं रही। जो हमारे मूल मुद्दे थे, उन से हम हट गये हैं। आप किसके पीछे घूम रहे हैं, मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि दोस्त बनाने के चक्कर में अमेरिका के पीछे घूम रहे हैं। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारे बुनियादी मुद्दे थे, क्या आप उन पर टिके हुये हैं?

सभापति महोदय, यह देश का दुर्भाग्य है कि विदेश नीति जिन बुनियादी मुद्दों पर टिकी हुयी थी उन्हें एक-एक करके त्यागा जा रहा है। आप जानते हैं कि १९३७-३८ में गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में डा. राम मनोहर लोहिया ने विदेश नीति बनाई थी। सन् १९४७ में जब से नेहरू जी के नेतृत्व में सरकार बनी तो उन्हीं नीतियों सिद्धान्तों मुद्दों को लेकर विदेश नीति चलती आ रही थी। जैसा मैंने शुरु में कहा कि चाहे कोई प्रधानमंत्री रहा हो, कोई सरकार आई हो लेकिन हम अपने मौलिक मुद्दों से कभी पीछे नहीं हटे। लेकिन क्या यह सरकार उन मुद्दों से पीछे नहीं हटी है?

सभापति महोदय, हमारा पहला मुद्दा विश्व शान्ति का था, दूसरा लोकतांत्रिक व्यवस्था, तीसरा गुटनिरपेक्षता, चौथा मानवाधिकार तथा गैर-बराबरी का था तथा पड़ोसी देशों के साथ अच्छे संबंध व बातचीत का सिलसिला जारी रखना। यही भारत के प्रमुख सिद्धान्त व बुनियादी मुद्दे थे। क्या आज देश की विदेश नीति इन सिद्धान्तों पर टिकी हुई है नहीं। आप तो पूरी तरह से इन मुद्दों से पीछे हट गये हैं। इन्हीं मुद्दों पर भारत को विश्व का व्यापक समर्थन प्राप्त था। आजादी के बाद अगर गैर-बराबरी के खिलाफ २०वीं सदी में कोई लड़ा है या किसी ने पक्ष लिया है या किसी मुल्क में असमानता रही है तो भारत ने उस आन्दोलन की अगुवाई की है तथा भारत लड़ा है। गुट निरपेक्ष नीति के कारण विश्व में कई देश हमारे मित्र बने गये और विरोध में कोई पड़ोसी नहीं रहा। जहां तक चीन का प्रश्न है, उसके बारे में हम बाद में कहेंगे। वर्तमान विदेश नीति के मूल मुद्दों से हटने के बाद हमारा देश विश्व के अन्य देशों से अलग-थलग हो गया है। श्री संगमा जी ने ठीक कहा है जिसको हम दोहराना नहीं चाहते। देश की जनता उन दुष्परिणामों को भोग रही है। उसका नतीजा यह हुआ है कि हमने अमरीका के सामने घुटने टेक दिये हैं। इस तरह भारत सरकार ने पूरी तरह से अमरीका के सामने आत्मसमर्पण कर दिया है। यह हमारा इस सरकार पर आरोप है और जब प्रधानमंत्री उत्तर दें तो हमें बतायें कि किन कारणों से सरकार ने अमरीका के सामने घुटने टेक दिये? वैसे इस सरकार ने पहले दिन से ही अमरीका के आगे घुटने टेक दिये थे। भारत ने ११ मई को पोखरण में परीक्षण किया था और उसी शाम को सरकार ने अमरीका को पत्र लिख दिया। पत्र में लिखा कि चीन और पाकिस्तान की वजह से हमें मजबूर होकर यह परीक्षण करना पड़ा। सभापति महोदय, ऐसा नहीं था। इसके पीछे देश का हित या देश की सुरक्षा नहीं थी। इन्होंने देश को सर्वोपरि न मानकर अपनी पार्टी को सर्वोपरि माना, अपनी कुर्सी को सर्वोपरि माना और प्रधानमंत्री की कुर्सी बचाने के लिये पोखरण परीक्षण किया गया। यह सरकार आज कोई भी बहाना ढूँढे, कुछ भी कहे लेकिन ममता बहन भी उस समय दुविधा में थी। स्वामी जी, जो जयललिता के नेतृत्व में जीतकर आये थे, वह उस समय दुविधा में थे। जयललिता भी दुविधा में थी। मैं उन सब बातों को दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ क्योंकि सी.टी.बी.टी पर बहुत कुछ बोला जा चुका है। मैं इतना जरूर कहना चाहूँगा कि अमरीका का पिछलग्गू बनकर, जो हमारे मित्र देश थे, उनको भी इन्होंने खो दिया है।

सीटीबीटी पर भी दोहरा चरित्र है। सीटीबीटी के संबंध में आज जो पड़ोसियों से सम्बंधों के बिगाड़ा जा रहा है या अमेरिका से बातचीत हो रही है, उस पर हम कहना चाहेंगे कि गुपचुप वह बात हो रही है। अमेरिका के विदेश मंत्रालय ने कहा है कि भारत सीटीबीटी के बारे में जो बात कहे, उसे सार्वजनिक रूप से कहे। इसका अर्थ क्या है? इसका अर्थ यह है कि गुपचुप बातचीत हो रही है। अगर गुपचुप बात हो रही है, तो सदन को बताइए कि क्या-क्या बातें हो रही हैं? सी.टी.बी.टी. किन-किन प्रावधानों पर आप सहमत हैं, हम कहना चाहते हैं कि सीटीबीटी पर भारत का स्टैंड इसलिए था कि यह सीटीबीटी की संधि गैर-बराबरी की संधि है और भारत की स्पष्ट नीति थी कि जब तक दुनिया की सारी परमाणु शक्तियाँ एक समयबद्ध कार्यक्रम के अनुसार पूरी तरह से अपने परमाणु हथियार नष्ट नहीं करेंगी, तब तक भारत सीटीबीटी पर दस्तखत नहीं करेगा और आज भी भारत उस बात पर कायम हैं। क्या सरकार इस बात पर कायम है? अगर नहीं है तो कौन से प्रावधान हैं जिन पर सहमति है यह बताएं। आप कार्यवाही उठाकर देख लें, इसी सदन में विदेश मंत्री या विदेश राज्य मंत्री ने कहा कि सी.टी.बी.टी. के कुछ प्रावधानों पर हस्ताक्षर करने हेतु विचार कर सकते हैं, ज़रा बताइए कि वे कौन से प्रावधान हैं, जिन पर आप सहमत हैं? इतनी कमज़ोरी क्यों दिखाई? आज हम इस सरकार को चेतावनी देना करना चाहते हैं कि सीटीबीटी पर दस्तखत किये तो समाजवादी पार्टी निर्णय ले कि हर स्तर पर हर तरह से कहेगे हर तरह से विरोध करेंगे

....(व्यवधान)

डेकोरम हमें मत सिखाइए। अगर सीटीबीटी पर दस्तखत किये तो डेकोरम की परवाह हम नहीं करेंगे, देश की सुरक्षा और देश के हित को सर्वोपरि मानेंगे। धीरे-धीरे गुपचुप बात क्यों हो रही है? अगर नहीं हो रही है तो बताएँ कि सी.टी.बी.टी. किन प्रावधानों पर विचार कर सकते हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

जब परमाणु परीक्षण नहीं हुआ था तब भी कश्मीर में क्या हो रहा था? हम क्या नाम लें, उन्होंने कश्मीर में क्या किया था और वर्तमान रक्षा मंत्री उनके बारे में क्या विचार रखते थे, हम दोहराना नहीं चाहते।

... (व्यवधान)

जब आप कश्मीर में गवर्नर थे तब आप क्या कर रहे थे और आपके वर्तमान रक्षा मंत्री आपके बारे में क्या कह रहे थे? हमारा मुंह मत खुलवाइए। आप क्या कर रहे थे, इसके बारे में उन्होंने साफ-साफ कहा है कि आपने निर्दोष लोगों की हत्या करायी है, बलात्कार करवाए हैं। यह मैं नहीं कह रहा हूँ, आपके रक्षा मंत्री कहते थे। आज स्पष्ट करें कि आप सही थे या आपके रक्षा मंत्री सही थे? आपको यह बताना चाहिए क्योंकि आप दोनों सत्ता पक्ष बैठे हैं, मिलकर सरकार चला रहे हैं, तो उन बातों को साफ करना चाहिए कि कौन सही था और कौन गलत था। आज हम नहीं कह रहे हैं परन्तु हम बता रहे हैं कि आपके रक्षा मंत्री आपके बारे में क्या कह रहे थे, हम जानते हैं उन्होंने कहा था कि कश्मीर में हमने झुग्गी-झोंपड़ियों में घुसकर देखा है, घरों और कारखाने में जाकर देखा है कि किस तरह से हिन्दू मुस्लिम शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से रहते थे प्यार से रहते थे। लेकिन कश्मीर का गवर्नर उनको शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से नहीं रहने देना चाहता है, वह कत्लेआम कराकर खून बहा रहा है। आपके जमाने से यह हुआ। अब कहते हैं कि तमाम हिन्दू मारे जा रहे थे। जब से परमाणु परीक्षण हुआ, तब से ज़रा बताएं कि पहले वहां लोग ज्यादा मारे जा रहे थे या अब ज्यादा मारे जा रहे हैं?

... (व्यवधान)

श्री जगमोहन : आप फिगर्स क्वोट करिये।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : शांति।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : यही डेकोरम है?

... (व्यवधान)

श्री जगमोहन : आप फिगर्स क्वोट करिये। ज़बानी जमा-खर्च मत बताइए।

... (व्यवधान)

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : फिगर्स सरकार बतायेगी अभी कहा जा रहा था कि तमाम हिन्दू मारे जा रहे हैं और जब से परमाणु बम का परीक्षण पोखरण में हुआ तब से सारे हिन्दू सुरक्षित हो गये, पूरा डोडा सुरक्षित हो गया। कम से कम देश को इस तरह से गुमराह तो मत करो, आंखों में धूल तो मत झोंको। जब से भाजपा सरकार आये हैं तभी से हिन्दुओं की यह दुर्दशा है। जब संयुक्त मोर्चा सरकार डेढ़ साल रही, हमारे पूर्व गृह मंत्री बैठे हैं, हम रक्षा मंत्री थे, जरा बताइये कि डेढ़ साल में कितने हिन्दू मारे गये और अब कितने मारे जा रहे हैं?

... (व्यवधान)

अयोध्या के बारे में हमारी स्पष्ट नीति है कि अगर कोई भी

... (व्यवधान)

अयोध्या के बारे में आप सुन लीजिए कि अभी तो १६ मरे थे, अगर कभी भी संविधान और कानून के खिलाफ, न्यायालय के खिलाफ कोई काम करेगा तो देश हित में, आदमी की जान की कोई कीमत नहीं है, १६ तो कम है ३२ पर भी गोली चलवानी पड़ी तो चलवायेंगे। क्या आप बार-बार अयोध्या-अयोध्या कहते हो। वहां देश के हित में गोली चली थी, देश की एकता के लिए गोली चली थी, हिंदू-मुस्लिम एकता के लिए गोली चली थी,

... (व्यवधान)

सभी धर्मों के पूजास्थलों की हिफाजत के लिए गोली चलवानी पड़ी थी।

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI TAPAN SIKDAR (DUMDUM): There were both Hindus and Muslims. Both of them have been killed.

उसके बारे में हमने कही नहीं बताया। हम जानते हैं कि हजारों मुसलमान कश्मीर छोड़ आये हैं

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : हाउस की डेकोरम कहां गई, प्रधान मंत्री जी को बुलाइये। सभापति जी आप डेकोरम देखिये

... (व्यवधान)

जब हमारे गृह मंत्री जी वहां के प्रभारी थे और अब श्री आडवाणी जी वहां के प्रभारी बने हैं, आप समीक्षा करिये कि क्या हालत है। जम्मू कश्मीर में गुप्त जी के रहते शांति थी। एक-दो छिटपुट घटनाएं होती थीं। हम लोग मौखिक रूप से एक ललकार देते थे, पाकिस्तान का पसीना निकल जाता था। अब पाकिस्तान से बात करने में भाजपा सरकार का पसीना निकल रहा है। ... (व्यवधान) आज यह हालत है, देसी मुर्गी विलायती बोल।

श्री लालू प्रसाद (मधेपुरा) : जिस दिन से इन्होंने बोलना शुरू किया है।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : हां, उसी दिन से ऐसा है। हम लोग मौखिक रूप से एलान कर देते थे, पाकिस्तान को खबरदार कर देते थे कि हम शांति चाहते हैं, लेकिन अगर किसी ने हमारे देश की तरफ बुरी निगाह की तो लड़ाई दुश्मन की धरती पर होगी। वह चुप रह जाता था। यही हम बोलते थे। अब क्या करते हैं, अब तो पसीना निकल रहा है। आप कहते हो कि हम परमाणु शक्ति सम्पन्न देश हो गये हैं। आपके बाद पाकिस्तान भी मूर्खता कर रहा है, नवाज शरीफ भी बेवकूफी कर रहे हैं। तथा आत्मघाती कदम उठा रहे हैं सभापति जी सच्चाई यह है कि भारत में अटल जी की कुर्सी को खतरा था और वहां नवाज शरीफ की कुर्सी को खतरा था। दोनों ने अपनी कुर्सी बचाने के लिए परमाणु परीक्षण किया है। न हिंदुस्तान से पाकिस्तान को खतरा था और न पाकिस्तान से हिंदुस्तान को खतरा था, बल्कि दोनों की कुर्सी को खतरा था। एक बनावटी खतरा पैदा करके दोनों देशों को युद्ध के कगार पर लाकर खड़ा कर दिया। यह हम गंभीरता के साथ बोल रहे हैं कि दोनों देशों को बरबाद करने के लिए और अपनी कुर्सी बचाने के लिए ऐसा किया गया है। वहां नवाज शरीफ की कुर्सी खतरे में पड़ गई थी और यहां अटल जी की कुर्सी खतरे में पड़ गई थी। इसलिए दोनों देश परमाणु शक्ति का परीक्षण कर रहे हैं।

सभापति जी, आप भी महासंघ के पक्षधर रहे हैं और आज हम कह रहे हैं कि आप चीन की बात करते हो, दुनिया में वातावरण बनाने की बात करते हो, आप कम से कम बंगलादेश और पाकिस्तान के साथ मिलकर ही वातावरण बनाइये। जर्मनी से सीखो, वियतनाम से सीखो और आपस में मिलकर एक वातावरण बनाइये, हिंदुस्तान, पाकिस्तान और बंगलादेश का एक महासंघ बनाइये। चीन से कोई खतरा नहीं रहेगा। आप चीन को दुश्मन नम्बर एक मानते हो। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सेना बहादुर है। हमारी बहादुर सेना के रहते हुए हमारे देश का कोई बाल भी बांका नहीं कर सकता है। सभापति जी, जब तक हिंदुस्तान, पाकिस्तान और बंगलादेश का महासंघ नहीं बनेगा, तब तक आप चीन का ढिंढोरा पीटते रहिये, आप चीन का बाल भी बांका नहीं कर सकते।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव सभापति महोदय, अगर छीन सकते हैं, तो चीन से जाकर छीनो कैलाश मानसरोवर को जो शिवजी की तपोभूमि है और पार्वती का मायका है। आप धर्म की बात करते हैं। धर्म कहां चला गया? जय श्री राम की जय बोलने वाले, जय शिव शंकर की तपोभूमि कहां हैं? धर्म के नाम पर आप देश को बांट रहे हो

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : शांति-शांति। बीच में मत बोलिए।

श्री तपन सिकदर : सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य गलत बयानी कर रहे हैं। हमने शंकर को वहां नहीं भेजा है।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : श्री राम और शिव जी का नाम लेने वालों को चुल्लूभर पानी में डूबना चाहिए। इसलिए लालू प्रसाद जी ठीक कह रहे हैं-जय श्रीकृष्ण। अगर आप हिन्दू-मुसलमान को लड़ाओगे, तो हम राम और कृष्ण को लड़ा देंगे और फिर कृष्ण से ज्यादा कूटनीतिज्ञ कोई नहीं हुआ। सारे चरवाहे और गोपाल तैयार हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : शांति-शांति।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : हम पूरी गंभीरता से बात कर रहे हैं। सभापतिजी आजादी के बाद इस सरकार की विदेश नीति के चलते जितना अपमान हमारे देश का इस बार हुआ है उतना पहले कभी नहीं हुआ। १९७१ की लड़ाई के बाद पूरे विश्व में भारत के पक्ष में वातावरण तैयार करने के लिए जय प्रकाश जी को भेजा गया था। अब कौन भेजा जा रहा है-एक अफसर और जब वह सरकारी अफसर अफ्रीका में जाता है, तो राष्ट्रपति उससे मिलने से मना कर देता, उप राष्ट्रपति उससे मिलने से मना कर देते हैं, रक्षा मंत्री उससे मिलने से मना कर देता है। अब पता नहीं वे किससे मिलकर आए या बिना मिले ही लौट आए। जब प्रधान मंत्री जी इस चर्चा का उत्तर देंगे, तो वे अपने वक्तव्य में बताएंगे कि वे किससे मिलकर आए। आज हमारे देश की हालत यह है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश का अपमान जितना इस बार हुआ है, उतना पहले कभी नहीं हुआ। इसको हिन्दुस्तान की जनता कभी नहीं भूलेगी और इस सरकार को इसकी सजा जरूर देगी।

सभापति महोदय, यह विदेश नीति नहीं, यह तो आर.एस.एस.नीति है। विदेश नीति के स्थान पर आर.एस.एस. नीति कैसे चलेगी, वह क्या करेगी। आर.एस.एस. वाले तो नेकर पहन कर सुबह डंडा घुमा लेते हैं। अब डंडे से क्या एटॉमिक बम विस्फोट और न्यूक्लीयर युग में चले गए। डंडा हमारा असली था। आज भी हमारा बूढ़ा आदमी डंडे से चल लेता है। हमारे देश ने अहिंसा के रास्ते पर आजादी हासिल की। अहिंसा में कितनी ताकत थी कि सात समुंदर पार से आया अंग्रेज गांधी और गौतम की अहिंसा की नीति के आगे टिका नहीं और भागना पड़ा भाग गया। यह हमारे देश की नीति है, यह हमारे देश की संस्कृति है, ये हमारे देश के मूल सिद्धान्त हैं।

सभापति महोदय, आज हम अपने मूल सिद्धान्तों से हट गए हैं। हमारे देश का अपमान एक जगह नहीं, कई जगह हुआ है। अभी हमारे देश में अमरीका के उर्पा विदेश मंत्री श्री टालवोट आए। कहां हमारा विश्व ख्याति प्राप्त महान देश भारत और कहां अमरीका के विदेश मंत्रालय में एक छोटा सा उप मंत्री, लेकिन हमने देखा मंत्री लोग उसके आगे-पीछे घूम रहे हैं। प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने भी उनको मिलने का समय दे दिया। जब हमारे जसवन्त सिंह जी, अमरीका गए थे, तो अमरीका में भारतीय अखबारों में तो हम जसवन्त सिंह जी के बारे में चाहे जो छपवा लें, लेकिन अमरीका के अखबारों में उनके बारे में एक शब्द भी नहीं आया। हमने मालूम किया है। अमरीका में जसवन्त सिंह जी का कितना सम्मान हुआ, पत्रकारों ने, मीडिया ने उनको कितना महत्व दिया? जब हमारे देश में उनका डिप्टी मिनिस्टर आता है, तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री तक उसको लंच और डिनर देते हैं। मैंने टी.वी. पर देखा हमारे जसवन्त सिंह जी उनके पीछे-पीछे भाग रहे थे। हमें इस पर गंभीरता से सोचना चाहिए कि हमारे देश का मान-सम्मान कहां पहुंच गया है और अगर हमारे देश का सम्मान गिराया है, तो इस सरकार की गलत की विदेश नीति के कारण गिरा है और इसके लिए भारतीय जनता पार्टी की सरकार उत्तरदायी है। भारतीय जनता पार्टी की सरकार ने हमारे देश को अपमानित किया है।

सभापति महोदय : आप कन्कलूड कीजिए।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : अभी तो समय है।

... (व्यवधान)

हमारा आधा समय तो टोका-टाकी में ही चला गया है। अगर यह टोका-टाकी न हो तो हम अपना भाषण जल्दी ही समाप्त कर देंगे।

... (व्यवधान)

हमें पता है कि मेरे खड़े होने से उनको बहुत परेशानी होती है और वह परेशानी तो रहेगी ही।

... (व्यवधान)

भाजपा की पोल हम ही खोल सकते हैं क्योंकि आपातकाल में १९ महीने हमारे साथ आर एस एस वाले भी अगर हम जेल न गये होते तो हम इनकी पोल खोल ही न पाते।

... (व्यवधान)

इनमें ऐसे लोग बैठे हैं जिन्होंने इमरजेंसी के समय माफी मांग ली थी। जब मैंने उनसे कहा कि आपने माफी क्यों मांग ली, तो उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे गुरु ने कहा कि माफी मांगकर बाहर आओगे तो तुम अच्छा काम कर लोगे इसलिए माफी मांग ली।

... (व्यवधान)

बहुतों ने माफी मांग ली। पता नहीं

... (व्यवधान)

वरना उनकी पोल खोल देते। ... (व्यवधान)

श्री शान्तिलाल चपलोट (उदयपुर) : ज्यादातर सदस्य तो बी.जे.पी. के ही थे जबकि दूसरी पार्टी के मुश्किल से पांच-सात सदस्य ही थे। आप बढ़-चढ़कर बात कर रहे हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : मान्यवर मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : अब आप कन्कलूड कीजिए।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : अभी तो दस मिनट ही हुए हैं।

सभापति महोदय : पच्चीस मिनट हो चुके हैं।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी में भाषण हो रहे थे जिससे लग रहा था अभी लंदन के लोग बोल रहे थे। ऐसा लग रहा है कि लोक सभा लंदन में है। हमें ऐसा नहीं लगता कि यह भारत की लोक सभा है। हमें प्रधान मंत्री जी से बड़ी उम्मीद थी। उनकी कविता संगमा जी ने सुनाई। अटल जी की कविता को हमने पढ़ा है। अटल जी अपनी कविता पढ़कर व्याख्या करें कि आज के संदर्भ में उनकी कविता कहां तक सही है, प्रासंगिक है। उन्होंने नई व्याख्या तो नहीं कर दी, यह भी पता चल जायेगा। आपने बहुत अच्छा किया क्योंकि हमें याद नहीं था। यद्यपि मैंने यह लाइनें पढ़ी हैं और उसे अंडरलाइन भी कर दिया है। अटल जी की किताब मेरे पास रखी है। अटल जी ने वह किताब पूरी पढ़ी होगी जो उन्होंने लिखी है। आप लोगों ने पढ़ी हो या न पढ़ी हो लेकिन मैंने अटल जी की पूरी किताब पढ़ी है।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति जी, कश्मीर के प्रश्न पर हम कहना चाहते हैं कि इस सरकार के रहते आज कश्मीर का प्रश्न अंतर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न बन गया है। ५० साल से लेकर अभी तक यह अंतर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न नहीं बना था लेकिन अब बन गया है। यह सबसे बड़ी पराजय है हमारी विदेश नीति की, कूटनीति की। इससे बड़ी पराजय और क्या हो सकती है? आज विदेश नीति की विफलता के कारण, कूटनीति की विफलता के कारण कश्मीर अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्दा बन गया है और दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान सफल रहा है। जब भी मुस्लिम सम्मेलन होते थे तो उन में पाकिस्तान को कोई भी समर्थन नहीं देता था। आप जानते हैं कि कश्मीर के इस सवाल पर मुस्लिम देश कभी भी पाकिस्तान को समर्थन नहीं देते थे और मुस्लिम देशों के सम्मेलनों में भी पाकिस्तान को समर्थन नहीं मिलता था। कहीं कश्मीर के सवाल को नहीं उठा सकें ललेकिन आज नवाज शरीफ पूरे अरब कंट्रीज में जाकर कह रहे हैं कि हिन्दुओं का विस्फोट हो गया है और अब हमें इस्लामी विस्फोट के लिए आप मदद करिये। आज पूरे अरब कंट्रीज जो भारत का साथ दे रहे थे, वे अब भारत से अलग रहे हैं। वहां अब भारत के विरुद्ध पाकिस्तान की मदद के लिए धन इकट्ठा हो रहा है। इससे बड़ी पराजय और क्या हो सकती है?

... (व्यवधान)

आपके पास इसका कोई जवाब है? आपकी विदेश नीति के कारण भारत की इससे ज्यादा पराजय और क्या हो सकती है? हम आपको सावधान करना चाहते हैं कि आज हिन्दुस्तान चारों तरफ से घिर गया है। जैसे अंगूठी घिरी हुई है वैसे ही हिन्दुस्तान घिरा हुआ है। नेपाल भी हमारे साथ तैयार नहीं है, बर्मा भी तैयार नहीं है। मालद्वीप हमारे साथ हमेशा रहा लेकिन आज वह भी तैयार नहीं है। चीन हमारे साथ नहीं है और पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा झगड़ा हो गया है। कोई भी देश हमारे साथ नहीं है। आज पूरे मित्र देश, पड़ोसी देश हमारे साथ नहीं हैं। पूरा हिन्दुस्तान अलग-थलग हो गया है।

सभापति जी, अब हमारा कोई दोस्त नहीं है और यह दोस्त बनाने के चक्कर में हम अमरीका के पीछे घूम रहे हैं। इसके लिए हम कोई शब्द इस्तेमाल नहीं करना चाहते लेकिन इतना कहना चाहते हैं कि आप अमरीका के पीछे मत घूमिये क्योंकि अमरीका ने कभी भी हमारा साथ नहीं दिया और न देगा। आप सावधान रहिये। अमरीका ने क्या काम किया, वह आपको याद होगा। अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति चीन गये और वहां जाकर उन्होंने चीन को पंच बना दिया और कहा कि दक्षिण अफ्रीका की शांति की जिम्मेदारी हम आपको देते हैं।

हमारी विदेश नीति की असफलता है। पचास साल से लगातार हमारी विदेश नीति की सफलता रही कि हमने पाकिस्तान और चीन को कभी एक नहीं होने दिया। लेकिन भारत की इस विफल विदेश नीति के कारण पाकिस्तान और चीन एक हो गए और दोनों को अमरीका का आशीर्वाद मिल गया। आप कहते हैं कि हम अलग-थलग नहीं पड़े, प्रधानमंत्री जी ने एयरपोर्ट पर आकर कहा कि हम अलग-थलग नहीं पड़े, जरा बताइए, आज पाकिस्तान और चीन के बीच जो रिश्ते हैं, उसमें चीन कितना आपके साथ है, अमरीका कितना आपके साथ है? प्रधानमंत्री ने चीन व पाकिस्तान को लिखा अमरीका को पत्र लिखा और आपके डिफेंस मिनिस्टर चीन को नम्बर एक का दुश्मन कहते थे लेकिन अब बकरी की तरह मिमियाने लगे कि चीन हमारा दोस्त है। चीन कहता है कैसी दोस्ती? वह प्रधानमंत्री जी की चिट्ठी दिखा देगा कि आप यही दोस्ती करना चाहते हैं। आप किताब दिखा देते हैं कि मुलायम सिंह ने ऐसा कहा। यह सच है कि हमारी निगाह कमजोर पर नहीं जाती, जो मजबूत है, जबरदस्त है, जो लोगों का शोषण कर सकता है, रक्षा मंत्री रहते हुए उसकी तरफ हमारी निगाह गई और हमने काम किया। लेकिन हमने बड़बोलापन नहीं किया, शोर नहीं मचाया, शक्तिपीठ बनाने की बात नहीं की, मंदिर बनाने की बात नहीं की, चुपचाप काम किया। मैंने सबसे कहा कि हमारी नीति है कि जो मजबूत है, जिससे खतरा है, उसके बराबर हमें तैयारी करनी चाहिए। मैंने वह किया है। आप उसे दिखा रहे हैं। आपने किया-धरा कुछ नहीं। चीन एक नम्बर पर हो गया। उसका नतीजा क्या हुआ? १९६२ में चीन और भारत की लड़ाई हुई। उसके बाद १९६५ और १९७१ में दो युद्ध हुए और दोनों युद्धों में जीता पर चीन ने कभी भी पाकिस्तान का साथ नहीं दिया। ... (व्यवधान)

श्री तपन सिकंदर : आप क्या बोलते हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

आप कुछ भी बोल देते हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : अब आप समाप्त कीजिए।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : बड़बोलेपन और जल्दबाजी का यह नतीजा हुआ कि पाकिस्तान और चीन दोस्त बन गए।

... (व्यवधान)

अब इन्हें कौन पढ़ाएगा, इनको जितनी ट्रेनिंग दी जाती है उतना ही जानते हैं। इनको पता है कि चीन चुपचाप बैठा रहा और पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान की लड़ाई हुई। सबसे पहले अपने दोस्तों को विश्वास में लिया जाता है। इंदिरा जी ने रूस को विश्वास में लिया, उसके बाद बंगलादेश की लड़ाई हुई और बंगलादेश और पाकिस्तान को अलग कर दिया। सारी दुनिया में हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ कोई भी तीव्र प्रतिक्रिया नहीं हुई। यह विदेश नीति है, इसे विदेश नीति कहते हैं। ... (व्यवधान)

क्या आज वह स्थिति है। भारत कभी चीन तथा पाकिस्तान दोनों देशों को एक साथ दुश्मन बनाकर अपनी नीति का कुशलतापूर्वक संचालन नहीं कर सकता अब कूटनीति और विदेश नीति में अफसरशाह है। पहले अटल जी जाते थे। जब अटल जी नेता, विरोधी दल थे तो नरसिंह राव जी अटल जी को विदेश भेजते थे। भारत के पक्ष को विश्व में समझाने के लिए लोकनायक जयप्रकाश जी को भेजा गया। अब किसे भेजते हैं? अपने विभाग के नौकरशाह, अफसरशाह को भेजते हैं। अब केवल फाइल पर दस्तखत करने वाले लोग विदेश नीति, कूटनीति तय करेंगे। उनसे फाइल पर दस्तखत करवाइए। विदेश नीति, कूटनीति के लिए, आप अपने को याद कीजिए, नरसिंह राव जी आपको भेजते थे, उसी तरह समझदार राजनीतिज्ञ को भेजा जाता है। देश सर्वोपरि है, देश के मामले में हम सब एक हैं, देश की सत्ता के मामले में एक हैं, देश को मजबूत बनाने में एक हैं। यदि आप विपक्ष विश्वास करते, इधर से लेकर यदि दस लोगों को सारी दुनिया में भेज दिया जाता तो आज वातावरण दूसरा ही होता। लेकिन आपने विदेश नीति को पॉकेट में रखा, विदेश नीति भी पॉकेट में रखी जाएगी, ऐटम बम भी पॉकेट में है।

... (व्यवधान)

जिस पर आपको भरोसा होता, उसे भेज देते।

... (व्यवधान)

लालू जी को भेज देते, बढ़िया काम करके आते, सबको ठीक करके आते।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री लालू प्रसाद : भेजना क्या है। लड़ना तो हमको ही है, आप तो भागने वाले हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (सम्भल): लड़ना तो हम लोगों को ही है। वीरेन्द्र सिंह जी, युद्ध तो आप लड़ते हैं या हम लोग लड़ते हैं। वीरेन्द्र सिंह जी, सीमा पर ये लोग नहीं हैं, सीमा पर आज या तो आपके लोग हैं या हमारे लोग हैं। ये तो मजा ले रहे हैं।

सभापति महोदय : अब समाप्त किया जाये।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : प्रधान मंत्री जी को हमारी राय है कि अब भी समय है, समय रहते पड़ोसी देशों को भारत के दोस्त बनाइये। डा. लोहिया कहा करते थे कि किसी देश की अर्थनीति भुजा है और विदेश नीति मुट्ठी है। अगर हमारी बाजू मजबूत है तो मुट्ठी जोर से बंधी रहेगी इसके लिए कुछ कर रहे हैं? संगमा साहब ने ठीक कहा कि पानी, बिजली, दवाई नहीं, आज प्याज नहीं, गरीब आदमी के लिए टमाटर नहीं, आलू नहीं, यह तो मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि गरीब आदमी को सब्जी चाहिए। उसके लिए बिजली नहीं है, पानी नहीं है। आज बाढ़ है, किसान हमारे देश के विकास की बुनियाद है। मा. लालू प्रसाद जी बाढ़ पर बोलते हैं, उस समय डैकोरम चलता ही नहीं है।

श्री लालू प्रसाद : आसमान में छेद हो रहा है।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : इतनी खराब हालत है। इसलिए हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि पहले भारत को आर्थिक दृष्टि से मजबूत करिये। हमारी कितनी बड़ी असफलता हुई, आज दुनिया में तमाम मुल्क सुरक्षा परिषद में सदस्य बनाने के लिए भारत का समर्थन करने के लिए तैयार थे, लेकिन आज हिन्दुस्तान का सुरक्षा परिषद में सम्मिलित करने के समर्थन हेतु कोई भी मजबूत देश, बड़ा देश तैयार नहीं है। संयुक्त मोर्चा सरकार ने भारत की इस हालत में ला दिया था कि दुनियां के तमाम देश भारत के सुरक्षा परिषद में स्थान देने हेतु तैयार होने लगे थे। यह अफसोस की बात है, जब पोखरन विस्फोट हुआ उस समय प्रमुख राष्ट्रों में भारत का कोई राजदूत अथवा हाई कमिश्नर नहीं था। उस समय अमेरिका में और न इंग्लैंड में कोई भारत के अधिकारिक राजदूत ही नहीं थे देश की नीतियां का पक्ष प्रभावी ढंग से रखते

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : अब समाप्त कीजिए।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (सम्भल): मैं दो मिनट और लूंगा।

इसलिए हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं, तथा सावधान करना चाहते हैं और प्रधान मंत्री जी को सुझाव देना चाहते हैं। कि भारत को कभी भी तीसरी ताकत की देखरेख में पाक के साथ बातचीत हेतु राजी नहीं होना चाहिए इन्दिरा जी की शिमला में मि. भुट्टो के साथ आमने-सामने बातचीत हुई, उसी का पालन करना। तीसरा पक्ष जब-जब बीच में हुआ, मध्यस्त जब-जब हुआ तो भारत को घाटा हुआ। आपको याद है कि लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी जब १९६४ राष्ट्रमंडलीय सम्मेलन में इंग्लैंड गये और इंग्लैंड का दबाव पड़ा और उन्होंने कच्छ तिकु पर पंचनिर्णय को स्वीकार कर लिया और उसे छोड़ दिया। ... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : ठीक है, समाप्त किया जाये।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (सम्भल): एक मिनट की बात है।

इसी तरह से १९६५ के युद्ध के बाद शास्त्री जी ताशकन्द गये तो हाजी पीर दर्रे को भी हमें देना पड़ा। रूस हमारा मित्र राष्ट्र था, उसके दबाव में आकर, फील्ड मार्शल अयूब खान हमारे देश के सैनिकों के महान बलिदान से जीते हुए उसकी बात मानकर हाजी पीर दर्रे को हमने वापस कर दिया। यदि हाजी पीर दर्रे को हमने नहीं दिया होता तो शायद पाकिस्तान का कश्मीर में हस्तक्षेप इतना आसान नहीं होता और आज पाकिस्तान हमारे सामने इस तरह से कड़ा रूख नहीं अपना पाता। आज हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि हमने मध्यस्थता में हाजी पीर दर्रा भी दिया और कच्छ तिकु भी दिया, इसलिए हम आपको राय दे रहे हैं कि मध्यस्थता करेंगे तो भारत को नुकसान और पाकिस्तान को फायदा होगा।

... (व्यवधान)

इसलिए हम आपको सावधान करना चाहते हैं। कि तीसरी मध्यस्थता के जरिये पाकिस्तान हमेशा लाभ में रहा है। मुझे लगता है भारत पुनः मध्यस्थता के लिए उत्सुक हो रहा है। मैं भारत सरकार को इसके लिए चेतना चाहता हूँ दूसरी बात कहकर हम अपनी बात समाप्त करना चाहते हैं। संयुक्त मोर्चा की सरकार की सबसे बड़ी सफलता यह थी कि चीन से हमारे रिश्ते सुधर रहे थे। हो सकता था कि समस्या का समाधान हो जाता। पाकिस्तान से हमारे रिश्ते सुधर रहे थे, लेकिन एक मिनट में सारे रिश्तों पर पानी फेर दिया। संयुक्त मोर्चा सरकार ने पाक को राजी कर लिया था कि कश्मीर के सवाल की कोल्ड स्टोरेज में डालकर अन्य समस्याओं पर बात करें।

आज आप युद्ध के लिए तैयारी कर रहे हैं। अगर युद्ध के लिए तैयारी कर रहे हैं क्या आपने अपने मित्र देशों को विश्वास में ले लिया। वैसे मित्र तो आपके रहे नहीं, आपकी विदेश नीति के चलते शत्रु बढ़े हैं, मित्र घटे हैं। हम तो जानते हैं, आज विदेश नीति दो लोगों की पाकेट में है और सीमा पर जो गोलीबारी चल रही है, उसके चलते आप देख रहे हैं कि जो स्थिति है, उसमें युद्ध की स्थिति पैदा मत कीजिए।

आज भी हम कहना चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान, बंगलादेश और हिन्दुस्तान का एक महासंघ बनाया जाए। मैंने पहले भी कहा है कि हमारी राय में पाकिस्तान का बंट वारा गलत था, अप्राकृतिक था। जब भी दोनों देशों में तनाव होता है तो हमारे देश में वहां के बटे परिवारों का आना जाना बन्द हो जाता है भारत-पाकिस्तान के मध्य व्यापार, उद्योग, बिजली सभी चीजों की लेन देन तो शुरू हो।

मैं सिख भाइयों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे सिख भाइयों के भी वहां कई तीर्थस्थल हैं, उनका भी वहां आना जाना शुरू हो। सिख भाई गुरुद्वारों में जाएं, इसकी तैयारी होनी चाहिए, लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि भारत सरकार पाकिस्तान के साथ युद्ध की तैयारी कर रही है। आपकी विदेश नीति के कारण देश का सम्मान गिरा है, महंगाई बढ़ी है। भाजपा जब से सत्ता में आई है, तब से कमरतोड़ महंगाई हो गई है।

">SHRIMATI KRISHNA BOSE (JADAVPUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the outset, may I welcome back our Prime Minister amidst us after his successful participation were with him. Now, he has come back and, in the morning, he has given us a very good presentation. We heard him in the morning. For all that, we congratulate him. It is now time for us to express our congratulations to him.

But Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would also like to express some of our genuine concerns about this.

Shri Sangma, in the morning, made a point. He said that economic might is the real might in today's world. That was a very pertinent point which he made. If that is so, I do not know why he was disappointed with our Prime Minister's performance at Colombo. Our Prime Minister went straight for the economic agenda there. It was a very bold stroke of economic diplomacy that we witnessed in Colombo. As we all know, he had lifted the quantitative restriction from more than 2,000 items so that our smaller neighbours will now have access to the Indian market. He has spoken about Free Trade. We also know that Indian investment there will go on a fast track. Shri Sangma could have spared one or two words of praise to the Prime Minister for all this.

Apart from this, by taking the economic initiative, our Prime Minister also prevented Pakistan from hijacking the agenda. They wanted other things on the agenda, but the bold economic initiatives taken by our Prime Minister prevented that. So, I have expected a few words of praise from the Meeting.

Sir, after saying all this, I have to admit that if we think of reality, no significant progress was made in the talks between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan. We admit that. I think, our diplomatic initiative was oriented more on preventing other nations from condemning our nuclear policy. The Prime Minister has a very bold envoy in Shri Jaswant Singh, who was in Manila for the ASEAN Meeting. Now, I must congratulate Shri Jaswant Singh for what he achieved at the ASEAN Meeting. ... (Interruptions)

कुमारी ममता बनर्जी (कलकत्ता दक्षिण) : लालू जी कृपया इनको बोलने दीजिए।

श्री चिन्मयानंद स्वामी (मछलीशहर): ये आपस में बातें कर रहे हैं। जब एक सदस्य बोल रहा है तो क्यों ये बराबर बोलते रहते हैं। बैक बैचर्स को सुना नहीं जाता और आगे बैठने वाले बराबर बोलते रहते हैं। यह ठीक तरीका नहीं है।

ये लोग सदन में लगातार बात करते हैं। सदन में गंभीरता का ध्यान नहीं रखते। ... (व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : आप शांत हो जाइए।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री चिन्मयानंद स्वामी : हम शांत क्यों हो जाएं? आप शांत हो जाइए। ... (व्यवधान) आप चुप बैठेंगे तो कोई नहीं बोलेगा।

... (व्यवधान)

यह क्या तरीका है?

सभापति महोदय : आप फिर इसी तरह बात कर रहे हैं। इस तरह से बैठे-बैठे बोलना उचित नहीं है। सभी को सुनना चाहिए। किसी के बोलने में बाधा डालना उचित नहीं है।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री लालू प्रसाद : हम लोग चुप बैठे हैं। आप बोलिए।

... (व्यवधान)

SHRIMATI KRISHNA BOSE : I thank all of you from this side and from that side for giving me your attention. May I go back to my point now?

I was mentioning Shri Jaswant Singh's role in the ASEAN meetings. He had said in a press interview there as follows. I quote: -

"There was no unanimity in condemning India between ASEAN and ARF and within P-5 and G-8 which is an aspect of our nuclear diplomacy carrying conviction."

He was very right. Getting the word 'condemn' replaced by 'deplore' can certainly be termed a diplomatic success of sorts and also we have prevented Pakistan, as I have already said, from hijacking the Agenda by putting other things into the Agenda.

I would like to say that we also need to go a little deeper into that. We must not forget that we have two neighbours on our border who are now nuclear powers. We have to tread the path very carefully.

Many of our hon. Members will recall that when our Prime Minister was in Colombo, we had a discussion in this House about the hegemonistic role that China and USA were taking up. The nuclear haves were trying to preach us the virtues of nuclear non-proliferation. Now I must say that after our tests, we have done away with that very unequal nuclear regime which the nuclear haves wanted to impose on us. That was a very good thing we did. But what next is the question which is now before us. Now we are face to face with a very grave decision. It is the decision about nuclear weaponisation in Asia. I know there was always a consensus in the House about our nuclear options. But what about nuclear weaponisation? We do not have a consensus on that issue. I know that.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister to take the whole House into confidence about this. What does he really want? Does he want that we shall deploy warheads and we shall say that we shall never be the first to press the nuclear button or does he want us to carry on negotiations with China and with Pakistan so that such a scenario does not arise where Asian neighbours will be targetting one another all the time with nuclear weapons?

I would like to have a word of assurance from the Prime Minister with regard to this. I am sure the Prime Minister will always give diplomacy the first chance before going into any dangerous and expensive path of weaponisation.

I am sure all of you will agree with me on one thing. In a nuclear war, there is no winner or victor. Let us not bury our heads in the sands of Pokhran like an ostrich. Let us face that fact.

Somebody mentioned about one Ms. Arundathi a little while ago. I would like to mention another Arundathi, the famous novelist who had this to say. I was just reading her statement. She says:

"If there is a nuclear war, our foes will not be China or America or even each other. Our foe will be the earth herself. The very elements - the sky, the air, the land, the wind and water - will all turn against us. Their wrath will be terrible."

I am sure, both sides will listen to this and be careful.

I am very happy that our Prime Minister, in the very first day of this Session, had used two words "restraint and responsibility." I am sure, we will remember the words that he used. When the nuclear blasts rocked Rajasthan, I was in my rural constituency, in a very very poor village in West Bengal. I was very proud of what happened. I was very proud of our scientists. But I was also in a situation where I could see that people around me did not have the basic civic amenities like drinking water or electricity or primary schools. So, we have to remember all this. Our Prime Minister has given us a very good slogan jai vigyan. I want that slogan to become truly meaningful. When we shall have a useful participation between politics and science which will eradicate our poverty and hunger from this unhappy land, on that day, the jai vigyan slogan, which our Prime Minister has given, will become truly meaningful. We are waiting for that.

I know the hurdle that stands between the negotiation between us and Pakistan, between our Prime Minister, and the Pakistan Prime Minister. What is it? It is the letter "K" of the alphabet, Kashmir. It comes up all the time and creates all problems for us. I know our neighbour is very obstinate. I know that our neighbour is very unreasonable. But we have to continue the dialogue. We have to think what we can do at home. Again, I will plead with the Prime Minister that we should assure the people of Kashmir, the long-suffering people of

Kashmir that we shall never trample upon the legitimate rights of the region and if there is any alienation, we shall try to redress it. We should always be by their side. That much we can do without getting into any confrontation with our very very difficult neighbour because we must remember that by nuclear warheads, we cannot do that. That assurance has to be given in some other form.

Thousands of nuclear warheads did not prevent the disintegration of the former Soviet Union. We remember that. So, what can we do? We shall have to say that we shall never ignore the regional aspirations of our people. We shall have a good Centre-State, federal infrastructure where, in decision making process, even the smallest of the States will have some say. We shall have to assure all of them in this manner.

I know somebody mentioned here that Mr. Sharif has said that the talk between the two Prime Ministers was a big zero. In today's newspaper, I saw that he has spoken about war. These are very very irresponsible things to say. I shudder at the thought that such irresponsible people now have nuclear power. In comparison, India comes out in a far better light. We are speaking about responsibility. We are speaking about restraint.

14.00 hrs.

Even if the outcome of a dialogue is thousand times a zero, we have to go on talking. Talks must continue. We will have to continue the talk whatever Shri Sharif has to say. I have every faith in our Prime Minister that he will always give diplomacy a first chance and never go in for any dangerous confrontation.

I would like to request my fellow Members in the Opposition that in internal matters we may have disagreements but when we are talking about foreign affairs, always constructive criticism is welcome. But on certain sensitive issues like Indo-Pak issue or the nuclear issue, I would like them to rally behind the Prime Minister. This is a request to them. And I have a request to our Prime Minister that he will continue his talks with our difficult neighbours and will not go in for weaponisation so long as the path of diplomacy is open. Thank you.

">SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (LATUR): Sir, in this Parliament, I am very sorry to say that unfortunately, we have not been able to discuss the important issues which are faced by our country. We cannot blame the ruling party or the opposition parties or the Presiding Officers for this. The blame has to be shared by all of us together.

Defence is the first topic in the Seventh Schedule of our Constitution and the Foreign Affairs is the second topic in the Seventh Schedule of our Constitution. Planning covers the entire nation and planning is done for five years. Poverty has been in India for many years. Science and technology can take us to the future. Rural development is very important and unemployment is very important. Unfortunately, we have not been able to discuss these issues on the floor of the House. Why? Probably, the time is not sufficient for us to discuss these issues. I think, we shall have to sit for more days to cover these important matters. Probably, the Government does not want to discuss these things because the Government probably thinks that only criticism is levelled against the Government and no positive suggestions can be given. Probably, we are concentrating on constituency issues more than anything else. There is a scope for improvement and it is better for our system to take this fact into account and modify our conduct in the House and modify our method of dealing with these issues in the House. Unfortunately, for many years we have not paid enough attention to foreign affairs. We have not discussed foreign affairs in the House. It is not being discussed in the media. It is not touched upon in the public meetings also. This is a mistake we are committing and we shall have to rectify and see that the foreign affairs are discussed.

The world is becoming smaller. Foreign affairs are very complicated, probably they are more complicated than internal affairs, in certain respects. If we do not pay attention to foreign affairs, we are likely to suffer not only in foreign matters but also in internal matters.

So, it is very important and necessary to pay the requisite attention to the foreign affairs. I am happy that this matter has been taken up for discussion today, and most senior Members are expressing their views on this point.

While discussing the foreign affairs, sometimes, we are trying to say that foreign affairs, cultural matters and social matters are important but economic matters are more important. This is a fact of life and we have to recognise it. Economic matters have acquired greater importance in our life and we shall have to pay attention to economic matters also. If we do not pay attention to economic matters, we will not be able to alleviate and eliminate poverty; we will not be able to have a social harmony which we require to defend our country; we will not have our defence strength, enough strength to defend our territory and sovereignty also. But it should not be, at the same time, forgotten that life is not only economics, life is not only money, and certainly in the life of the country, it is not only economics and money, but also social and cultural aspects. The country will also have to deal with matters which relate to war, peace, and internal reactions. Now, if we are not paying attention to these facts, probably, we are going to commit a mistake and it is necessary that in this world of ours, where we are talking about the market economy, social structure and all those things, we shall have to pay attention to other aspects also. If we do not pay attention to other aspects, we are likely to suffer.

Now today, we are expected to discuss the current political issues, statement made by the hon. Prime Minister is made part of the Resolution that we are discussing today. Very rightly, by the senior Members on the floor of the House, it is said that India is a country which has been talking about peace and tranquillity everywhere. India is a peaceful country. The history points out that India has been a peaceful country. And, India will continue to be a country which will appreciate peace and tranquillity everywhere. We should do everything possible and necessary to avoid war.

Now, it is said that the present wars are not won by fighting them but present wars are won by avoiding them because in the present wars, there is no victor and no vanquisher. Everybody is defeated. The Governments are defeated, peoples are defeated, and individuals are defeated. It is so destructive that nobody comes out victorious from the present wars and that is why it is necessary for us to avoid wars.

We need to subscribe to the principles of Disarmament. I think, in the Resolution moved by Shri Rajiv Gandhi in 1988 in the United Nations General Assembly with respect to Disarmament, it gave us as to how we can go about these things. We are for Disarmament -- non-conventional and conventional. Disarmament should take place within a limited period, within a time framework which is given to us.

This disarmament should relate not only to the nuclear and other mass destruction weapons but to the technology and development of technology also. It should relate to conventional weapons also. This is to be done within a particular period of time.

I think, India will try to see that India goes with all the other countries in agreeing to the proposals which would be made, which are not discriminatory. If they are discriminatory, India has to take its own stand. But if they are not discriminatory, India would certainly go with all the other countries of the world.

Unfortunately for India, I say, five wars were inflicted on it. I say, 'five' because I include the Rann of Kutch war also as one of the wars and it makes for five wars. If wars are inflicted, what do we do? Is it possible for us to run away from wars?

India was very strong economically and yet India was defeated in the past. People came to India because India was economically strong and rich. Even though India was economically strong and rich, India was defeated and India was subjugated. This history of India cannot be forgotten by us. That is why if a war is inflicted on India, India has no option but to face it. If it has to be faced, India should be prepared to face it. This is a very, very delicate issue on which we have to be careful in making our policies and preparing ourselves to face all the eventualities which may arise in the future. If India is not prepared to face the eventualities, it will be difficult for India to protect its own sovereignty, territory and its interests. That is why India has to take a very careful stand on this point.

I am not one of those who would criticise for the sake of criticism. I do think that we should express our views very sincerely and honestly in this august House. This is not a House where we can just fling criticism at each other and try to blacken each other's faces. This is not the place for that. This is a place where some positive points can also be given by one to another and that could be useful. It is not possible for me to blame this

Government or that Government for what this Government or that Government has done because the Congress Party has also been responsible for certain developments and we will not criticise them. What we are afraid of is that the Government is not prepared to face the fallout of what they have done. We have a sincere apprehension in our minds that having taken a step the Government is not in a position to meet the consequences of what they have done in a fashion that it would protect the interests of India.

Now, for instance, let us take the case of difficulties on the economic front. We have been asking this question: 'You have taken a step and it seems that you are going to face some difficulties. Please let us know how you would like to deal with these difficulties.' We are told that India is not afraid and we should not be worried about all these things. Certainly, India should not be afraid; certainly, we are not afraid; certainly, we will not be cowed down by some restrictions or limits put on the help and assistance given to India. But at the same time it would be necessary for India to be prepared to face the difficulties that may arise out of the economic sanctions.

Is it not a fact that the prices are going up? Is it not a fact that the value of the rupee is coming down? Is it not a fact that production has come down? We should be very clear what we are going to do to meet these difficulties. From these benches, we would not like to say that you are doing everything wrong. But you cannot avoid telling us what you are going to do about these things.

Now, I come to science and technology. When we are discussing these issues, we are not keeping only one country before us. We are not saying that one big country has put some sanctions and so we are afraid. There are many other countries also which have withdrawn support in this field. Probably after some time they may change their attitude and help us also. It is necessary for us to talk to them and see that the help is given by them.

Science and technology is going to suffer. For some time the developed countries were resisting to give science and technology which is necessary for economic development. They were saying that these things would be used for defence purposes also. They keep on saying that dual-use technologies would not be given to you. After the Pokhran explosion, I think, there would be more restrictions on the transfer of science and technology from one country to the other. They are expelling the scientists from other countries.

This issue was discussed more than once in this House itself as to what we should do. Should we allow our scientists to go to other countries or should we restrain them from going to other countries? We have said that we would like our scientists to go to other countries, work for them, contribute to the development of that country, as well as learn from what they have with them. If these scientists are expelled from some countries, well we would like to welcome them back. It would be the responsibility of the Government and the country to take these scientists in our laboratories and give them the positions that they deserve. If we do not do that, that would be very sad for us. Let us decide to welcome them back. Let us give them the positions and the opportunities to work in our laboratories. We did not stop them from going to other countries. If they are coming back, we would not refuse to take them back. We shall have to have a policy on this matter.

As far as CTBT is concerned, the people have developed some kind of apprehensions in their minds. I do think that the Government has to be very careful in this respect. This House has resolved that India will not sign CTBT. The Government has to take this House into confidence in making any policy with respect to CTBT. If this House and the people are not taken into confidence, probably, the Government would not be in a position to say that we have not cooperated in matters of foreign affairs. This is the area which is very delicate and which has to be handled very carefully. We understand the difficulties. But we would also like to caution that this difficult situation has to be delicately handled.

One apprehension in my mind which I would like to put before this august House is with regard to terrorism. Terrorism is a low intensity war. The Generals have developed a policy that in an open war, thousands and crores of rupees are spent, a lot many lives are lost, and countries are held responsible for having started the war. So, let us not spend the money on open war and let us spend on this low intensity war or proxy war. Due to the proxy war or low-intensity war by our neighbour we are suffering in many States. Jammu & Kashmir, and North-Eastern States are suffering due to this low intensity war. Punjab suffered a lot due to this. Some cities are also suffering due to this. This low intensity war, I am afraid, is likely to increase in the future. It is because they would not be audacious enough to start an open war, they would like to take recourse to terrorist activities and

spend more on terrorist activities. If India is not prepared to face this difficulty, Indians especially the innocent ones, will suffer. What are we doing to face this difficulty in future?

I think, it is necessary for us to prepare our defence forces to protect our sovereignty and integrity. At the same time, it is also necessary for us to prepare our police forces to meet these difficulties. If we do not modernise the police forces, if we do not give them the transport and the communication facilities, if we do not give them the intelligence which is required and if we do not provide them the necessary training which is required, probably it will not be possible for India to use the defence forces in all cases and we will suffer from this low-intensity war.

India, I am afraid, will have to face this situation for some time to come, unfortunately. We may not have war; and we pray that there should be no war. But if war is there, nobody is going to run away and we will face it boldly. We would do our best. But terrorism and terrorist activities are something about which we have to be very very careful.

I have read the statement made by the Prime Minister very carefully made four or five points. The first point relates to the Free Trade Zone that liberalisation; the third point relates to the joint ventures which these countries would like to establish; the fourth point relates to the trade in services, that is banking, shipping, aviation, insurance and such other things; the fifth point relates to the tourism between these countries; the sixth point relates to the social issues; and the seventh point relates to the sharing of energy and sharing of scientific and technological knowledge.

countries had applied their minds to the issues in a proper perspective and they had arrived at good conclusions. What now remains is that we have to see that these resolutions are implemented, and implemented to produce good great difficulties. It is necessary to see that those difficulties are overcome.

Our neighbour Pakistan is using a language which is not very welcome. But as was said by one of the lady Members in the House, India has no option but to keep talking to Pakistan. We cannot disrupt our dialogue with Pakistan; by disrupting our dialogue with Pakistan, we are going to gain nothing. Having exploded the bomb, it is necessary for us to see that we do not enter into a race, an atomic weapons race; we shall have to see that we do not enter into an atomic weapons race or any other kind of arms race with Pakistan.

Now, it is also necessary for us to see that we are prepared for any eventuality. This is something like this: you have a cloth and you have to keep a burning piece of wood covered by that cloth; the burning piece of wood should not be extinguished and that cloth should also be not burnt. It is something like that; and yet, we shall have to do something to see that this happens and happens in a very good manner.

14.24 hrs (Shri Basu Deb Acharia in the Chair)

Let us now see our relations with our neighbours. We are trying to have good relations with our neighbours. China is one of the big countries and it is necessary for us to deal with the Chinese matters in a careful manner. There is no point in unnecessarily niggling our neighbour; and we are going to get nothing out of it. It is better that the Defence Minister, generally, avoid making statements. The Defence Ministers are expected to act and the Foreign Ministers are expected to speak. I think that we shall have to avoid saying certain things which will unnecessarily create bad relationship with our neighbour.

There is no point in saying that this country or that country is our first enemy or second enemy. I think this has to be avoided.

Now, as far as relations with other countries like Russia, United States of America, European countries, Asian countries and Non-Aligned countries are concerned, history is proving that what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had thought and done in the realm of foreign affairs is true and correct even today and likely to be true and correct in future also. Our relations with Russia are good and it is necessary for us to maintain good relations with Russia.

The United States of America had made some statements after the explosion. Other countries also made statements after the explosion. India also made statements after the explosions made by other countries. So, we

shall have to deal with the United States of America in such a fashion that our relations do not worsen. Now, if they do not like some of our policies, let them not like those policies. We also do not like the policies of some other countries. That itself should not create any bad blood between the two democracies.

European countries have been, by and large, very restraint. It would be necessary for us to talk to them and give them more information. Asian countries also have been very restraint in their statements. Now, Japan had made some statements and had said certain things. They tried to impose some sanctions. I think it is possible for us to talk to the Government and the leaders in Japan as also the people of Japan.

The Non-Aligned countries have, by and large, been very understanding and this point goes to show that what Pandit Jawarhalal Nehru did in developing good relations with the then Soviet Union, the present Russia, and the Non-Aligned countries is going to be helpful to us. It will not be beneficial for India if we neglect the Non-Aligned countries and the Non-Aligned Movement. Now a theory has developed that the Non-Aligned Movement has become irrelevant. We are saying that the economic aspect of foreign policy is very important, but, at the same time, we do not apply the same principle to our relationship with Non-Aligned countries. Non-Aligned countries were not a block against any country. Non-Alignment is a forum where the cooperation between the countries on economic, social, cultural and scientific cooperation could be possible. These facts are relevant even today. So, it is necessary to have good relations with them.

Now, relations with international organisations in the world are also very important. The United Nations is very important. Now, we were trying to have good relations with other countries and play an important role in the United Nations. I think the position has changed a little. It would be necessary to have good diplomatic moves to be taken by India to better our relations with the United nations and the organisations under the United Nations. I do think that if we sink, we become small, if we expand, we can become strong and useful also. If we think of the entire world, we will be able to protect the interests of India also. If we think of India, we will be able to protect the interests of the States also and if we think of the States, we will be able to protect the interests of the districts. But by thinking only about districts, it will not be possible to protect the interests of the States or by thinking only about the States, it will not be possible to protect the interests of the nation. And by only thinking about the nation and forgetting the entire world, apart from our nation, it will not be possible for us to protect our interests. So, foreign policy is very important. Let us not forget that the Union Government is mainly responsible for matters concerning defence, and foreign affairs. If we neglect in paying attention to them, and paying attention to the planning of foreign and defence policies, the country will suffer.

When Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, I was told that not only once but twice or thrice the 'foreign affairs' was discussed. I was sitting there. Once the foreign affairs came for discussion, one of the gentlemen got up and said, "Let us not discuss foreign affairs. It is not that important. Let us discuss economic affairs." One of the gentlemen sitting on the Opposition benches got up and said, "When Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, was India more powerful economically than what it was today? But what India used to say at that time was heard with great respect by other countries. Why is it not being respected today in matters of foreign affairs?" So, only the economic aspect is important. But it is not the only aspect which is an important content of the foreign policy. That aspect has to be borne in mind.

1431 hours

">SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, I listened with rapt attention the quite illuminating speech on foreign affairs delivered by our hon. ex-Speaker, Shri Shivraj V. Patil. I also listened with equal attention the speeches made by hon. Members from the Opposition, Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav and Shri P.A. Sangma.

Everybody agrees on one point that India is a peaceful country. Everybody agrees with the point that India has been a peaceful country, India is a peaceful country, and India will remain a peaceful country. There is no difference on this point. For thousands of years, India has remained the torchbearer, the harbinger, and the forerunner of peaceful coexistence in the world. But now the point is whether the test of nuclear device in Pokharn has made us drift away from the path of peaceful coexistence? There lies the main point.

Some of the hon. Members from the Opposition have criticised us. They have criticised the Government. Shri P.A. Sangma and Shri Mulayam Singh were criticising us. Hon. Members from the Leftist parties were also criticising that there was no need of testing the nuclear devices because, first, we want food and clothing. The people in this country are poor. So, instead of looking after them, we are just looking after the nuclear devices. These points were mentioned by some of the hon. Members from the Opposition and also by some of the hon. Members from the Leftist parties.

When the Asian Games were held in India in 1984, the same thing was being told. At that time, it was being said: "We are poor. We do not want these Asian Games. So much money is being spent for Asian Games. With this money, we could have provided so many houses and so much of food to the people." What I mean to say is this will any country, which is poor or which is just not able to provide some basic amenities to some of its people, not test a nuclear device or will it not hold the `Asian Games'? Have only the rich countries like the USA

or Western countries like the UK or France or Japan and all other countries only got a right to conduct all these things?

I mean to say that a country which does not have self-confidence, which does not have the morale, suffers from inferiority complex. That country cannot rise and stand among the comity of nations.

Excepting, hon. Shri Shivraj Patil, all the Members of Congress Party have criticised the Government. They are asking, why has the Government conducted these tests.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA (GUWAHATI): There is no Minister to note down the points.

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: I am here.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA :The hon. Member is making such an important intervention and there is nobody to note down the points.

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: I have requested my dear friend to note down the points. Meanwhile, I was discussing an important matter with the senior leader.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : We are being criticised for having conducted these tests. I may tell you that in 1974 when Madam Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister, the then Government had also conducted the Pokhran test. Did it create any impact in the world? Without being weaponised, the nuclear test does not have any meaning. That is why, even though a test was conducted in 1974 it did not have any impact all over the world. I am here talking about the United States of America or the super powers of the world.

What did the super powers think about India? Shri Mulayam Singh has said that nowadays the American Newspapers do not write about India. I may ask him, when did they write about us earlier. I can dare say that prior to Pokhran tests, the American Government and the American people thought that India is a totally uncivilized country. Most of the Americans used to think that we are red Indians. Even when the Americans used to meet some of the Indians who had been to America on some visit, they used to ask them, how many snakes or elephants did you meet before coming here. They used to think probably India is not a civilized country. In American newspapers they did not use to write even a line about India. I may tell you that after the Pokhran tests, we are being talked about there, whether good or bad, the American newspapers write about us. They may be writing against us but they are writing.

श्री लालू प्रसाद : क्या कहते हैं ?

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN :I feel happy when I am interrupted by a senior Member like Shri Lalu Prasad. I am a new Member to the Lok Sabha. When a senior Member is passing comments on me, I feel proud that he

does not think that I am an inconsequential new-comer. The hon. Leader is giving due weightage to what I am saying.

So, I was saying that India is now being talked about. After two or three days of our conducting the test, the American President, Mr. Bill Clinton has said that India is a great civilization. It has nearly 10,000 year old civilization. He has never said so before the Pokhran tests. Within one day, India has become a great civilization of 10,000 years. Before that, India was a poor country which was not at all cared for. For America, India was an inconsequential country. These nuclear tests have brought, I can dare say, dignity, prestige and self-confidence to Indians and the Indian Government. I would just like to ask one question to the hon. Members of the Opposition who are criticising the Government. Now that we have conducted the test, whatever Members may say, will it be possible to bring back India to the post-Pokhran days?

The tests have already been conducted. They were not in the interest of a Party, they were in the interest of the nation. Instead of rising in one voice, the Opposition Members are criticising now. Does it show their interest in the country? Can we say that they are patriots when they criticise the tests?

When Kalidas was carrying Bhojraj on his shoulders in Palki and was walking with difficulty, Bhojraj asked him, `

किम् बाधति ?'

Kalidas replied,

ऌस्कंधं न बाधते राजन्, तव बाधति बाधते ।'

Similarly, it is not the sanctions which hurt, it is the defeatist mentality of the Opposition that hurts. It is their defeatist attitude that makes them say `we are poor, we cannot do anything, we cannot fight with others, money will not come, what shall we do?, etc.', which hurts.

The hon. Members were speaking about Indian scientists being expelled from America. I dare say that this is a good augury for India. I remember that in the Sixties, the word `brain drain' was being used often. People were getting educated in the country in the fields of engineering, medicine, etc., and, after getting their degrees, were going to America in search of greener pastures. I proudly say now that it is a reversal of the brain drain that these people are now coming back to India. We will get our own people back. They will make India prosperous. We will say that our people had gone there and they were just residing in America.

The hon. Members were saying that our Prime Minister has failed and that we have not achieved anything. Hon. Shivraj Patil was just saying that the Government was not prepared to face the consequences of the post-Pokhran incidents. If you see the chronological events, the ASEAN did not condemn the test conducted by India in spite of the pressure exerted on them by Western countries like the United States of America. Is it not an achievement? In the accepted. ... (Interruptions) I know, Sir, that it hurts. It will hurt, I know. It will hurt when I reply to their questions. They say, `

मिनिस्टर बन जाओगे ।'

I will be very happy every time they say, `

मिनिस्टर बन जाओगे ।'

Yes, I will be happy to be given Ministership. That is the reply that I give to their comment.

the Indian territories to try to draw sympathy from the countries like the United States of America and United Nations. They have no other intention. Theirs is a frustrated mind now because they were defeated by our diplomacy.

Previously when the sanctions were imposed after the Pokhran-II tests, the hon. Members from the Opposition were saying, 'sanctions are coming now, what will you do?, how can you defend this country?, etc.' Countries like the United States of America and Japan were saying that more sanctions, punitive sanctions, should be imposed.

Are they now telling the same thing? Now, there is a talk of withdrawal of sanctions; there is a talk of dilution of sanctions; and there is a talk of reduction of sanctions. The American Senate itself has tried to find out fault in their own laws and they have prevented Mr. Bill Clinton for imposing the sanctions for the next one year. They are doing it, we are not doing it. What does this point out? Is it not a success of the diplomacy by the Government of India? Is it not a success for Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the Prime Minister of India? I can tell you that it is a silent coup; it is a victory for Indian democracy without the beating of the drums. Sir, it is a success. All these things point out that the Indian democracy has succeeded.

Finally, I would just tell you that we honour Indra, Vishnu, Brahma and Maheshwar because everyone of them is in possession of a very destructible weapon. They may not utilise it. They hold Pasupathi Trishul Sudharshan Chakra. There are 36 crore of Gods. We do not know the names of them. Why? Because they are helpless. They do not have anything with them. They are not significant. We only know the names of the powerful ones. World salutes only those countries which are powerful. World honours them. The future economic development of the country lies with this honour and dignity. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is going to make India a self-confident country.

Previously, there were Governments; there were same Governments; there were same Members; and there were same scientists. Why did they not test the nuclear devices? Because there was no political will; there was no political determination. Only Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the Prime Minister of India and the proud son of Mother India decided to conduct the nuclear tests because of his political will and determination. He is willing to take India into the 21st Century to make it a prosperous, powerful and the best nation in the world.

I would just like to congratulate him and thank him for what he did. He should proceed further to show us light and glory and take us into the 21st Century.

">

श्री लालू प्रसाद (मधेपुरा) : सभापति जी, माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के सार्क सम्मेलन में जाने के पहले एक प्रश्न हमने यहां किया था कि पाकिस्तान से क्या कोई तारीख बातचीत के लिए तय हुई है तो प्रधान मंत्री जी और खुराना जी ने बड़ा जोर देकर उस दिन जवाब में बताया कि पाकिस्तान से बात करने की तारीख तय हो गई है। यह माननीय सदस्यों को याद होगा, सदन को पता है। भारत के कई अखबारों में, प्रमुख समाचार-पत्रों में छपा था कि प्रधान मंत्री जी मि. नवाज शरीज से बात करने के लिए बहुत उत्साहित हैं, बड़ा अच्छा रैस्पोंस आ रहा है। भारत के लिए यह स्थिति क्यों आई? ऐसी क्या स्थिति हो गई, ऐसे क्या हालात हो गये? इस शासन के पहले जितना काल गुजरा, हमारी आजादी के पचास साल गुजरे, लेकिन हमने ऐसा नहीं देखा कि लोग कभी इतने ज्यादा उत्सुक हुए हों।

प्रधान मंत्री जी वहां गए। भारत के प्रमुख समाचार पत्रों में फोटो छपी पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री नवाज शरीफ और हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री अटल जी की फोटो छपी। दोनों के हाथ में बोतल थी

... (व्यवधान)

बोतल का मतलब अंग्रेजी जानने वाले लोग गलत समझ लेते हैं। हम हिन्दी वाले हैं, बोतल दूध की भी होती है और पानी की भी होती है। उन दोनों के हाथ में पानी की, मिनरल वाटर था

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त :वह भी १५ रुपये की आती है।

श्री लालू प्रसाद :हमारे देश में पानी भी १५ रुपये लिटर मिलता है। हमें आशा थी कि प्रधान मंत्री जी जब वापस आएंगे तो निश्चितरूप से दोनों में जो बातचीत हुई है, उसका ब्यौरा देंगे। सार्क सम्मेलन में कई राष्ट्र जुटे थे। भारत, पाकिस्तान, बंगला देश और कुछ छोटे-छोटे राष्ट्र थे। अगर आप प्रधान मंत्री जी का आज का

वक्तव्य देखें तो उसमें कुछ खास नहीं है। केवल आफिशियल्स द्वारा जो रूटीन वर्क होता है, उसी का ब्योरा इसमें है। हमें उनके वक्तव्य में कोई ठोस चीन नहीं मिली, बल्कि ऐसा लगा कि वे कुछ गंवा कर ही आए हैं और कोई बात आगे नहीं बढ़ी। एक रटी-रटाई बात जो हमारे पदाधिकारियों ने उसमें लिख दी, जैसे बिजनेस के क्षेत्र में उदारवादी नीति का फायदा उठाया जाए, व्यापार को बढ़ाया जाए, यहां से सामान वहां जाए, ये सारी बातें ही वहां हुईं। इसी रूटीन वर्क को उन्होंने यहां पढ़ दिया। अटल जी के जो सहयोगी हैं और उनके सहयोगी दलों के जो सदस्य हैं, वे कह रहे हैं कि भारत आगे बढ़ गया और यह इनके चलते हुआ।

न्यूक्लियर टेस्ट हुआ, हमें समय देखना चाहिए था कि यही समय उसके लिए क्यों चुना गया। इस पर पहले भी काफी चर्चा हो चुकी है और देश में भी चारों तरफ डिबेट हो रही है। परसों मैं जमशेदपुर गया था। वहां टेलीग्राफ के लोग और कई अन्य जाने-माने पत्रकार भी जुटे थे। वे हमसे पूछ रहे थे कि इस टेस्ट के बाद राष्ट्र ने क्या खोया और क्या पाया। हम लोगों ने अपने विचार वहां रखे। लेकिन हमें विचार करना चाहिए कि आज भारत कि स्थिति ऐसी क्यों हो रही है। हमने किनको लक्ष्य बनाया था, न्यूक्लियर टेस्ट के पीछे हमारी मंशा क्या थी। क्या हमने अमेरिका को लक्ष्य बनाया था या सम्पन्न राष्ट्रों को लक्ष्य बनाया था? उस परिप्रेक्ष्य में जो यह न्यूक्लियर टेस्ट हुआ, उसका असर और प्रभाव कहां तक जाता है। जब प्रधान मंत्री जी ने टेस्ट के बाद विपक्ष के नेताओं और वैज्ञानिकों को अपने निवास पर बुलाया तो वहां वे डेमोंस्ट्रेशन करा रहे थे। हमने डा. कलाम जी से कहा था कि यह जो टेस्ट हुआ, दुनिया के सम्पन्न देश जिनका अगुवा अमेरिका है, उसने न जाने ऐसे कितने टेस्ट किए हैं और वह छोटे-छोटे राष्ट्रों को कह रहा है, भारत को भी कह रहा है कि सी.टी.बी.टी. पर दस्तखत करो। भारत ऐसा नहीं कर रहा था। दुनिया को पता था, दुनिया के लोगों को पता था कि आणविक क्षेत्र में भारत के पास न्यूक्लियर डिवाइसेज हैं।

लेकिन हमने अपनी पोल, हमने अपनी रणनीति सरकार बनते-बनते खोल दी। दुनिया एलर्ट हो गई और हम कन्फाइड हो गए। हम सीमित हो गए। डा. कलाम से पूछा कि आप बताएं कि यदि न्यूक्लियर टेस्ट से लड़ाई हुई तो हम भारत के लोग अमरीका से लड़ने में क्या इस टेस्ट से सक्षम होंगे? यदि हैं तो अपने वैज्ञानिकों को बुला लीजिए। उनकी क्षमता को समझ लीजिए। उन्होंने कहा कि आप पैसा लाइए, साधन दीजिए तो हम निश्चित रूप से इस अमरीका तर पहुंचने के बारे में भी विचार करेंगे। दुनिया में जो बड़े राष्ट्र हैं, दुनिया का जो कॉमर्शियल सेंटर है, जिनके हाथ में दौलत है, वे छोटे-छोटे राष्ट्रों को तोड़ना चाहते हैं, लड़ाना चाहते हैं, यह उनकी नीति रही है और हम अपनी कूटनीति में विफल रहे हैं। आपकी विफलता, भारतीय जनता पार्टी और आर.एस.एस. का कट्टरपंथ, कम्युनल करेक्टर में जाकर हम पाकिस्तान की सरहदों से सिमट गए हैं।

जब हमने टेस्ट किया, अमरीका का बयान आता है कि मैं पाकिस्तान जा रहा हूँ। अमरीका से पाकिस्तान टीम जा रही है कि हम उनको मना कर देंगे कि तुम मत फोड़ना। आपको याद होगा, सारी दुनिया का ध्यान केन्द्रित कर दिया गया। पाकिस्तान भर से हिन्दुस्तान अमरीका की टीम गई। अमरीका ने कहा कि मैंने तो इनको मना किया है, तुम जवाब मत देना। जो अखबारों में बातें चली, वही मैं जानता हूँ। उसने भी चार ठोंके। पाकिस्तान ने भी छः न्यूक्लियर ब्लास्ट किए तो हमारा ध्यान लड़ाई पर केन्द्रित हो गया। आपकी नीति और आपकी गंदी कूटनीति ने, आपके कट्टरपंथ ने, आपके कम्युनल करेक्टर ने भारत और पाकिस्तान को एक जगह लाकर फँक दिया।

मुलायम सिंह यादव जी के एक बार फुफकारने से, ललकारने से पाकिस्तान की हालत खराब हो जाती थी। यह जरूर था कि सीमा पर पहले वह उपद्रव करता था लेकिन बाद में पाकिस्तान को डिफेंस में जाना पड़ता था परंतु आज हालत है कि आज कैसी-कैसी बातें पाकिस्तान आपकी वजह से कर रहा है। आप अगर खुश हैं, आनन्दित हैं, दुनिया में अगर आपका गौरव बढ़ रहा है तो हम लोगों को कुछ नहीं करना है। चीन के मामले में सोवियत रूस जब था तो सोवियत रूस छोटे-छोटे राष्ट्रों को अमरीका के डोमिनेशन के खिलाफ खड़ा करता था। आज सोवियत रूस बिखर गया है। अमरीका का मुकाबला जापान कर सकता था लेकिन जापान में आज चीन का राज चल रहा है। चारों तरफ स्थिति यह हो गई है कि जब प्रधान मंत्री जी बाहर गए तो उन्होंने सीधे श्री नवाज शरीफ से कहा कि कश्मीर की पहले बात करिए।

15.00 hrs.

जम्मू कश्मीर की बात करिए। दुनिया को मालूम है कि जम्मू-कश्मीर भारत का अंग है। यह कहने का मतलब है कि पाकिस्तान भारत से बात नहीं करना चाहता है। चीन को किसने नाराज किया? चीन को नाराज किया, आपके डिफेंस मिनिस्टर ने। गैर जिम्मेदारी का बयान दिया कि चीन अब्बल नम्बर का दुश्मन है। इस बयान पर जब चीन ने रियैक्ट किया, तो आपके विदेश विभाग के प्रवक्ता कहते हैं कि यह भारत सरकार का चीन के प्रति रियैक्शन नहीं है। यह सरकार की हालत है कि कोई कुछ कहता है, कोई कुछ बोलता है और कोई इस तरह का बयान देता है, कोई संयम नहीं है। यह देश हमारा है, देश के सर्वहारा लोगों का है। चाहे बिहार रैजीमेंट हो या राजपूत रैजीमेंट हो या कुमाऊं रैजीमेंट हो या गोरखा रैजीमेंट हो या मद्रास रैजीमेंट हो या सिक्ख रैजीमेंट हो - यह देश इन बहादुर लोगों का है। हमारी पंचशील की नीति

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव :खुराना जी का नहीं है।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री लालू प्रसाद : यह देश खुराना जी का नहीं है। खुराना साहब, जिस दिन दिल्ली में बम गिरेगा, तो वे अस्पताल में नजर आयेंगे।

... (व्यवधान)

खेत-खलिहानों और चौक-चौराहों पर देश की बहादुर जनता नजर आएगी, लेकिन जब सर्वाहारा की बात करते हैं, तो कहते हैं कि विदेश नीति पर बोलो। हमारी बहन बैठी हैं, वे बतायें कि आप की वजह से हम लोगों को क्यों अपमानित किया जा रहा है? अमरीका में टैक्नोलॉजी के नाम पर, कम्प्यूटर के मामले में साइन्टिस्ट्स की क्रीम को चुन-चुनकर ले जाया गया। क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि अब हमारे साइन्टिस्ट को वहां से भगाया जा रहा है और अपमानित किया जा रहा है? उनसे कहा जा रहा है कि अमुक तारीख तक अमरीका छोड़ दो। क्या यह बात आपके गौरव की है। यह बापू का अहिंसा पर आधारित देश है। अहिंसा हमारा अमोघ अस्त्र है। अहिंसा के रास्ते से दुनिया की बड़े से बड़ी ताकत को पराजित किया जा सकता है। हम यह नहीं कह सकते हैं कि आपका दोष भी नहीं है। आप आरएसएस के लोगों को गंठा पहनाकर ट्रेनिंग देते हैं। कांग्रेस का तैयार किया हुआ और वैज्ञानिकों का तैयार किया हुआ न्यूक्लियर बम, स्वदेशी छोड़कर आप न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट पर चले गए।

... (व्यवधान)

लंगड़ी विलार घर में ही शिकार

... (व्यवधान)

यह माला थैला रखा रह जाएगा। रजाई ओढ़ कर घर में ही रह जाओगे और चलेंगे हम, इस बात को समझ लेना। प्रधान मंत्री जी सदन में नहीं है, सुन रहे होंगे, खेत और खलिहानों में, देश के अन्दर चारों तरफ सदभावना कायम करने के लिए आप क्या कर रहे हैं? कम्युनल हार्मनी, भूख और प्यास - क्या आपका घर ठीक है? आपने बम तो फोड़ दिया और डिवाइस की बात करते हैं। भारत के अन्दर जगह-जगह न्यायालय की मनाही के बावजूद क्या मंदिर डिवाइस अलग-अलग नहीं बन रहा है? क्या देश में हिन्दू-मुसलमान-सिक्ख-ईसाई, जो परिवार हैं, वे इन्टैक्ट हैं, असुरक्षा की भावना उनके मन में नहीं है। आपके लाखों अर्द्ध सैनिक बल जम्मू-कश्मीर में लगे हुए हैं।

जो हमारे सैनिक हैं, आर्मी है, सरहदों पर लड़ने वाली आर्मी आज देश के अंदर किस की वजह से है। भारत को दूसरों से मुकाबला करने से पहले अपने घर को अंदर से ठीक रखना पड़ेगा। घर फूटे, ग्वार लूटे। पड़ोसी नाराज हैं और आप देश को गुमराह कर रहे हैं। अमेरिका के खिलाफ न्यूक्लियर टेस्ट कहां था, यह बंदर घुड़की है पाकिस्तान की भारत के खिलाफ। मुलायम सिंह जी ने नवाज शरीफ के बारे में ठीक कहा कि वहां गरीबी, भूख, प्यास है और भारत में भी गरीबी, भूख और प्यास है। राम राज कौन लाएगा, कौन गरीबी मिटाएगा? आपने कहा कि हमने बम फोड़ दिया- 'बोलो बम और तोलो कम।' देश में बड़े-बड़े होर्डर्स और ट्रेडर्स सारा सामान जमा कर रहे हैं, होर्डिंग कर रहे हैं। युद्ध होगा, युद्ध की तैयारी कर रहे हैं। आप अखबार में पढ़िए, अगर अखबार ने गलत लिखा है तो इनके खिलाफ प्रिविलेज दीजिए।

... (व्यवधान)

महोदय, हमें आपसे बड़ी आशाएं हैं। इसमें ५० आदमियों के सीमा पर मरने की खबर है।

... (व्यवधान)

स्वदेशी पर हम क्या बोलें। अभी मुलायम सिंह जी ने कहा है 'देसी मुर्गी, विलायती बोल', 'देखो यह कुदरत का खेल, खा गया राशन, पी गया तेल।'

स्वदेशी, गांधी बाबा का ठेहना धोती, हाथ में डंडा, क्या गांधी जी को कमीज का, कोट का शौक नहीं था। 'वह है भारत, वह है स्वदेशी, चलो गांव की ओर।' आप गरीबी का कैसे मुकाबले करेंगे, जमीनें सूखी पड़ी हैं। बीजेपी के पापाचार से वर्षा नहीं हो रही है, चारों तरफ तबाही मची हुई है। अगर राजा पापी हो जाए तो वर्षा नहीं होती, कुदरत भी साथ नहीं देती। पता नहीं कैसे-कैसे लोग उधर बैठे हुए हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

अगर राजा पापी होगा तो बाढ़ आ जाएगी।

श्री तपन सिकंदर :बाढ़ नियंत्रण के लिए बाढ़ का पैसा कहां चल गया?

... (व्यवधान)

श्री लालू प्रसाद :आप हमें टोका-टाकी करते हैं। मुलायम सिंह जी और हमने तय किया कि हम वहां नहीं जाएंगे और आपको सलाह देते हैं कि आप बैठिए, ऐसे मंत्री नहीं बनते। आप ही जैसे लोगों के लिए रहीम जी ने कहा-

'रहिमन चुप भर बैठिए, देख दिनन के खेल,

जब नीके दिन आई हैं, बनत न लगी है देर।'

श्री तपन सिकदर : मैं भी आपको भोजपुरी में बताता हूँ- 'सौ-सौ चूहे खाकर बिल्ली हज को चली।'

... (व्यवधान)

श्री लालू प्रसाद : महोदय, सरकार की यही नीति थी, दुनिया में जिन कमजोर राष्ट्रों पर अन्याय होगा, हमारी नीति थी कि वहां भारत अकेले खड़ा हो जाएगा। हम अन्याय और जुल्म को नहीं सहेंगे, लेकिन आज अंगूठी की तरह बर्मा में विदेशी सैनिक लगे हुए हैं। हम पाकिस्तान से घिरे हुए हैं, बंगलादेश और पूरे चीन से घिरे हुए हैं। हमने जार्ज साहब का फोटो देखा- टोपी लगा कर बर्फ में खड़े हैं, पीछे आर्मी वाले हैं, जहां शंकर जी मानसरोवर में हैं उनको वहां जाने की हिम्मत नहीं हुई, वह डर के मारे वहां जा नहीं सके।

देश का रक्षा मंत्री कहां जा रहा है, बिहार में क्या बोलकर आता है, चुनाव के लिए तैयार रहिये, समता पार्टी की सरकार बनेगी। समता रमता ही रह जाएगी, सरकार नहीं बनेगी। इसलिए आप सभी को कॉन्फिडेंस में लीजिए, देश की एकता के लिए, देश में भाईचारे के लिए सबको साथ लीजिए क्योंकि अगर देश पर किसी तरह का हमला होगा तो हम सभी को इकट्ठा होकर उसका मुकाबला करना होगा। इसलिए अपने मन से कट्टरपन को खत्म कीजिए, फंडामेंटलिस्ट लोगों के बहकावे में मत आइये और अपनी आर्थिक स्थिति को मजबूत कीजिए। स्वर्गीय शास्त्री जी ने नारा दिया था 'जय जवान, जय किसान' लेकिन आप क्या कह रहे हैं 'जय श्रीराम, राम-राम'। इसलिए हम तमाम ग्वाल-बाल, आदिवासी, गरीब आदिमियों को इकट्ठा करके बोल रहे हैं 'जय श्रीकृष्ण, जय भगवती और जय देवी दूर्गा'। उनके लौकिक स्वरूप को लेकर हम देश को बचाएंगे, साधू-बाबा लोग नहीं बचाएंगे।

यह सरकार हर मोर्चे पर बिल्कुल विफल रही है और न्यू-क्लीयर विस्फोट के बाद राष्ट्र को इनकी नीतियों के कारण बड़ा भारी नुकसान हुआ है, इसका खामियाजा आने वाले समाज को उठाना पड़ेगा। ये तो महीना, दस दिन में जाने वाले हैं, जिस दिन इन्द्रजीत बाबू तैयार हो जाएंगे, इनको जाना पड़ेगा।

">SHRI C. SREENIVASAN (DINDIGUL): Sir, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to participate in the discussion on foreign policy. India is not just a country, India is a subcontinent. India has diverse religions, diverse communities, diverse languages and diverse cultures. India's unity in diversity is our strength. When several other nations were practising gun power, India was the only country which gave the message of non-violence and peaceful negotiations as instruments for finding solutions to all international problems. This year, we conducted our nuclear tests. Our intentions are very clear. We associated our nuclear tests with 'Buddha smiles'. Buddha had renounced the world, but Buddha did not renounce wisdom. We are not a nuclear power; we are a nuclear saint. The nuclear weapons will be used only when the saint is disturbed.

15.14 hrs (Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

On this occasion, I feel it my bounden duty to congratulate our Prime Minister and the scientific community for their tremendous success. Now, the US has imposed sanctions on us. The US has also expelled some of our scientists. It had denied US visa to the Chairman of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission. With these happenings, I feel that the real era of swaraj has begun and the era of dependence on Western technology has ended.

Sir, as far as the Kashmir issue is concerned, it should be resolved only bilaterally. Thanks to the best efforts of our hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, we have been able to convince the world that the Kashmir issue is a bilateral issue which can be solved within the framework of Simla multilateral issue.

In this connection, I must say a word about our time-tested relationship with Russia. Russia still supports our stand on the Kashmir issue. Russians have also come forward to provide us all assistance in setting up two atomic power stations of 1,000 mega watt each at Koodankulam in Tamil Nadu. So, I want the Government to forge stronger ties with Russia.

Sir, it is a matter of grave concern that a large number of fishermen of Tamil Nadu are being killed on the high seas by the Sri Lankan Navy as well as the LTTE cadres. The Sri Lankan Government is violating the 1974 Katchatheevu Agreement. The traditional fishing rights of our fishermen are protected under that Agreement.

Since that Agreement is being violated, our leader, Dr. Puratchi Thalaivi gave a call for taking back Katchatheevu. I feel the Government should have strongly taken up this matter with the Sri Lankan Government.

As far as the issue of LTTE is concerned, their movements have greatly increased in Tamil Nadu. The bomb blasts all over Tamil Nadu might have been the handiwork of not only the ISI, but also of this terrorist group. Maintenance of internal peace has a tremendous bearing on our relations with neighbours. Therefore, for maintaining perfect internal peace in Tamil Nadu, I fervently appeal to the Central Government, through you, to dismiss the DMK Government in national interest. Now, after the laying of the Final Report of the Jain Commission, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu should either step down or his Government should be dismissed for knowing the truth about the assassination of Shri Rajiv Gandhi

Sir, I, once again, appeal, through you, to the Government to kindly save the fishermen of Tamil Nadu. This is my humble request. With these words, I conclude my speech.

">SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (MIDNAPORE): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as some of the hon. Members have already remarked, it is a long time since we had a debate on foreign affairs and foreign policy in this House. Today, we are having it, although the attendance is not very encouraging. I listened very carefully to the hon. Prime Minister's introductory remarks.

I know he wanted to concentrate mainly on the Colombo meeting. Nevertheless, since this foreign affairs debate is taking place not only after a long time but after a very critical new situation has developed, I was expecting to hear from him something about what the country's nuclear policy is going to be now. We have entered this nuclear capability era. We have now joined informally the nuclear club of those countries which have demonstrated their nuclear capabilities. This is a new thing for us. Now I would like to know from the Prime Minister what is the Government's future nuclear policy going to be. But nothing has been said clearly about that. He has, of course, said that we do not intend to commit aggression on anybody. That is very good. We know India is not a country which goes about committing aggression, and certainly with nuclear weapons, we cannot commit aggression. These are weapons of mass destruction. These are not weapons in any case which you can use against anybody else and much less a neighbouring country. If you try to use them, then you are bound to get some retaliation. I find it very difficult to believe that when this Pokhran test took place, our Government and our scientists particularly were completely ignorant of the fact that Pakistan also has developed this nuclear capability. Is it possible to believe such a thing? We hold our scientists in great esteem. I do not believe that it was possible that when the Pokhran test took place they do not know and they did not warn the Government that Pakistan is likely to retaliate. Within two weeks time it exploded its own nuclear device. The Government may say now that they were not taken by surprise. But I think they were taken by surprise. If they were expecting this to happen, then when we did our testing at Pokhran, some indication would have been given to the country. It is because instead of talking about India's great achievement we should have anticipated that Pakistan is also likely to do a similar thing and they did it. So, what is the position now? Of course, in one sense, I feel, the possibility of another war between India and Pakistan - we have already four or five of them - is probably a bit less now than it was previously. For, before these tests took place, wars were being fought with conventional weapons - tanks, guns, planes and all that. In which respect India, of course, decisively superior to Pakistan? There is no doubt about it. This was one reason why Pakistan was also always trying to explain to the world that India is much stronger than Pakistan and they are likely to commit aggression against Pakistan and therefore America should help them, China should help them, and so on and so forth. But having exploded their own nuclear device or shown their capability to some extent as far as non-conventional weapons go, both the countries are now in a way more or less on the same footing because they cannot use these weapons against each other. Neither Pakistan can attack India with nuclear weapons nor can India attack Pakistan. These are weapons of mass destruction which cannot be used. The entire world came to this conclusion after Hiroshima. Yes, they can be used as a deterrent. I do not know what the main objective of our BJP Government is, whether they want to use it or they want to keep it as a kind of deterrent. Certainly, they do not wish to use it as a weapon of aggression. I am sure of that. Of course, this will not prevent the proxy war from going on.

I agree with Shri Shivraj Patil that these weapons will not be used, but the proxy war which is going on at the instance of Pakistan, a low intensity war on our borders, specially in Jammu and Kashmir, may be intensified further. We have to be on guard because of that.

I want to know what is going to be our nuclear policy. We should be told something on this. This is the Parliament of India and we are discussing foreign affairs for the first time, after these tests have taken place. So, what is the nuclear policy of this country going to be?

As far as CTBT is concerned, from time to time, some statements are being made by various people that we may even consider signing CTBT or some aspects of CTBT provided there are some modifications made. But it has never been clarified as to what those aspects are. What are those modifications which we would like? Up to now, as far as I know, Shri Jaswant Singh, who is roaming around the world, meeting his American counterparts and discussing probably this very question about CTBT, has not explained to us at any place or at any time as to what exactly we are trying to get out of the Americans before we agree to sign CTBT. I think, we should be told about it. As far as we are concerned, we are laymen and we have to come to conclusions on the basis of what we read. Even if we sign CTBT, perhaps, it is the refusal or reluctance of the Americans to part with certain very crucial technology which is connected with the CTBT. Naturally, if we sign CTBT, then we would like to have access to this superior kind of technology which all the signatories' States of CTBT should be in a position to share among themselves. I do not know if that is what is holding up the signing. I do not find any other clause in the CTBT which can be described as discriminatory. If there is one, I would like to be educated about it.

As far as Non-Proliferation Treaty goes, it is clearly discriminatory. As far as CTBT goes, I do not know if the terms of provisions contain anything [which is discriminating against any particular country or countries. But I do find that, and I know what the Americans are like, they would not like to part with their technology which India naturally would like to have. Perhaps, the negotiations and the bargaining which are going on at present, behind the scenes, may be connected with this thing. If we are informed something by the Government, then I would be very much obliged to know.

Then, Sir, in the statement made by Shri Vajpayee, at one place, he has said, "I took the opportunity in my interaction with other leaders to set at rest the misconceptions about our recent nuclear tests." He has not explained why there were misconceptions, what those misconceptions were, and which are the countries which were harbouring those misconceptions. We should be told about them. In what way did our Prime Minister set those misconceptions at rest and by giving what assurances? I do not know what he said because nothing is explained in this statement. He has said, "The looking at things." This is what Pakistan always does. They try to narrow down all the discussions to the single issue of Kashmir, and naturally we resist will not discuss issues which are matters of dispute between member-countries and, therefore, Pakistan could not really get anybody to discuss Kashmir. So, the proxy war will, of course, go on.

Shri Nawaz Sharif is talking about the results being zero and being a waste of time because, from his point of view, unless the Kashmir issue is discussed and some decision is reached, it is a waste of time. That cannot be helped. The question is being mentioned here and I quote : -

"How do we judge now? How are we going to assess the effects of this nuclear testing which we did?"

Many hon. Members in this House are always talking about how it is strengthened, how strong we have become now, and so on and so forth. I think that is the correct way. We should estimate whether, after these Pokhran tests vis-a-vis Pakistan, India has become stronger and Pakistan has become weaker. How is this to be demonstrated? I do not know. The way they are behaving on the border now for the last few days, carrying on unprovoked firing and shelling everyday, much more than they used to do before, killing innocent civilians, killing members of our security forces and the army, is such that the Army Chief has had to rush there. He is there now along with other top-ranking officers and all that, working out measures on how to counteract this Pakistani attack which is going on. He does not appear as though they have been cowed down by the fact that we have got this weapon. Of course, it is partly due to the fact that they have developed the weapon themselves also. They feel that India is not superior to them in that sense. When there were conventional weapons only, then India was ten times stronger, perhaps hundred times stronger. I am not giving figures because of lack of time. The figures are here. If you compare our tanks, planes, artillery and other weapons with the same type of weapons that Pakistan has, we are 20 times stronger than them. But once that conventional weapons equalisation is ruled out, except for proxy war, it will not be of much use. Both of us are now back to the nuclear stage. Pakistan is behaving in such

a way that it does not seem it has been cowed down and that it is in any way less bellicose or less belligerent than than it used to be.

So, I would like to know from the hon. Members here when they are being so euphoric about the alleged added strength which India has acquired, how exactly they are estimating or calculating this.

The hon. Prime Minister has also said; -

"During my talks with the Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, I also emphasised that instigation and support of terrorism was incompatible with our own desire for friendly and peaceful relations and that these activities must cease immediately."

This is what the Prime Minister told Mr. Nawaz Sharif. But there is not a single sentence which indicates what was Mr. Nawaz Sharif's reaction or response to this demand by our Prime Minister. I take it that Mr. Nawaz Sharif's reaction was negative. Either he must have contradicted our Prime Minister and said he has got nothing to do with this instigation and support of terrorism or he may have said "I am not in a position to do anything."

But I am only saying and pointing out that there is nothing in the Prime Minister's statement except what he told Mr. Nawaz Sharif.

The global economic situation has been substantially transformed. That is mentioned. A substantial transformation of the global economic situation has taken place. This is true, of course. What will India gain from it? Is India gaining out of that global transformation or are some other countries gaining at the expense of the least developed countries? That is a very important question for India with all its long history and tradition of standing up for the rights of the weaker nations and all that. We were the champions always of the weaker nations. Shri Lalul Prasad has also mentioned it. Traditionally, we have been looked upon as the champions of the weaker nations, the non-aligned, the Third World countries and so on.

Now, in this new global economic situation, there is no doubt that some powers, a few powers, which are very strong economically and financially, which have got multinational corporations based in their countries, are using this new global situation in order to threaten, and in some ways, to force, pressurise and coerce the lesser developed countries, the weaker nations who are naturally very much concerned about it. What is India's role now vis-a-vis this problem? I think we are so anxious to show our credentials to President Clinton that immediately after the test, our Prime Minister goes and writes a letter to him, for which I do not think there was any need. Why was it necessary for the Prime Minister to re-assure President Clinton saying that what we have done is only because of China and if there were no threats from China, we would not have done this. It is a kind of a roundabout apology by saying: "Yes, we have done something which we should not have done. But what is to be done? After all, China is threatening us." Within a few weeks of that, we find President Clinton, on his trip to China, being so friendly with them, giving them so many concessions as far as economic, commerce and all that is concerned. Of course, we always thought that India is such a big market that the Americans and the other Western powers would not try to displease us because they want to make money out of our market. That is still true. But China is a bigger market. The multinationals are rushing to China. They are being welcomed there. They have established themselves there. And profits are being mounting up and up. So, what I would like to say is that this is not something which can be solved by just exploding nuclear devices. We should not give up the role which we followed consistently for so many years from the time when we took to the path of Non-Alignment and Peace. I do not know if we can call ourselves Non-Aligned now. But, in any case, since we are now a nuclear weapon State, we are in a position to speak up more strongly, I think, for the rights of the least developed countries which are looking to us and whom we should also try to unite and to coordinate in common moves which can resist this pressurising by the globally advanced countries at our expense.

Finally, Sir, I would like to say that I do not want to take more time. There is no point in it. I do not want to repeat things which have already been said. The Prime Minister has referred to his bilateral meetings on the sidelines of the Summit. As the main Summit was going on, he had some bilateral meetings with the representatives of Maldives, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan and so on. It is good. But as a matter of information, I am just wanting to know whether, for example, in the case of the representative of Bhutan, when

he had separate bilateral meetings with him, they had at all discussed the question, what is reported and I believe it is true, that there has been a great stepping up of activities of the ULFA in Bhutan, inside the Bhutanese territory. Bhutan is a sovereign country. It is an Independent country. It is a friendly neighbour of ours. Everybody knows it. The Government of India definitely knows that from the time when we were in the Government, we were plagued with this question: "Why do not you do something? Why does not India do something to see that these ULFA camps in Bhutan are removed? The ULFA insurgents, who make their way to Bhutan from the neighbouring soil of Assam, are creating all kinds of problems there. The King of Bhutan was himself very much worried about it." We should do something because it has become a sanctuary and a safe haven for them from where they are perpetrating all kinds of violence and atrocities in Assam. They are running across the border into Bhutan. Was it discussed at all with the King of Bhutan? I do not know about that.

I would like to know about it. If they did not discuss it, it is a different matter. But it is a thing which is closely connected with our own security.

Secondly, with Bangladesh, I presume, the hon. Prime Minister had bilateral talks in all good faith with Shrimati Sheikh Hasina also. I do not doubt her faith. She had assured, at the Government to Government level and at the Prime Minister's level, us some time ago that she would not like the Bangladesh soil to be used by any of these insurgent groups from India to go and take refuge there, to establish basis there and to carry out anti-Indian activities from Bangladesh. It is very easy for them to cross the border. They are doing it all the time. But later on, we got some disquieting reports that for reason or the other, Bangladesh authorities were not very successful in checking these people and controlling their activities or in seeing that their camps are closed down. They have got some weakness in their administrative structure and so on. What is the latest position in this regard? One very well-known leader of ULFA Shri Anup Chettia has taken refuge in Bangladesh. He is wanted by us. Unfortunately, there is no extradition treaty with Bangladesh. But we would like to get the man like Shri Anup Chettia back here so that he can be tried for all the violence and crime which have been committed under his leadership. I do not know about the latest position. For some reasons, the Bangladesh Government is not finding it possible to hand him back to the Indian authorities. I would like to know whether this matter was discussed or not. I would like to know whether they are taking any steps to really stop the flow of arms and all that through Bangladesh which is coming to our insurgent groups on the border. The Prime Minister has said that in these bilateral meetings, I had fruitful discussions on the progress in specific areas of cooperation. This is one area of cooperation which is of vital importance for India. I am sure, he must have raised this point with the King of Bhutan and Shrimati Sheikh Hasina of Bangladesh. If so, I would like to know what reaction did they give and what do we intend to do now about it?

">

प्रो. प्रेम सिंह चन्दूमाजरा (पटियाला) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश नीति पर चर्चा करने से पहले देश की संस्कृति, हमारे पूर्वजजन, पैगम्बर, गुरुओं और पीरों ने जो कहा, जब हम उस पर चलने की बात सोचते हैं तो हमें अहिंसा का सिद्धान्त मिलता है। हमारे देश की यह संस्कृति रही है कि यहां जन्न का मुकाबला सब्र से किया गया। गुरु तेगबहादुर साहब की शहादत जन्न का मुकाबला सब्र से करने के लिए हुई थी। उससे पहले गुरु अर्जुन देव ने जो शहादत दी - तत्ते तवे पर बैठाकर उन पर तत्ता रेता डलवाया गया - वह भी जन्न का मुकाबला सब्र से करने की बात थी। शायद यही सिद्धान्त महात्मा गांधी और जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी ने अपनाया और हमारे देश में पंचशील का सिद्धान्त प्रचलित हुआ।

१९६२ में जब चीन का अटैक हुआ, उस समय हमें अहसास हुआ - दुनिया मानती है जोरों को, लानत है कमजोरों को। कमजोर लोगों को मित्रता भी नहीं करने देते। हमें यह सिद्धान्त भी इस धरती के गुरुओं ने दिया कि जब सारे उपाय फेल हो जाएं तो हथियार उठाना चाहिए। क्योंकि आज 'हलाहल से दर्दहस्त हलालात, वर्दहस्त शमशीरदस्त' की बात कही गई, इसलिए कही गई कि हमें मजबूत होना होगा। आर्थिक व्यवस्था भी मजबूत होनी चाहिए, साथ ही अपना सम्मान कायम करने के लिए, आजादी कायम करने के लिए, अपनी सुरक्षा को मजबूत करने के लिए भी हमें जरूर सोचना चाहिए। इसलिए जो उपाय किए जा रहे हैं, मैं समझता हूँ कि वे देश के हित में हैं।

जहां तक पड़ोसी देश हैं, उनके साथ दोस्ती की बात है, मैं समझता हूँ कि दोस्ती होनी चाहिए और दोस्ती ही हमारे जैसे देश के लिए अच्छी हो सकती है। हमारे देश के लिए भी और देश के लोगों के लिए भी। कुछ बातें हुईं, पड़ोसी मुल्कों के साथ, चीन की बात भी हुई, यहां चर्चा में बात आई कि चीन के बारे में बयान दे दिया, इससे दुश्मनी बढ़ गई। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या चीन के साथ पहले दोस्ती थी? यहां माननीय मुलायम सिंह जी बैठे होंगे, मैं उनका बहुत सत्कार करता हूँ, वे किसानों की बात करते रहते हैं।

बंगलादेश की उस समय की पॉलिसी, उस समय के प्रधान मंत्री के सिरे चढ़ गई। मैं समझता हूँ कि बंगलादेश के बनने से भारत को क्या मिला? हमने एक और दुश्मन खड़ा कर लिया और जो आज पाकिस्तान के साथ दुश्मनी की चर्चा कर रहे हैं, मैं समझता हूँ ५० वर्षों में जो कुछ हुआ, उसका नतीजा है। क्या इन चार

महीनों में पाकिस्तान दुश्मन बना लिया, श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने? चीन के साथ क्या चार महीनों में दुश्मनी खड़ी हो गई। ५० वर्षों से जो नीति अपनाई गई, यह उसका नतीजा है कि पड़ोसी मुल्क लाइन में खड़े हुए हैं। श्रीलंका में हमने पैसा भी दिया और अपनी फौज भी मरवाई। बंगलादेश में फौज भी भेजी। अगर किसी के घर में हम आग लगाएंगे तो अपने घर भी अगले आग लगा सकते हैं, यह सोचने की बात कि हमने अपने घर को पहले मजबूत करना होगा, तब दुश्मन से लड़ना होगा। हमें घर को भी मजबूत करना होगा, यह सच्चाई है कि कोई चोर, कोई डाकू किसी घर में नहीं घुस सकता, न चोरी कर सकता है, न डाकू डाका मार सकता है, जब तक घर का कोई सदस्य उसके साथ न मिला हो या कोई पड़ोसी उसको इन्फोर्मेशन नहीं देता हो। हमें यह भी सोचना होगा कि जो पड़ोसी मुल्क हैं या विदेशी दुश्मन लोग हैं। हमारे देश में आई.एस.आई. की कार्रवाई क्यों असफल हुई, क्यों कर रहे हैं। उसके लिए देश के लोगों की जो अशान्ति थी, उसको किसी ने नहीं सुना। पंजाब की भी समस्या थी, असम की समस्या भी थी, बोडोलैंड की समस्या भी है, नागालैंड की समस्या भी है, ये समस्याएं किसने पैदा कीं। ये समस्याएं पैदा होने के कारण ही दुश्मन को मौका मिला।

मैं समझता हूँ कि आज जैसे ही राजनीति में परिवर्तन हुआ है, उस परिवर्तन का नतीजा है कि जो लोग असुरक्षित महसूस कर रहे थे, जैसे पंजाब में हम असुरक्षित महसूस कर रहे थे, हमारी बात ही नहीं सुनी जा रही थी और हमारे धार्मिक स्थानों पर फौज के हमले हुए तो यह सब कुछ आज थोड़ी सी आशा बंधी है, हमें इस बात का विश्वास हुआ है कि हम इस देश के नागरिक हैं और देश के लिए हमने जो कुर्बानियां कीं, आज की सरकार उसका मूल्य पा रही है। जब देश के लोगों का विश्वास बढ़ेगा, देश के लोग देश की सरकार के साथ होंगे तो दुश्मन का मुकाबला भी कर पाएंगे, इसलिए मैं पड़ोसी देशों के साथ दोस्ती के पक्ष में हूँ। मगर मैं यह बात भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें अपनी ताकत को, हमें अपनी मजबूती को और बढ़ाना होगा।

जो न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट हुए, उससे हमारी शक्ति बढ़ी है, उससे चीन से दुश्मनी कैसे बढ़ गई? क्या अमेरिका पहले हमारे साथ था? अमेरिका तो पहले ही चीन को भी उठा रहा था, पाकिस्तान को भी उठा रहा था। आज उनको पता तो चल गया कि हम भी दुनिया में कुछ हैं। अपनी आइडेंटिटी दिखाने के लिए, अपनी शक्ति बढ़ाने के लिए, अपना रौब दिखाने के लिए अगर हमने कोई प्रदर्शन किया है तो उससे हमारा बल बढ़ा है और दुश्मन को महसूस हुआ है कि हम भी कुछ कर सकते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज की जो सरकार है, श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी की प्राइममिनिस्टरशिप के अन्दर, उसने सार्क में जाकर अपने देश की स्थिति को स्पष्ट किया और अच्छे ढंग से रखा। मैं समझता हूँ कि दुनिया कह रही थी कि पता नहीं भारत अलग-थलग पड़ जायेगा, लेकिन जिस तरह से इन्होंने वहां बोला और वहां अपनी पॉलिसी को रखा और अपनी बात को मनवाया। मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार और विशेष रूप से प्रधान मंत्री जी बधाई के पात्र हैं। मैं इनको बधाई भी देता हूँ और इनको धन्यवाद भी देता हूँ।

मैं फिर इस बात को कहता हूँ कि जब लड़ाई होती है, उस समय सबसे ज्यादा पंजाब के लोगों को पड़ना पड़ता है, आप सब को पता है। नुकसान भी सबसे ज्यादा हमको उठाना पड़ता है। इसी बात को मैं बार-बार दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि विदेश नीति में मैक्सिमम, जितना भी हो सके, पड़ोसी मुल्कों के साथ दोस्ती बढ़ानी चाहिए।

उनके साथ सम्बन्ध अच्छे रखने चाहिए और जो बोर्डर एरिया के राज्य हैं, उनको भी विश्वास में लेना चाहिए। उनकी जो मांगें हैं, उन्हें पूरा करना चाहिए। अभी इन्द्रजीत गुप्त जी कह रहे थे कि हथियारों को यहां आने से रोकने के लिए सीमा पर तार लगाई गई है। तार लगाने से हमारी बहुत सी जमीन उस पार, पाकिस्तान में चली गई है। वहां के लोग हमारी फसलें काट लेते हैं, ट्यूबवैल ले जाते हैं, इससे हमें बहुत नुकसान होता है और इसे कोई देखने वाला नहीं है। वहां जाने के लिए चार-चार गेट हैं, लेकिन दो ही खोले जाते हैं। समय भी सुबह दस बजे से शाम सात बजे तक का है, लेकिन सुबह दस बजे गेट खोलकर दोपहर दो बजे ही बंद कर देते हैं। जब तक लोगों में विश्वास नहीं होगा, वे लड़ नहीं पाएंगे। इसलिए विदेश नीति के साथ-साथ घर की नीति भी मजबूत बनाने की जरूरत है। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी को मुबारकवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने एक अच्छा वक्तव्य दिया।

">SHRI PRITHVIRAJ D. CHAVAN (KARAD): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this very important debate on the post-Pokhran-II handling of India's foreign policy was long overdue, particularly after our Prime Minister went to Colombo and tried his hand at bilateral diplomacy, trying to talk to the Pakistani Prime Minister. We are discussing his statement along with our concerns about the handling of the foreign policy. We are very gravely concerned about the developments of the last two and a half months, particularly after the BJP Government took over. Without taking too much of time, I will just enumerate our concerns very briefly.

Today, India's foreign policy consensus built over the last fifty years stands shattered. Our well wishers and the entire world blame us for because if there is a nuclear war, they will be the ones who will be affected first. We are being condemned at every international fora. The P-5 Foreign Ministers have condemned us and the G-8 Foreign Ministers have told us to stop testing. They have said that India will not get the 'Nuclear Weapon-State' status. The Security Council of the United Nations has deplored us. Mr. Kofi Annan says that he is deeply disturbed. In every international fora, India is being singled out for criticism. India stands isolated.

The next major concern is that our foreign policy appears to be drifting. I do not want to comment on who is the Minister of External Affairs or who should be the Minister of External Affairs but the concern is that it is not India's foreign policy but it is the RSS' foreign policy. What else can explain the Government sending Shri Brajesh Mishra to explain India's foreign policy stand to Tony Blair, Jacques Chirac and the Russian President? It was not the Foreign Secretary but an RSS ideologue who was sent abroad. Can you imagine what effect it had on the morale of the Indian Foreign Service? The problem is that the Prime Minister is conducting the foreign policy, the Prime Minister's Office is conducting the foreign policy and not the Foreign Office.

The third major concern is that we have managed to internationalise the Kashmir issue. The Indo-Pak dialogue stands frozen. Never have such expressions like 'waste of time', 'zero outcome' and 'neurotic obsession' been used while describing Indo-Pak dialogue. After all, Pakistan is an important neighbour of ours. I was very sad when Shri Jag Mohan talked about Kashmir in his intervention. I was wondering whether it was a debate on foreign affairs or on internal affairs. The issues which normally get discussed in a debate on domestic affairs have been discussed in this foreign affairs debate.

You yourselves have got into the mindset that now Kashmir has become an international issue. We have managed to concretise US-China-Pakistan axis. President Clinton had the audacity to assign the role of a mediator between India and Pakistan to China. Rather it is a role of an umpire. We do not accept that.

Our next concern is about our claim to the permanent membership in the Security Council. Now, that remains a distant dream. We are far away from it. As far as security aspects between India and Pakistan are concerned, there was a time when India was definitely superior. We had nuclear weapons. We had exploded nuclear weapons in 1974. But now we have parity not only in nuclear weapons but also in delivery systems.

My next point is this: Have you seriously complained about Chinese clandestine help to Pakistan on the fissile materials transfer and on the missile technology transfer? There are serious apprehensions that during 1989, China delivered usable nuclear weapons to Pakistan. Have you complained in the international fora? Have you seized initiative to complain that China has violated the NPT? We read in the newspapers about the export of ring magnets. It has been widely publicised. But we failed to seize the initiative and take this to the international fora.

Our post-Pokhran-II handling of the situation, whether it is in respect of economic sanctions or trade sanctions or dual-use technologies, has been very poor. What did we see? We saw an unfettered jingoistic chauvinism. Shri Madan Lal Khurana talked about the time and place for the next war. I do not have time to quote what others have said. That was not the best way to handle the post-Pokhran situation. I think we lost a great opportunity. The country would have supported you had you taken some difficult and tough economic decisions like Pakistan did. India is a strong country with a strong economy. We could have used this opportunity to take some difficult and tough economic decisions which this country required.

U.S. has offered to Bangladesh Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA). What made U.S. to do this? They are already in Diego Garcia. Now they want to come to Bangladesh, particularly in Chittagong. So far, the Prime Minister has not told us as to what has happened in this respect. Tell us what had happened. Please tell us as to what had happened to Indo-US dialogue. That is most important.

Shri Jaswant Singh is an excellent negotiator, whether he is negotiating inside the country or outside the country. I do not know why he has not been given the official status of a Foreign Minister. There are serious concerns that we are softening our stand on nuclear disarmament issue, particularly on the CTBT and Fissile Materials Cut Off Treaty. There are rumours that the Government of India has given an assurance, a written undertaking over the CTBT. It is also said that the Government has offered to pledge this document with the UN Secretary General, Mr. Kofi Annan, in exchange for some dilution of economic sanctions, transfer of dual-use technology and some softening on the nuclear weapon status. Please take us into confidence and tell us whether such an offer was made by the Government to Mr. Strobe Talbott. On 4th May, the spokesman of the Security Council said the following: "India has made a qualified offer to adhere to some of the undertakings of the CTBT selectively".

What are those undertakings?

16.00 hrs.

I will conclude by saying that India needs to take a pro-active stand on foreign policy. The Government is talking about the pro-active stand on internal affairs. Shri Advani is very fond of using this phrase. But we need to take a pro-active stand on foreign policy. We need to take the initiative back again. We are no longer standing on the high moral pedestal which we stood at one time, when the world listened to us. It is no longer the case.

But India is not a small country. We have almost a billion-strong population. Economically we are at a stage where we can talk and the rest of the developing world will listen. Please take back the leadership of the developing world -- G-15, G-77, the NAM, etc. The NAM meeting is going to be held in South Africa, the place where Gandhiji started his work and gave new ideas to the world.

So, please set an agenda and please do not follow the Western agenda. I would like to remind you that it was India which set the agenda on disarmament debate -- whether it was Nehru's Memorandum to the UN Secretary-General in 1952 about the Standstill Agreement on Testing, or the 1st, 2nd and the 3rd UN Special Sessions on Disarmament. We have Indira Gandhi Initiative and Rajiv Gandhi Initiative. Under Rajiv Gandhi Initiative, we have a concrete Action Plan. Please tell us what you are going to do about Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan about the Nuclear Weapons-free and Non-Violent World. It was a plan which was very clearly set out. There are three phases: 1988-1994, 1995-2000 and 2000-2010. Three distinct phases were spelt out. What is the stand of the present Indian Government on Rajiv Gandhi Initiative?

There are treaties to be negotiated like the No First Use or the Non-First Use against non-nuclear weapon States. What are you going to do about that? Please tell us about your direction.

Finally, tell us about the economic aspects of the foreign policy which are equally important; rather more important than the security aspects. My senior colleague, Shri Shivraj Patil discussed about that; Shri Indrajit Gupta also talked about that. Today, it is a fact that India is not in any of the economic groupings; and we are not a part of any trade blocks.

While trying to re-establish our leadership in the developing world and trying to set agenda, I would like to suggest some items where you can set the agenda in the economic dialogues. Firstly, there was an UNCTAD Initiative on Code of Conduct for Multinationals. After the formation of the WTO, that has been set aside. Please bring that back in the WTO agenda. Secondly, Intellectual Property Legislation is very crucial. Please take a proactive stand on amending the patent law. There are issues like the Geographical Appellation Act which has caused us problem in the Basmati rice patent. There is a Bio-diversity Convention; there is a Plant Varieties Protection Act. As you know, Terminator technologies are being introduced in our country. Unless you enact these legislations, unless we take these things into the centre-stage of economic thinking, we will feel sorry later.

We need to take a very strong stand against the US Laws like the Special 301, Super 301, Ban on Export of Dual-Use Technologies, Trade Sanctions in the guise of dual-use technologies. These are bilateral actions, not permitted by the WTO. We need to take the US to the WTO on these things. There is also the issue of mobility of labour or free movement of natural persons which need to be taken into consideration.

The visa regime is very discriminatory. The developed world is to be taken on these issues. We need to complain to the International Union of Scientists about denial of visas for Indian scientists.

There are other issues like the Climate Change Conventions, the Global Environmental Fund Facility, etc. On all these, we need to take initiative. The most important of all is, we need to take initiative on nuclear disarmament. When the new treaty will come up for negotiations next year, whether it is the CTBT or whether it is the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty, India must lead the Third World today and give leadership to the Third World and set the agenda.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, there are eight more hon. Members who would like to participate in this discussion. After that, the hon. Prime Minister has to give a reply.

Before that, at 4 o'clock, we should have started another discussion under Rule 193 on the statement made by the hon. Home Minister regarding deportation of certain people by the Maharashtra Government. At 5.30 p.m., there is half-an-hour discussion also.

The Chair would like to know the sense of the House. Can the two items be taken up after the completion of this discussion?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF TOURISM (SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA): Sir, after the completion of the discussion on foreign affairs and the reply of the Prime Minister, we may take up the other two items....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Promothas Mukherjee.

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (ULUBERIA): Sir, it may be too late by the time we take up the discussion under Rule 193. So, it may be taken up tomorrow as the first item.

MR. SPEAKER: There is already another discussion under Rule 193 listed for tomorrow.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (HAJIPUR): Sir, the first item tomorrow should be the discussion on SCs/STs... (Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (CALCUTTA SOUTH): Sir, you may take it up tomorrow after completing the discussion regarding deportation of workers from Maharashtra.

MR. SPEAKER: Tomorrow, we have to complete the discussion under Rule 193 and also the Jain Commission Report.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Sir, it was decided that the first item tomorrow would be the discussion regarding SCs/STs. After that, you may list any other item.

MR. SPEAKER: After completing this discussion, we may take a decision. Now, Shri Promothas Mukherjee may speak.

SHRI TAPAN SIKDAR : Sir, what about Special Mentions? Will they be allowed or not?...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It may be taken up at 5 p.m.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA (CALCUTTA NORTH-EAST): Sir, what about the discussion under Rule 193? Are you taking it up tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER: We will decide about it after the completion of this discussion.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE (BERHAMPORE) (WB): Sir, I thank you for the opportunity given to me to speak on the foreign policy of India...(Interruptions)

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (MUMBAI NORTH-WEST): The discussion under Rule 193 is a very important discussion. It is better that we defer it for tomorrow...(Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): If such an important discussion is taken up late at night, then it may lose its importance...(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI L.K. ADVANI): In fact, I have left the debate taking place in the other House in order to listen to the debate at 4 p.m. in this House. I was in the other House where the Jain Commission Report is being discussed. If the House agrees to take it up tomorrow morning, I may go there... (Interruptions)

SEVERAL HON.MEMBERS: We may take it up tomorrow morning.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : महोदय, मेरा सिर्फ आपसे इतना ही आग्रह है कि आप इसे कल लें या जिस समय भी लें, यह आपके ऊपर है, लेकिन एससी, एसटी का डिस्कशन कल के लिए शुक्रवार से लगा हुआ है। आपको मालूम है कि शुक्रवार को चार बजे यह तय हुआ था। बीएसी में, लीडर्स मीटिंग में तय हो गया था कि कल दो घंटे के लिए यह आइटम लिया जाएगा, इसका ११ बजे से एक बजे तक टाइम फिक्स था, उसके बाद आप जो लेना चाहें, लें। ऐसा न हो कि कल भी इसको लास्ट में डालें।

PROF. P.J. KURIEN (MAVELIKARA): I would like to submit that the sitting of the House was extended upto 5th in order to discuss the Jain Commission Report and the ATR. It was decided that the discussion of the Jain Commission Report and the ATR may be taken up at 2 p.m. I am only submitting that it should be taken up at 2 p.m. Please do not create such a situation so as to postpone it further. Already we had postponed it from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. That was of course the decision of the BAC and we abide by its decision. Let us not create a situation where we have to postpone it further. My submission is that the Jain Commission Report and the ATR should be discussed from 2 p.m. onwards.

श्री मदन लाल खुराना: पांच बजे तक आप इसे ले लीजिए, फिर पांच बजे से महाराष्ट्र, बंगाल वाला लेना है। कल मेम्बर्स सैलरी एंड एलाउंसमेंट के बारे में बिल है तथा और भी कई बिल हैं उनको भी पास करना बहुत जरूरी है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर इस डिबेट का जवाब कल सुबह दे देंगे, उसके बाद कुछ और ले लें।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR): Sir, there is an important Bill regarding oilfields. We may pass it without discussion, if the House agrees to it.

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE : Sir, I may be permitted to continue the discussion on India's foreign policy.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मेरा एक सजेशन है कि पांच बजे लीडर्स की मीटिंग होगी उसमें आप तय कर लीजिए। इसको यहां डिस्कशन का मुद्दा क्यों बनाते हैं।

PROF. P.J. KURIEN :Sir, what is your ruling? I think, there is no change. And it will be tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: We will complete the discussion under Rule 193. The reply by the hon. Prime Minister will be tomorrow.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN :At 2 P.M., the discussion on Jain Commission Report will be taken up?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : All right.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, when will the discussion regarding deportation of certain people will start?

MR. SPEAKER: By five o'clock.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH (BHARATPUR): When will the Prime Minister reply to the debate on foreign affairs?

MR. SPEAKER: Tomorrow.

">SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE (BERHAMPURE) (WB): Sir, I have the highest regards for my hon. friend, Shri P.A. Sangma, for moving this motion relating to India's foreign policy. I have two books in my possession. The first book is by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: 'New Dimensions of India's Foreign Policy'. It contains his valuable speeches as India's Foreign Minister outside the country. I will quote a few lines to show how the spirit of what he spoke elsewhere has been violated by his doings now.

I have another important book titled 'A Foreign Policy for India' by Shri Inder Kumar Gujral. Both the former and the present Prime Ministers have written two books on India's foreign policy. Both the books contain the

same ideology and commitment to the ageold principles of India's commitment towards world peace, disarmament and non-alignment.

I begin to say that there is a tradition of our country in respect of world peace, disarmament and Non-Alignment Movement. But today, the most important incident of the nuclear tests, conducted by the Indian scientists at Pokharn range, have violated this tradition. This is a complete departure. The conduct of nuclear tests at Pokharn range without any security threat have become a violation of our ageold principles of India's foreign policy and non-alignment movement.

To substantiate my argument, I am referring to an important article "World Nuclear Order and India's Nuclear Deterrence" by Shri Muchkund Dubey, a prominent person in this field. It is a big quotation. With your kind permission, I quote:

"Acquisition of nuclear deterrence is a necessary, even indispensable, condition for safeguarding our security, for gaining the bargaining clout which has so far been lamentably missing and for making an effective contribution to shaping a new world order. But this is certainly not a sufficient condition. Acquisition of nuclear deterrence will have to be combined with a sustained dynamism of economic growth in spite of the sanctions, removing the long-pending incapacities in the social sectors, and tackling some of the basic problems of governance. This will call for sacrifices at all levels and, above all, maintenance of national unity and cohesion.

Will the BJP-led Government be able to discharge these onerous responsibilities?"

It is my observation that during the last four months, the Government led by the BJP and its allies has absolutely failed to carry out these responsibilities.

Sir, there is another reference about the nuclear tests conducted by the Indian scientists at Pokhran range. We have heard the name of Arundhati Roy, a great poet and a fiction writer who has written a prize-winning book. She has written a very good article which has been published in The Outlook. I do not agree with all the points covered by her in this article. There are some prominent features which can be referred to here. With your kind permission, I would like to refer to one important feature here. "Is it possible for a man who cannot write his own name, to understand the basic facts about bomb? Has anybody bothered to explain to him about the nuclear winter? Does he not matter at all, this man?" This is the attitude of the intellectuals. This is the attitude of experts in regard to the question of nuclear tests conducted by Indian scientists at Pokhran range.

As the Indian Foreign Minister, Shri Vajpayee visited Pakistan. He held a number of meetings there. He also delivered a beautiful speech at the dinner hosted by the Pakistan Government. With your kind permission, I would like to quote from shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee's book, 'New Dimensions of India's foreign Policy'.

"'A new Era of Understanding'

I am indeed happy to be in Pakistan today. This elegant Capital is not only blessed by the beauties of nature but is also a symbol of your culture and your new aspirations."

This is the beginning of his speech delivered by him at the dinner hosted by the Pakistan Government in 1978. This is a beautiful speech and I would like to show how the spirit of this beautiful speech has been violated by him today.

SHRI E. AHAMED (MANJERI): This speech was delivered when he was the Minister of External Affairs and now he is the Prime Minister.

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE (BERHAMPORE) (WB): He concluded his speech by saying and I quote:

"In reminding ourselves that what matters is the urge to move ahead to a better future, I could do no better than recite from Allama Iqbal:"

Then he recited a very good poem of Allama Iqbal. I do not know Urdu or Hindi. I would like to quote the English translation of this poem.

"Thaherta nahin karvan-i-wajud

Ke har lahza hai Shan-e-Wajud

Samajhta hai tu razha-i-zindagi

Eaqat bauq-i-parwaz hai zindagi

Bahut usne dekhe hain pashto-o-baland

Safar usko manjil se barhkar pasand

Safar zindagi ke liya barg-o-sav

Safar hai haqiqat

Hazar hai majaz.

डा. शकील अहमद (मधुबनी) : जिस तरह से आप सुना रहे हैं, अगर अल्लामा इकबाल सुन लेते तो खुदकुशी कर लेते।

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE (BERHAMPORE) (WB): Please help me. Let me come to my conclusions. Please permit me to read out the English translation.

"The caravan of life never halts;

At every moment life has a fresh visage.

You think life to be a secret;

But life is only the urge to keep moving;

It has seen many ups and downs and

loves movement more than rest;

Movement is the essence of life.

To move is reality;

To stand is illusion.

This was a part of his speech delivered in Islamabad. This indicates that India and Pakistan should move ahead towards a better life and that there should be people to people, philosophy to philosophy contact. That spirit has been violated by today's action against Pakistan.

I can also show from this book that Shri I.K. Gujral, the former Prime Minister, has initiated a dialogue with Pakistan. Innumerable references can be made here to show that a good attempt was made by the Government of India to restore the Indo-Pak relationship, to restore the friendly relations between the two neighbouring countries, and that attempt has been aborted by the Pokhran tests. Sir, I can give many references but only references are not sufficient here. It is my feeling that the foreign policy of any Government depends upon the internal policy. If the internal policy, the economic policy, of the country is good and stable, the foreign policy must be good and stable. It is unfortunate that the economic policy of the Government of India today is not satisfactory. It is in the interest of those persons who believe in liberalisation and privatisation. It is in the

interest of national bourgeoisie. It is not in the interest of the poor and the starving people. It does not think of the dire necessities of the people.

Kashmir is really an important factor but Kashmir affair alone cannot determine the nature of India's foreign policy. That might be the concept of Shri Jagmohan but only the Kashmir affairs cannot determine the future of India's foreign policy. There are many things. It may be a question of internal security calculus but it cannot be a question to determine the face of India's foreign policy. There is the question of the North-East; there is the question of insurgency; there is the question of terrorism; there is the question of poverty; there is the question of disintegration, and there are all other things. All these things come out of the economic frustration caused by the mishandling of the situation by this Government.

There is a 'Golden Triangle', that is, Bangladesh-Myanmar-Nepal; and there is a 'Golden Crescent', that is, Pakistan-Afghanistan-India. Our North Indian States fall within this Golden Triangle and Golden Crescent. This has been taken as the narcotic trafficking route. The smugglers of narcotics have poisoned and polluted the local situation and our North-Eastern people. That is the main reason why only these things cannot determine the nature of our foreign policy. These things must be settled within ourselves by our Ministry of Home Affairs, by our internal security arrangements. These things cannot determine the nature of India's foreign policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE : Sir, I am the only speaker from my Party. Please allow me some more time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have been referring to the speeches of the Prime Minister and the former Prime Minister. How long will you take now?

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE : I have already come to my point and you have marked it. I have only referred to their speeches to show how things were being done.

With your kind permission, I would like to state that we now see a new world after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. We have seen that the bipolar world has turned into a unipolar world. Today, the world is not divided into two forces only, or two umbrellas only. Today, the world has become a unipolar world just after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. And yet, the Euro-American imperialism is ruling the unipolar world. In these circumstances, India was poised to play a great role. India had got the greatest opportunity to play the role of the leader of the Non-Aligned Movement. I am sorry to say that the Prime Minister, the champion of the cause of India's foreign policy, has failed to lead this Government as the leader of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Sir, it is a fact that India could take up this role, but India could not do it because of internal disturbances. I see our hon. Prime Minister is perturbed. I am sorry to say that he has been a prisoner of indecision in the hands of Hindu fanaticism. That is a fact. We have failed to take the lead in the Non-Aligned Movement. I know that after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, a new empire of Non-Aligned Movement was opened up before India, but we could not utilise that opportunity.

Today, Parliament being in Session and therefore important discussions are going on in regard to the CTBT. It was the unanimous decision of this House that the Government of India must not sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We did not sign the NPT. Why? This is only because of the fact that the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was discriminatory in nature and so we opposed it. We did not sign it. With the same voice and on the same grounds of unanimity, we also objected to the signing of the CTBT and it was the consensus of this House that the Government of India must not sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We do not know what is going on behind the scenes. I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister, if he can say something on this, if he can enlighten the House as to what is going on between our de facto Foreign Minister, Shri Jaswant Singh and Mr. Talbott. (Interruptions)

Lastly, our hon. Prime Minister has given a good leadership in the also. In his suo motu statement, the hon. Prime Minister stated in Para 4 and I quote:-

towards setting up a Free Trade Area..."

How far this Free Trade Area can help the poor people of India? You have liberalised your economy, you have opened up your market economy to the multi-national corporations. This may be a bilateral agreement. I do not know how far the poor people get the benefit from the Free Trade Area. From this Free Trade Area, Indian bourgeois and the traders may get the absolute benefit. How can the Government make a monetary benefit from this? I do not know. I am not a student of Economics.

In his suo motu statement, the hon. Prime Minister stated in Para 5 and I quote:-

"5. We have reiterated our commitment to, and readiness for bold initiatives to speed up trade liberalisation..."

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude. I am going to call another hon. Member.

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE : We have to discuss many other chapters of the we are not getting sufficient time to discuss all these things. Yet, I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to express my views on this.

">

श्री चन्द्रशेखर साहू (महासमुन्द) : माननीय सभापति महोदय, मैं बहुत पॉइंटेड बात कहना चाहूंगा। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के नेतृत्व में कोलंबो में सार्क समिट में सफलता हासिल हुई है, उसके लिए यह सदन समवेत स्वर में उन्हें बधाई देता है, उनकी टीम को बधाई देता है।

माननीय सभापति महोदय, विदेश नीति की चर्चा के दौरान बहुत सारी बातें आईं। मैं उस पर अपना वक्त ज़ाया नहीं करना चाहूंगा, लेकिन कुछ स्पेसिफिक बातें करना चाहूंगा। जैसे माननीय इंद्रजीत गुप्त जी ने अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति को पत्र लिखने की बात का बार-बार ज़िक्र किया है।

सभापति महोदय, मैं इस सदन को बताना चाहूंगा कि जब यूनाइटेड फ्रंट की गवर्नमेंट थी तो भारत के प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अमरीका के निमंत्रण के सात दिन पहले अमरीका प्रवास प्रारम्भ कर दिया था, इसकी क्या जरूरत थी। उसकी बड़ी आलोचना हुई कि आप एक सप्ताह पहले अमरीका पहुंच गये।

यहां पूर्व स्पीकर साहब बैठे हुए हैं, उन्होंने जिस विद्वत्तापूर्ण भाषण से सदन के सारे सदस्यों और इस चर्चा को अधिक गंभीरता और संजीदगी के साथ बढ़ाया है, मैं उसका कुछ रेफरेंस देना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी की ओर से ठसार्क' के बारे में जो स्टेटमेंट प्रस्तुत हुआ है, उसमें साफ कहा गया है

PMs statement is very very calculated. `

सार्क' के बारे में मैं सदन के समक्ष कुछ बातें रखना चाहूंगा। सभापति महोदय, नान एलायन्स एसेम्बली ९९ में होने वाली है, यदि भारत चाहे और थोड़ा सा प्रयास करे तो क्यों न नई दिल्ली इसकी मेजबानी करे।

... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय, दो हजार आइटम्स पर लाइसेंस फ्री की एक महत्वपूर्ण घोषणा कोलम्बो दक्षेस में हुई है, वह कोई कम बड़ा पैकेज नहीं है। लेकिन उसमें मुझे थोड़ी सी आशंका है कि आज भी चीन की प्रोडक्ट्स नेपाल के माध्यम से भारत के बाजारों में बहुत तेजी से पहुंच रही है। क्या इस घोषणा से हम चीन के उत्पादों को यहां आने से रोक सकेंगे और क्या इस घोषणा का लाभ ठसार्क' कंट्रीज को उठाने का अवसर मिलेगा? यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण बात है।

सभापति जी, माननीय सदस्य श्री पृथ्वीराज डी. चव्हाण ने बड़ी अच्छी बात कही है, मैं उसके बारे में कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि भारत आज भी नॉन अलाइन मूवमेंट के लिए प्रोएक्टिव रोल अदा कर सकता है। इसमें कोई दो मत नहीं हैं कि भारत के प्रति सबका विश्वास है और भारत की अगुवाई में पूरे विश्व में अभी तक

NAM की गतिविधियां और भूमिका रही है। हम लोग इसमें और आगे बढ़ सकते हैं।

सभापति महोदय, न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट पर जो आज बात कही गई है मैं उसके बारे में भी कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट के बारे में यहां बहुत से वक्तव्यों की चर्चा की जाती है और कहा जाता है कि आखिर इसकी जरूरत क्या थी? सिक्कोरिटी को ध्यान में रखते हुए जब पाकिस्तान ने ठागौरी' मिसाइल का परीक्षण किया तो सब तरफ यही अनुमान लगाया जाने लगा था कि भारत कुछ न कुछ कदम जरूर उठायेगा। २८ मई को माननीय डा. राजा रामन्ना ने राज्य सभा में जो भाषण दिया, उसमें उन्होंने स्पष्ट रूप से कहा कि पाकिस्तान द्वारा ठागौरी' मिसाइल के परीक्षण के बाद यह अपेक्षित था कि भारत कुछ न कुछ कदम उठाये और उसी के

परिणामस्वरूप यह परीक्षण का कार्य हुआ, जो कि निश्चित रूप से सही समय पर हुआ है। मैं समझता हूँ कि डा. राजा रामन्ना किसी पार्टी लाइन से जुड़े हुए नहीं हैं, इसलिए उनको यहां कोट करना बहुत उचित है।

सभापति महोदय, यहां विदेश नीति की चर्चा चल रही है और हमारे कई विद्वान माननीय सदस्यों ने भारतीय जनता पार्टी की विदेश नीति की बड़ी आलोचना की है। मैं सदन का ध्यान बी.जे.पी. की फॉरेन पालिसी के एक शब्द की ओर ले जाना चाहता हूँ। २३.८.९२ को भोपाल में बी.जे.पी. की जो नेशनल एक्जीक्यूटिव की मीटिंग हुई उसमें

N.P.T. तथा CTBT से संबंधित एक रिजोल्यूशन पारित हुआ है, उसमें साफ लिखा है -

"The pressure on India to conform to discriminatory regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and control of missile technology is increasing day by day. Some countries want not only to maintain their nuclear weapons but also to refine and upgrade them."

माननीय सभापति जी, इस स्थिति में क्या करें? जहां तक निरस्त्रीकरण की बात है, भारत अपनी प्रतिबद्धता पर पहले से जोर देता रहा है, आज भी उस पर कायम है और यह सदन उसके लिए अगुवाई करने के लिए तैयार है। यदि भारतीय जनता पार्टी के नेतृत्व में चल रही सरकार की तरफ रचनात्मक दृष्टि से देखें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई ऐसी आलोचना की बात नहीं है। मैं अपने संक्षिप्त वक्तव्य को इस रूप में रखते हुए कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज भी हमें और पूरे भारत के लोगों को यह संदेश देने की जरूरत है कि भारत इस टर्निंग प्वाइंट में एक है। चाहे पाकिस्तान का मामला हो, या कोई भी मामला हो, हम यह संदेश नहीं देना चाहते और यह नहीं कहना चाहते कि यदि पाकिस्तान नहीं होता तो भारत का विदेश मंत्रालय नहीं होता, ऐसी ध्वनि नहीं जानी चाहिए। यही कहते हुए मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

">

श्री राम विलास पासवान (हाजीपुर) : सभापति जी. सर्वप्रथम मैं श्री नटवर सिंह जी संगमा जी और आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि आपने विदेश नीति और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सार्क के संबंध में जो वक्तव्य दिया, उस पर चर्चा कराने की अनुमति दी और इस सदन और देश का ध्यान खींचने का काम किया। सबसे पहली बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे हम इस पक्ष के हों या उस पक्ष के हों, हम सब एक हैं। भारत के हित के मामले में जो सरकार बनती है, भले ही हम दल के अंदर कहें, संसद में कहें कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी की सरकार है, कांग्रेस की सरकार है या यूनाईटेड फ्रंट की सरकार है लेकिन वह देश के बाहर भारत सरकार होती है और जब भारत सरकार होती है तो भारत सरकार का मतलब कोई पार्टी नहीं होता बल्कि सरकार होता है। यह हमारी आज तक की पालिसी रही है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी और हम १९७७ से मैम्बर ऑफ पार्लियामेंट हैं। वे १९७७ में विदेश मंत्री थे। इस बात का हमें भी गर्व होता था कि श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी भारत के विदेश मंत्री बने हैं। उस समय शंकाएं भी थीं लेकिन अपने कम समय में इन्होंने विदेश मंत्री की हैसियत से जो काम किया, नाम अर्जित किया, उससे वे सारी शंकाएं निर्मूल हो गयीं। यह उम्मीद की जा रही थी और आज भी यह उम्मीद की जा रही है कि श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के नेतृत्व में जो सरकार बनी है, वह पक्ष और विपक्ष को, कम से कम कुछ भी हो लेकिन वैदेशिक नीति के मामले में, डिप्लोमैटिक फंड के मामले में कोई शिकायत नहीं होने देगी। हमेशा से ऐसा रहा भी था कि जो हमारे वैदेशिक नीति के मामले हैं या सुरक्षा के मामले हैं, उन पर संसद में कभी बहुत गहरे मतभेद उभरकर सामने नहीं आये। मैं देख रहा हूँ कि पहली बार इस सदन में गहरे मतभेद उभरकर सामने आये हैं और देश की जनता के बीच में इस मामले को लेकर बुनियादी बहस और बुनियादी मतांतर हुआ है।

जैसा मैंने पहले कहा कि देश का इंटरैस्ट सबसे ऊपर होता है और राष्ट्र के इंटरैस्ट के लिए जो भी कुर्बानी देनी पड़ी, मैं नहीं समझता कि उससे सदन, संसद या देश की जनता पीछे रही हो। जब कभी खून देने की बारी आई, भूखे रहने की बारी आई तो हमेशा यह काम देश की जनता ने किया और करती रहेगी। कभी-कभी हमें सोचना चाहिए कि शहीद होने और आत्महत्या करने में क्या अंतर होता है। यदि हम पांच माले से कूद जाएं और कह दें कि हम शहीद हो गये, लेकिन पांच माले से कूद कर मरना आत्महत्या कहलाता है। उनका शहीद की श्रेणी में नाम नहीं आता। उसी तरीके से जब हम नेशनल इंटरैस्ट की बात कहते हैं तो नेशनल इंटरैस्ट, पार्टी इंटरैस्ट और पर्सनल इंटरैस्ट में हमेशा अंतर रहा है। सबसे ऊपर राष्ट्र का हित होता है, उसके बाद पार्टी का हित और उसके बाद व्यक्ति का हित होता है। लेकिन इतिहास साक्षी है कि जब राष्ट्र के हित के ऊपर पार्टी हित रख दिया जाता है या व्यक्ति हित रख दिया जाता है तो राष्ट्र को लांग टर्म में उसका बहुत मूल्य चुकाना पड़ता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज जो चीजें हुई हैं, हम दो घेरे में हैं। जो अणु परीक्षण हुआ, कुल मिलाकर हम अणु परीक्षण पर चले आते हैं, तो उसके एक तरफ कहा जाता है कि यह राष्ट्र के हित में सही हुआ है और इससे राष्ट्र की गरिमा बढ़ी है लेकिन दूसरी तरफ यह आरोप भी लगता है कि यह राष्ट्र हित में नहीं है। इसमें पार्टी का हित ज्यादा है और यह बम विस्फोट दूसरे बम विस्फोट को डिफ्यूज करने के लिए इस्तेमाल किया गया है।

जब बम विस्फोट हुआ, उस समय मैं अमरीका में था। वहां भी इस बात पर काफी चर्चा चल रही थी और तरह-तरह की बातें हो रही थीं। लेकिन एक बात मैं अभी तक नहीं समझ पाया कि यह चैलेंज किसके खिलाफ है? हमने इस चैलेंज को किसके खिलाफ स्वीकारने का काम किया। क्या यह चुनौती अमरीका के खिलाफ है या जैसा हमारे साथी कह रहे थे कि यह चुनौती चीन के खिलाफ है या यह चुनौती पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ है? जहां तक चीन का संबंध है, जार्ज साहब हमारे नेता रहे हैं, उनकी काबलियत पर उंगली नहीं उठा सकते लेकिन कभी-कभी बेवक्त शहनाई बजती है। यह कोई औकेज़न नहीं था जिसमें बिना प्रोवोकेशन के आपने चीन को टारगेट बनाना शुरू कर दिया। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि यह चैलेंज किसके खिलाफ था। यदि आप कहते हैं कि हमने यह चैलेंज अमरीका से शक्ति लेने के लिए किया है तो अलग बात है लेकिन यदि इसका मतलब सिर्फ पाकिस्तान से है तो उसके साथ संबंधों को इस रूप में दिखाने की क्या आवश्यकता है। आज पाकिस्तान भले ही देश हो लेकिन वह हर मामले में उत्तर प्रदेश से भी छोटा है और इस सदन और देश को मालूम है कि पाकिस्तान किसी चीज में सात जन्म में भी भारत से मुकाबला नहीं कर सकता। यह पहले भी साबित हुआ है और भविष्य में भी हम साबित करने को तैयार हैं। लेकिन कुल मिलाकर जो बातें कही जा रही हैं, वे अंततोगत्वा पाकिस्तान पर आकर रुक जाती हैं। हमारे पास संदूक में जेवरात हैं। क्या जेवरात हैं, वह किसी को नहीं मालूम। लेकिन जब जे

वरात खोल देते हैं तो लोगों को पता चल जाता है कि इसमें कितना सोना है, कितना हीरा है। जहां तक पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान का मामला था, हम कहते थे कि पाकिस्तान के प्रधानमंत्री भी इम्पोर्टेड सिगरेट लाते हैं। लेकिन आज आपने चार अणु बमों का परीक्षण किया तो उसने पांच अणु बमों के परीक्षण किए। इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह किसके खिलाफ है। आज पाकिस्तान की यह हालत हो गई है कि उन्हें "प्राइम मिनिस्ट्रीरिल रैसीडेंस बेचना पड़ रहा है।

... (व्यवधान)

यह हंसने की बात नहीं है। वह छोटा देश है, उसकी झलक सामने आ गई है। इस मामले में हम दोनों एक हैं, वह सैंक्शन का विरोध कर रहा है और हम भी विरोध कर रहे हैं। सैंक्शन का विरोध करके उसे अपने प्राइम मिनिस्ट्रीरिल ऑफिस को बेचने की नौबत आ गई। हो सकता है आज हमारे सामने वह मामला न आए क्योंकि हम ज्यादा समृद्धिशाली देश हैं, लेकिन कुछ न कुछ असर तो यहां भी देखने को मिल रहा है। ४२ रुपये में एक डालर, ४४ रुपये में एक डालर, ४२ रुपये टमाटर क्या साबित करता है। आप बम को नहीं खा सकते।

... (व्यवधान)

हमारे जैसा आदमी कभी डिस्टर्ब नहीं करता।

... (व्यवधान)

इन्हें जवाब देने की पूरी आजादी है।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री राजवीर सिंह : आपने डालर के लिए भारत में महंगाई की बात की है। ... (व्यवधान) डालर महंगा नहीं हुआ है।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री राम विलास पासवान : जब प्रधानमंत्री जी जवाब देंगे तो यह बताएं कि जो ४२ रुपये का एक डालर हुआ है, उसका कोई संबंध इकोनॉमिक सैंक्शन से है या नहीं या वह स्वतः है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य कुछ चीजें प्रधानमंत्री जी पर छोड़ने का काम करें।

अभी इंद्रजीत गुप्ता जी ने बताया कि पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान की सैन्य शक्ति का संबंध है, हम उससे बीस गुना अधिक हैं। इसलिए पाकिस्तान को चैलेंज करने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं थी, मेरा सिर्फ इतना ही कहना है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि जहां तक पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों का मामला है, भारत ने हमेशा से पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों की अगुवाई करने का काम किया। बहुत सारे इस्लामिक कंट्रीज़ हैं।

शिवराज पाटिल साहब यहां हैं, स्पीकर के डैलीगेशन में हम लोग गये थे। एक बार तो वाजपेयी साहब के साथ ही हम सब लोग गये थे। हम लोगों ने हमेशा से यू.एन.ओ. में और दूसरी जगहों पर देखने का काम किया कि इस्लामिक कण्ट्रीज़ पाकिस्तान के साथ कभी नहीं रहे। आज हमारा जो डिप्लोमैटिक फ्रंट है, मुझे कहने में कोई आपत्ति नहीं है जो हमारी जो रणनीति है, जो कूटनीति है, जो विदेशी कूटनीति है, डिप्लोमैटिक फ्रंट है, उस पर हमने अपने को फैल्योर साबित किया है, उसमें हम फैल्योर रहे हैं। आज उसका नतीजा है कि जो राष्ट्र हमारे साथ थे, उन राष्ट्रों ने आज हमसे अलग होने का काम किया है।

मैं एक बात कहना चाहूंगा कि हम लोग जब हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान की बात करते हैं तो मैं आज पूछ रहा था कि हमारा आर्मस के ऊपर कुल मिलाकर कितना खर्चा होता है तो मैं देखता हूँ कि २० हजार करोड़ से २५ हजार करोड़ रुपया प्रतिवर्ष खर्चा होता है, पाकिस्तान का भी २० हजार से २५ हजार करोड़ रुपया खर्चा होता है। यदि दोनों देशों का खर्चा मिला दें तो ५० हजार करोड़ रुपया खर्चा होता है। जिस देश में पीने का पानी नहीं हो, आज भी ५० प्रतिशत और गैरसरकारी आंकड़ों के मुताबिक ६० प्रतिशत लोग गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहने वाले हों, जीवन व्यतीत करते हों, उस देश का २५ हजार करोड़ रुपया या २५ हजार करोड़ रुपया आज कहां जा रहा है? घूम फिरकर यह पैसा अमेरिका के पास जाता है। आज रूस सुपर पावर नहीं है। आज एक ही सुपर पावर है, उसका नाम अमेरिका है। याद रखिये

... (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now please conclude. Your ten minutes are over. You are taking Shri Natwar Singh's time now.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Sir, you have given me ten minutes and I have taken only seven minutes.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Sir, I would request you that if you could extend the time by fifteen minutes, we can deal with the whole subject. I hope, the Prime Minister will not object.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : I shall conclude within five minutes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, you have been given ten minutes only.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : सभापति जी, मैं यह कह रहा था कि आज तीन साल के बाद हमारे हथियार बेकार चले जाते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान दोनों का सौदागर अमेरिका वहां बैठा हुआ है। अभी उसको एफ-१६ दिया है, अब हमको कह रहा है कि तुम एफ-१७ ले लो। न तो कभी पाकिस्तान को हिन्दुस्तान खत्म कर सकता है, न हिन्दुस्तान कभी पाकिस्तान को समुद्र में फेंक सकता है। मैं आपसे इतना जानना चाहता हूँ कि यदि दोनों में से कोई एक दूसरे को खत्म नहीं कर सकता है तो यह हथियारों की होड़ क्यों चल रही है? संगमा जी ने ठीक कहा कि जब आप सिक्मोरिटी की बात करते हैं, नेशनल सिक्मोरिटी की बात कहते हैं तो नेशनल सिक्मोरिटी तब तक नहीं आ सकती है, जब तक इकोनोमिक सिक्मोरिटी नहीं होती है, जब तक कामर्स की सिक्मोरिटी नहीं होती है, जब तक हैल्थ की सिक्मोरिटी नहीं होती है, आज इस फ्रंट पर तो हम फैल्योर हैं, आर्थिक मामले में हम फैल्योर हैं, बेरोजगारी के मामले में हम फैल्योर हैं, हैल्थ के मामले में हैल्थ फॉर ऑल का नारा दिया गया, उस मामले में हम फैल्योर हैं, हर चीज पर हम फैल्योर हैं। हम कह रहे हैं कि हमारी नेशनल सिक्मोरिटी को हम मजबूत करना चाहते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे ज्यादा विडम्बना और कुछ नहीं हो सकती है। आप न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट की बात करते हैं। जापान ने कभी न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट नहीं किया। हिरोशिमा के ऊपर बमबारी की गई, अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी की कविता हिरोशिमा के ऊपर रुलाने वाली कविता है। लेकिन हिरोशिमा पर इतना होने के बाद भी जापान ने कभी न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट नहीं किया। जर्मनी ने कभी न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट नहीं किया। क्या जापान और जर्मनी किसी से कम शक्तिशाली देश हैं? हमने रूस को देखा है कि रूस कितना पावरफुल देश था, लेकिन वह न्यूक्लियर टैस्ट और आर्मस के कम्प्रीमिशन में कहां चला गया? आज वह जहां गया है, वह हमारे सामने है।

इसका मतलब यह नहीं है, मैं यह नहीं कहता हूँ कि आप भारत की ताकत को कम करो। हम यह नहीं कहना चाहते हैं कि आप अपनी शैत्य शक्ति को कम करो, जितना करना है उसको आप बढ़ाओ, आपको कभी अपोजीशन पार्टी के लोग, चाहे पावर में कांग्रेस थी, बी.जे.पी. पावर में है या यूनाइटेड फ्रण्ट पावर में था, कभी किसी ने नहीं कहा कि आप डिफेंस में कटौती करने का काम करो, उल्टे बढ़ाने का काम किया। इसलिए आपको उसमें जितना करना हो, उसमें आप करो, लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि आप देश के इकोनोमिक फ्रण्ट के ऊपर विचार नहीं करें। मैं एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने स्टेटमेंट में कहा है,

the atmosphere of our discussion was cordial and constructive.

एक तरफ से प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि हमारा डिस्कशन कोर्डियल और कंस्ट्रक्टिव था।

दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि इस डिस्कशन का रिजल्ट जीरो था और वेस्टेज आफ टाइम था। मैं यह नहीं कहना चाहता कि पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री ने जो बात कही है वह सही है, लेकिन मैं यह जरूर चाहूंगा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी इसके ऊपर जरूर जवाब दें कि यदि डिस्कशन हुआ तो उसका रिजल्ट क्या रहा। जो आप रिजल्ट कह रहे हैं कि यह फ्रूटफुल डिस्कशन रहा और कोआर्डियल रहा, यह सही है..

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त (मिदनापुर): फ्रूटफुल नहीं कहा।

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN :It is mentioned here 'the atmosphere of our discussion was cordial and constructive'. The word 'constructive' implies that it was fruitful. If it is fruitless, then how can it be constructive?

इसमें पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री का उल्लेख नहीं है। प्रधान मंत्री जी जब जवाब देंगे तो मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि यह डिस्कशन कंस्ट्रक्टिव रहा, फ्रूटफुल रहा या जैसा वे कहते हैं कि वेस्टेज आफ टाइम रहा या बिग जीरो रिजल्ट रहा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं फिर प्रधान मंत्री जी से आग्रह करूंगा कि आप देश की ताकत को बढ़ाएं, सेना के मामले में बढ़ाएं, लेकिन कोई ऐसा काम न कीजिए जिससे देश के इकोनोमिक फ्रंट पर जो हमारे सामने चैलेंज है, उसको स्वीकार करने में हम असमर्थ हों।

(इति)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Sir, it is nine minutes to five. If I could request you and my hon. colleagues to extend the discussion by 15 minutes, I would like to say a few things.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Ten minutes more may be given if the House has no objection.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.(Interruptions)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH :Sir, should I carry on?(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AHAMED :Sir, Shri Natwar Singh is an authority on foreign affairs. He should speak just before the Prime Minister will give his reply. Otherwise, the Members from all the small Parties will get only five minutes. That is what I feel.

SHRI SURESH KURUP (KOTTAYAM): There are other speakers also. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Regarding other Members, we will decide later.(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AHAMED :Other Members are also interested to speak on foreign affairs.(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP :What about other speakers?(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will consider the representations from other Parties.

">SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH (BHARATPUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Lok Sabha last discussed foreign affairs on 27th and 28th of May. In these two months and some days, the Government has been preoccupied with the damage control, and an assortment of envoys has been sent to do fire fighting with the result that all other areas of India's foreign policy and diplomacy have been totally and completely neglected by this Government. It is a statement of fact, and not of my imagination. If it is so, I would like the Prime Minister to clarify and give us a catalogue of the activities of the Ministry of External Affairs relating to other areas of foreign policy, besides the nuclear bomb and discussions of their envoys with Pakistan and the United States of America.

Now, what has happened in these two and a half months? Between 11th of May and 13th of May, the euphoria in the BJP was something fantastic. Then, suddenly reality struck on the 27th of May and even with greater force, two days later on the 28th and 30th of May when Pakistan exploded its bombs. Having been an Ambassador to Pakistan nearly twenty years ago, I could have given Shri Vajpayee in writing on the 13th of May that no power could stop Pakistan from exploding their bombs after India had done so.

You be a Pakistani and see; go there and find out how they feel. And what did you achieve? You achieved great wonders! I will tell you what you have achieved. You have achieved a total isolation of India, for the first time in 50 years, in the international scene. Who are your friends? There is Vietnam. Vietnam is a friend of ours, at all times. Has Mauritius spoken for you? Has Bhutan spoken for you? Has Nepal spoken for you? Let us see who has spoken for you. Who has spoken for you among the P-5, G-8 and Security Council?

Sir, the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs, my dear sister, is here. She is a charming person and she is learning very fast. She said a great deal and conveyed very little. You have also learnt the same, Mr. Prime Minister. You say a great deal and convey very little. It is very smart and it is one of the fundamentals of diplomacy to say a great deal and convey very little. But some of us here also know between the lines. You said that at the Non-Aligned Summit in Colombia, India had a great success. The representatives of Non-Aligned countries in the Security Council condemned India. For the first time in 50 years, the Security Council condemned India and the Resolution was carried. We were condemned before, but the Soviet Union exercised the veto. This time no one did.

Your achievement number 1 is, isolation in P-5, G-8 and the Security Council. For 33 years, Kashmir had not been discussed in the Security Council, because in September, 1965 Sardar Swaran Singh walked out of the Security Council. I was a member of the delegation, so was your Principal Secretary. We walked out. It was only in the month of June, after your performance, that the Security Council met to discuss Kashmir and we were condemned on Kashmir. Who is responsible for that?

Do you want to know more of the isolation that you have?

इधर कुआं और इधर खाई, जिम्मेदार हैं अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी। यह कुआं किसने खोदा? यह खाई किसने खोदी?

It happened because you did not think through the consequences of your actions. You invented reasons for exploding the bomb. We could have done this long ago. You said, first thing, in your letter to Mr. Clinton about

the security threat from China. I will tell you again with folded hands that you should not have signed that letter. You signed it, because you did not read it. If you have read it, you would not have signed it. It is as simple as that and the gentleman or the lady who drafted it is answerable to this country. It is the first violation of principal diplomacy that you do not name other countries in a letter to another Head of State, because when you name an adversary, you make an adversary. It is common sense. What did the letter do? Ten years of good work with China was spoiled and you started the process, even though your visit was aborted. We had a setback.

Your letter says one thing and Shrimati Vasundara Raje's reply to my question says quite another thing. Instead of inventing a security threat because to this day you have convinced no country in the world that there was a security threat - all you had to say was that, like France and China who exploded in 1995 and 1996 to update their nuclear technology, India, as a sovereign, Independent country, was exercising its right to make its nuclear technology up-to-date and exploding the bombs. If you had done that, nobody would have said anything to you, because they could not have said. If you had asked us, I would have given you this advice free, gratis, because it is elementary. But your Defence Minister says that China is adversary number 1, your Home Minister says that Pakistan is adversary number 1 and you say, in your letter, about both China and Pakistan, please decide!

SHRI MURLI DEORA : Shri Khurana also said something.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : No; I do not want to mention that.

17.00 hrs. It is not necessary. Although, I must say that statements of some of your Ministers - our foreign friends have told us - were considered even more damaging than the bombs themselves. It is because they said, are these people ruling India who say such things? Mr. Prime Minister, you have not said so. You have chosen your words carefully and I respect you for doing so. But I wish I could say the same thing about your colleagues also. You now find yourself in a situation that for the first time in 50 years the national consensus on foreign policy has been fractured. You can only repair the damage if you take us into confidence. It is because one of the great strengths of this country has been that on foreign policy matters this nation and this Parliament have spoken into one voice. It is for the first time in 50 years that the Houses are divided in the way they are. You regret it and we regret it and the damage has been done. Now how to put it right both internationally and domestically because the relationship between foreign policy and domestic policy is vital? You can only have a meaningful, forceful, and influential foreign policy if your domestic scene is coherent. There is a cacophony of incoherence from your Government and not a symphony from an orchestra of which you are the leader. It should be. But it is not so because there are so many war lords in your coalition who are law unto themselves and not amenable to discipline under your charge. I am not blaming you for it. This is a political reality. You cobbled up a coalition Government which has no common ground even on an issue like the foreign policy... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Natwar Singh, I am having my own doubt. Are you speaking in the House or are you speaking with the Prime Minister?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Well, I will speak to you, Sir. I stand corrected. I will only look at you now and I would like you to keep smiling.

Now, the other damage that has been done is that we have established parity with Pakistan. On the 28th and 30th of May, we came down. Now, you have proposed a no-first-strike agreement. Pakistan will never sign it. Why? It is because if they sign it, then conventional superiority of India is again re-established for ever and it has taken them 50 years to get the parity you have given them on a plate . Why do you think that Mr. Nawaj Sharif has said that it is a waste of time and it was zero. He never said it before. He could not have said it if they had not exploded the bomb. We had the initiative. Now on every occasion, the Government of Pakistan will be intransigent. You think, you have got away from the Security Council. From next month, the General Assembly of the United Nations will be meeting and you will have Kashmir right in the centre every day. What contingency plans do you have? How many friends are going to get up there to support us and say that this is not a matter which will be discussed here?

Shri Jaswant Singh is having talks with the Americans day in and day out. Now, we know what Shri Jaswant Singh has said to Mr. Talbott but we do not know what Mr. Talbott has said to Shri Jaswant Singh. Could you

please tell us? It is a vital matter for this country to know what you are discussing. Some hon. Members have spoken about some modifications in CTBT. What are those modifications? The CTBT cannot be amended. It is held up only because India, Pakistan and Israel did not sign it and it cannot be amended unless all the 44 countries who have signed it agree. Some of them have even ratified it. You should have asked the Americans - when they came here - this question. France and China did not sign the NPT till 1994-95, if I remember correctly, and yet they were given full status of nuclear weapon powers. You should have told Mr. Talbott and you should have told Mr. Clinton that India is a country of one billion people and ancient civilisation of great culture and tradition and poor we may be but proud we are, if you do not give us the same status that you gave to China and to France, we will not be cowed down.

You are bargaining on little bits here and there on CTBT and they are denying you nuclear weapon power status. Who are they to deny us? They have broken every rule, we have obeyed every rule and, yet, have been pilloried for all these times. Shri Jaswant Singh should not be discussing CTBT because he has no right to discuss, and you have no right to discuss CTBT unless you take us with you. That is for sure. We would like to have a common programme to talk to the Americans on CTBT. If you go with that, you will carry the good wishes of the entire House. Am I right or am I wrong? You will go and speak as the Prime Minister of one billion people. There are not very many people; you are the second individual -- Mr. Jiang Zemin of China is number one, and number two is Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee -- and the rest come in the league of 200 million and 300 million people. It is no ordinary honour to be the Prime Minister of India. You tell the Americans that every single Indian is behind you, that we want the status granted or they can keep their CTBT. I am speaking not in anger, not with any jingoism and I am giving you diplomatic facts.

Now, you take what the Americans have been doing to us. Kashmir is the flash point, and it is at the centre stage. In his speech to the National Geographic Society of America, Mr. Clinton says that India and Pakistan should sit down to discuss Kashmir, and China should also sit with them on the table. It has not happened in 50 years. Whose gift is it? It is not ours. Then, Mr. Clinton goes to China and he was there for nine days. In the joint statement issued by China and the United States, three pages were given to India and Pakistan. What right do they have? The answer of the Chinese is, "Well, you mentioned us through a letter to Clinton, we mention you here." If you had complaints against China, then complain to China. Why complain to Clinton? I would like to know the answer from the Government that how you wish to deal with the situation in isolation, without carrying all the parties with you. The framework left by Jawaharlal Nehru 50 years ago was held intact till the 11th of May. You became the Foreign Minister in 1977. There were five other Governments since then, but they could not change India's foreign policy because it could not be changed. I am not saying that we are running a static, sterile and meaningless policy. Agendas of countries change. The agenda for 1950s was one, and it is another one in 1997. But within the broad framework, in the Non-Aligned Movement, you can make the voice of the developing countries heard. You should ask Mr. Nawaz Sharif to join us so that we will jointly tackle these five powers in the Security Council to say, "Sit down and we will talk with you." You should tell the United States that they should take an initiative at Geneva in which to start a process for total and time based nuclear disarmament as proposed in Rajiv Gandhi's plan. Tell them to take the initiative and both India and Pakistan should say that "we will come along with you, but tell us the day on which there will be no nuclear weapons left." What has happened today is that the five powers continue to break the rules and laws and sit on judgment on us. I think, India is the only country in the world whose voice will matter, if you get up and say so with the support of all of us. Otherwise, you are going to get pushed around as you are being pushed around now.

Shri Indrajit Gupta asked an extremely important question. What is your nuclear policy? Are you going for weaponisation? Are you going to put nuclear warheads in our missiles? Where are they going to be placed? What is the expenditure? I have also been in Government from 1953 in one form or another. You cannot disclose certain things. We will not ask you certain things. What is the broad framework of your nuclear policy? Nuclear policy of India has been changed by you without consulting us. Your manifesto said "We will induct weapons. We will change nuclear foreign policy." You did not consult us. Shrimati Indira Gandhi in 1974 did not change India's nuclear policy and foreign policy. She did not induct nuclear weapons. You know and I know the reality that we inherited, the situation in which the Government has taken only soft option on 11th May. All other options before you are hard options, extremely hard. We would like to know how you will tackle the CTBT, security and nuclear policy and how you intend to deal with Mr. Clinton and the Americans because the

Secretary of State of the United States Miss Madeleine Albright herself has on five occasions used unacceptable language against a great country like India. You can say the same thing, politely, gently, firmly, with all the emphasis at your command that the Secretary of United States has no right to call the Home Minister of India, the names she did.

I can tell you that I raised this matter with Miss Madeleine Albright. I do not know whether the Government raised the matter with her or not.

Diplomacy does not offer me Nirwanor salvation, but it offers hope and this is necessary that you must use all the instruments available to you in this House to assist you in putting the consensus back where it was before 11th May. In future discussions. If you take us into confidence, Mr. Prime Minister, we will do our best because we do not want to internationalise the Kashmir issue. Your Party was critical of the Shimla Agreement. Now there is love for the Shimla Agreement. Even Shri L. K. Advani invoked Shimla Agreement. I was delighted that at least all the education we have offered has some effect and has rubbed off the Shimla Agreement which was at one time seen by you as some underhand trick by Shrimati Indira Gandhi with Mr. Bhutto. You went to Shimla after your holiday in Manali. I wish you had longer holiday. You probably need it. In the great meeting on The Mall, you said that Shimla Agreement is good. I am delighted. I congratulate you. Shri L. K. Advani said it the other day. I congratulated you should tell the Pakistanis "Yes. We will discuss exclusively the Kashmir issue and nothing else. If you want any help, I will join your delegation." Tell them "Only Kashmir and we will come out of it better than they." But why are you shying away on the Kashmir issue? You have a very good case, Mr. Prime Minister. Put it forward very strongly and with clarity. (Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : What about Discussion under rule 193 on deportation?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Mr. Prime Minister, we wish you luck. I wish you success in correcting the distortions on foreign policy with our assistance. Not only do you need luck and success at the moment, but you need strong nerves. Good luck to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I want to ascertain from the House whether to continue this discussion by extending the House. Three more hon. Members have to speak on this subject.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We can continue this discussion tomorrow.

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH : What is the use of taking up 193 discussion late in the night?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think five minutes only can be given to each Member. So, a total of 15 minutes will be enough for them.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA : Sir, the Discussion under Rule 193 is very important...(Interruptions) The deportation issue is very important. Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee has to start the discussion. It was stated that the discussion would start at five of the Clock. But it could not be done. At six of the Clock, if this discussion ends, the time would be too short to debate the important issue. Let us take it up tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have allowed three Members to speak. So, if three Members complete their speeches, tomorrow, reply can be given.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA : It will be six of the Clock by that time. Nobody will remain in the House... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Half-an-Hour discussion is also there. Then, what is supposed to be done? Let it start at eleven of the Clock tomorrow. The hon. Prime Minister is sitting here. As the Leader of the House, he can put in a word to the hon. Speaker...(Interruptions)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Tomorrow at eleven of the Clock we can take it up...
(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : That will be useful. It is a very important discussion. If the hon. Prime Minister wants to reply, we shall be very happy to hear him...(Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : There is also the Half-an-Hour discussion...(Interruptions)

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : Mr. Chairman, there was already a decision that tomorrow at 2 p.m. we have to take up the discussion on the Jain Commission Report. That has been decided in the BAC. The hon. Speaker has also agreed to that...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was already represented to the hon. Speaker.

... (Interruptions)

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : It was not represented. It was already decided. I am only saying that if so much of today's business is carried over tomorrow, it should not affect the discussion on the Jain Commission Report which is to be taken up at 2 p.m. It should not create a situation by which we will have to postpone it. Before taking it up, all other discussions should be over..(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No concrete decision was announced by the hon. Speaker earlier. The Parliamentary Affairs Minister is here. He can respond to it.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR : Where is the time now? Everyday, there is late sitting of the House. This is not proper...(Interruptions)

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री तथा पर्यटन मंत्री : सभापति जी, बी.ए.सी. की मीटिंग में पहले से तय हुआ था कि कल दो बजे जैन कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर चर्चा होगी और उसके पहले शोडयूल्ड कास्टस और शोडयूल्ड ट्राइब्स की समस्याओं के बारे में चर्चा को लिया जाएगा। मैंने पहले ही कहा है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी कल सुबह जवाब देंगे। आज एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स पर बहस को खत्म करके आपका जो नियम १९३ है

... (व्यवधान)

श्री सोमनाथ चटर्जी : वह हमारा नहीं है, पूरे हाउस का है।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मदन लाल खुराना : जो गीता जी के नाम से नियम १९३ के अधीन चर्चा है, उसको ले लिया जाएगा। हम एक घंटा लेट बैठ जाएंगे।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मधुकर सरपोतदार : वह आज नहीं होना चाहिए।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मदन लाल खुराना : हम तय करते हैं कि इसे चार बजे तक समाप्त कर देंगे लेकिन वह समाप्त होता नहीं। सब बोलना भी चाहते हैं और टाइम भी एक्सटेंड नहीं करना चाहते।

... (व्यवधान)

17.18 hrs. (Mr. Speaker in the chair)

MR. SPEAKER: There are only three Members to speak on the foreign policy. Let the three Members complete their speeches. Then, we will take up the discussion under Rule 193.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : How long will it continue? Half-an-Hour discussion is there. Generally, I do not wish to interrupt. But this is a very important issue. Do not take it as "also ran". If it starts at six or six-thirty or seven of the Clock, then nobody will be here. It is not that we want our speeches to be heard here. But it is a very serious matter. I am sure everybody agrees that it is a serious matter...(Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : There is Half-an-Hour discussion also. How will we discuss it?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Tomorrow, let it start. We shall try to finish the discussion within a limited time. You can regulate it...(Interruptions)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Tomorrow, at eleven of the Clock, we can take up the Discussion under Rule 193 on the deportation issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Basu Deb Acharia, tomorrow also, there is a Discussion under Rule 193.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Everyday, we have to sit up to 9 o'clock. It is not fair...(Interruptions)

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA : My point is that let the Members be given chance to speak on the foreign affairs. After that, Half an Hour discussion may be taken up. It will be completed by 6.00 p.m. Tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock, the discussion under Rule 193 on deportation may be taken up. It is a very sensitive issue. I had personally gone there to see the situation. Kindly have it discussed in the House. The situation is a serious one there. Thereafter, the Prime Minister may kindly give his reply on foreign affairs. The discussion on Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes is also important. At 2.00 p.m. the discussion on the Jain Commission Report and the Action Taken Report can start. We can start this discussion one hour later also at 3 o'clock. These are my respectful submissions.

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): It is a fair suggestion given by both the leaders from West Bengal. My only amendment to that would be that let the Prime Minister reply at 11 o'clock and after that the discussion under Rule 193 may be started. This would be better.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA : We agree...(Interruptions)

श्री राम विलास पासवान : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको मालूम है कि हर पक्ष के एम.पी. ने और अनुसूचित जाति तथा अनुसूचित जाति के सदस्यों ने वेलफेयर मिनिस्ट्री के संबंध में रिक्वेस्ट किया था लेकिन वेलफेयर मिनिस्ट्री ने डिस्कशन के बजाय यह माना कि एक दिन अनुसूचित जाति और अनुसूचित जनजाति के ऊपर डिस्कशन ले लेंगे। बिज़नेस एडवाइज़री कमेटी में ऑल लेडीज ने तय किया था कि फ्राईडे को ४.०० बजे हर हालत में इसको ले लिया जायेगा चाहे और बिज़नेस समाप्त हो या न हो। उसके बाद जब बी.ए.सी. में बैठे तो सब नेताओं की फिर राय ली गई। उस दिन हम लोगों ने यह आशंका ज़ाहिर की थी कि यह संभव न होगा, इसलिये सोमवार को रखो। सब लोगों ने कहा कि सोमवार को नहीं, मंगलवार को फर्सट लिस्ट में रखा जाये तथा उसके बाद ही दूसरा आईटम आयेगा। मैं आपसे आग्रह से कहना चाहता हूँ कि दूसरे आईटम्स भी इम्पार्टेंट हैं, इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं लेकिन अनुसूचित जाति तथा अनुसूचित जनजाति के मामले को इतना लाइटली न लिया जाये। आपसे आग्रह है कि आपने जो कार्यक्रम ११०० बजे से १३०० बजे तक लेना है, वह ले लीजिये तथा उसके बाद नियम १९३ के अधीन चाहे महाराष्ट्र ककी चर्चा लें या जैन कमीशन रिपोर्ट को ले लीजिये, मुझे इसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है..

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त : प्राईम मिनिस्टर के रिप्लाई का क्या होगा ?

श्री राम विलास पासवान : प्राईम मिनिस्टर का रिप्लाई ११ बजे हो जायेगा और उसके बाद एस.सी.एस.टी. को ले लीजिये।

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : Everyone knows that the House was extended in order to facilitate discussion on the Jain Commission Report. This was the decision of the BAC also. I am not saying that other discussions are less important. They are equally important. I have no doubt about it. My humble submission is, whatever is the business for today, let us finish it today itself by extending the time of the House. We have no objection about extending the time of the House. As decided earlier, the hon. Prime Minister will reply tomorrow at 11 o'clock and immediately thereafter, the discussion under Rule 193 on SCs and STs will be taken up. We will take up the discussion on the Jain Commission Report exactly at 2.00 p.m...(Interruptions) Let me complete. My point is that today's business, that is, the discussion under Rule 193 on deportation of the minorities should be taken up and completed today...(Interruptions) Please bear with us also. The House was extended to discuss the Jain Commission Report...(Interruptions)

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR : Sir, one should not carry a wrong impression. The House was not extended only for discussing the Jain Commission Report. This is a wrong impression. It should not go on record also... (Interruptions)

... (Interruptions)

SHRI E. AHAMED : Sir, the foreign policy is a very important matter. There are areas where some of the parties are interested. May I submit before the hon. Speaker... (Interruptions)

SHRI PRAKASH VISHWANATH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, everybody is aware that tomorrow will be election of Deputy-Speaker. That is why we have come here, and we are not informed when that election is... (Interruptions)

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (AKOLA): We can begin the House by 9 o'clock... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: How can we do it by 9 o'clock? What is this?

... (Interruptions)

SHRI E. AHAMED : Sir, all the parties have given the names of the speakers to participate on the discussion on Foreign Affairs. But only the Members from the major parties have been called for making their speeches, and other small parties like ours have not been given any opportunity to participate on the debates. We are also interested to speak on the Foreign Policy though not in a very wider sense but at least in a limited manner. Why not the House be a little bit sympathetic to the remaining three Members in the list to speak out their views now? The hon. Prime Minister can reply tomorrow. If it is not possible, my humble request to the Chair is that these three Members may be given the opportunity to speak tomorrow before the Prime Minister gives the reply... (Interruptions)... We are also elected representatives of the people. We are not being given opportunity to speak.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: My request to the hon. Members is that today's listed business can be taken up and finished today itself by sitting late.

... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Otherwise, you cannot complete the business tomorrow.

Now, Shri E. Ahamad to speak.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I am not interrupting. Just half a second. Mr. Speaker, Sir, then what is the decision? Shall we continue till 10 p.m.? ... (Interruptions)... Because that discussion cannot be over. Do you think, just because Members will be absent, most of the Members will go away and, therefore it is expected to be over within half an hour? No. It will not do. It will not happen like that... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: We will sit late, upto 8 o'clock.

... (Interruptions)

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR : Sir, this has become a practice... (Interruptions)...Mr. Speaker, Sir, just a minute.

MR. SPEAKER: No. Please sit down. Now, Shri Ahamed to speak.

... (Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, these are very important issues and you are not listening to us. Why not you take it up tomorrow at 11 o'clock? ... (Interruptions)... Sir, it is not fair. It is also a very important issue. After Prime Minister's reply, why do you not allow this discussion?... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri E. Ahmad, please.

... (Interruptions)

">SHRI E. AHAMED (MANJERI): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Due to paucity of time, I do not want to take much of the valuable time of the House. I do not want to elaborate my points. No Member could articulate the Policy on foreign affairs within a couple of minutes. However, Sir, I am constrained to mention certain things here in this House which other hon. Members did not mention. Therefore, I will confine my statement only within one or two points.

Sir, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had laid the foundation stone of our Foreign Policy.

One of the most important decisions he had taken when dealing with the relationship of India with other countries was maintaining the best of relationships with the Arab and Islamic countries. We have been following this policy. I would like to say that India has been ignoring a vital point on the matter of our foreign policy in the recent past, that is, the relationship with the countries in our neighbourhood. In our neighbourhood, we have the Gulf Cooperation Council States: Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, UAE, Oman, Bahrain and Qatar. This is a very important matter as far as India is concerned.

On five points, we cannot ignore the importance of India's relationship with these countries. The first point is that these are all our neighbouring countries; the second is that these countries are the source of our energy supply; the third is that we have trade relationships with these countries worth \$ 10 billion a year; the fourth is that we are earning \$ 4 billion worth of foreign exchange from these countries as remittance from Indian community and the fifth point is that more than three and a half million people are usefully and peacefully employed in these countries. But quite unfortunately, we are not giving that much of importance to these countries as we are giving to various other countries in Europe, Africa and Asia.

I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister how many Ministers have visited these countries. These are the countries where more than three and a half million of our people are living and from where we are earning more than \$ 4 billion by way of foreign exchange. But what is the relationship that we have with these countries? Of course, we have our diplomats there. But we are sending only the Secretaries to the Government of India there. Why are senior Ministers not visiting these countries?

They say that they are very much worried about India's situation. On the one hand, we employ our diplomats to tell them that our Pokhran tests were only a deterrent; on the other hand, the irresponsible statements made by our Ministers have created a lot of worry in the minds of the people living there. The statement made by the hon. Minister of Home Affairs - of course, with good intentions - was: 'The geo-strategic situation in the country has changed since the Pokhran tests.' Even the newspapers in those countries have quoted as "choosy quotations" made by my very good friend Shri Madan Lal Khurana. He made this statement and I quote: 'If Pakistan wants to fight another war with us, then, let them tell us the time and venue.' On the one hand, we are telling our

neighbours, the Arab countries that it is only for deterrence and on the other hand responsible Ministers are making irresponsible statements. Therefore, what is their thinking?

Hon. Members have mentioned about the OIC countries. Many of these Fifty-five countries of the world have been standing by India. They have been supporting India. They have always been aligned with India on various international matters. But are we showing the same courtesy, extending the same relationship with the same sort of interactions with these countries as much as we are showing to other European, African and Asian countries? Therefore, it is an imperative need in the country's interests that we have to have frequent interaction with these countries. I am very happy that our Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, the charming lady, Shrimati Vasundhara

Raje had visited some of the Arab countries. That much is good. But why do we not have more frequent interactions with these countries?

Sir, it is Government's prerogative to appoint Ambassadors and High Commissioners and calling them back. But the manner in which the High Commissioner of India in London had been replaced was very clumsy. It should not have been done. Of course, the Government has the prerogative to appoint anybody. I have no objection to that. Everything should be done in a graceful manner. In this case it was not done gracefully.

While dealing with foreign countries, we must bear the India's interests in mind. I think we would be able definitely to stop this isolation in the international community and go forward only with the policy initiated by no less a person than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

">SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (AKOLA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

So many changes are going on in the international relations. I happened to read a book titled, 'Thousand Years of War' by John Kennedy. According to him, there is an economic background for the wars that have taken place over the last thousand years.

After the Pokhran tests, a debate is going on whether it was necessary or not. I think, we have to look into a situation where we are going to land ourselves if we can continue with the controversy regarding explosion. If we are going to compete with the Western world in the fields where they have got monopoly, like armaments and aircraft manufacturing, then certain amount of economic power is going to be devolved to the regional centres that are coming up. Comparing to 1920s, the economic power of the Western world has already deteriorated. Today, there is a decline in the contribution of the Western world towards the international economic scene by more than thirty per cent. In the next twenty years, the economic contribution of the Western world to the world economic scene is going to dwindle down to forty per cent. That is the projection.

Another change, a subtle change, is taking place. That is the revival and resurgence of the old civilizations that are in existence now. No doubt, they have already modernized in many areas. Revival is taking place on the basis of the civilization. I can cite the example of Bosnia. Bosnia had been divided along the lines of Christians and Muslims. Now, we see signs of new world order based on the civilization emerging. This is already coming up in the Third World countries.

We are talking of isolation today. Some countries want to see us as an economic power and there are some other countries who do not want us to become an economic power. Therefore, these kinds of sanctions are going to be there. We have already conducted the nuclear tests in Pokhran. So, there is no use of debating whether it is useful or not.

The discussion about whether it is going to be helpful or not helpful is of no use today. We have to stand unitedly. I know that some of our Members have been in the NAM and leaders of the NAM. In the next ten years, what is going to happen to the NAM? Are we going to stick to the old dogmatic phenomenon that we were leaders of the NAM and therefore the NAM has some relevance? If there is going to be some realignment,

as I said, on the basis of civilisation, then I do not know what is going to happen to the NAM. In that case, we also have to change in that direction.

Therefore, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether he would look into this issue which is the most important one. As I have seen and as I have learnt from many newspapers and magazines, some parts of India, and especially Arunachal Pradesh is being shown in the map of China which is introduced in the schools as a part of China. It is not there in the official maps, but in the school maps it is being shown as a part of China. If this is going to be the teaching which is imbibed, that Arunachal Pradesh is not a part of India, then, for generations to come, this feeling would remain that we, being in Arunachal Pradesh, being a part of China, should be with China. Then this feeling would create hatred and ill-will for the coming generations. This is being imbibed. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister whether he is going to look into this matter and inform the House whether it is a fact or not a fact.

The other thing which I would like to mention over here is about the attitude of some of the BJP Members who have spoken and especially referred to the former Speaker, Shri Sangma who also spoke here. They said that this is the first time that some have also taken a stand saying that, "No. Pokhran blasts should not have been there; we should not have exploded bombs." What has been the attitude?

Shri Chandra Shekhar also said the other day that there was no need for a nuclear bomb in this country and that we should not have exploded. But I find two attitudes coming out from the BJP side, especially when Shri Jag Mohan was speaking. He made a reference, as if Shri Sangma was speaking in the Pakistan Parliament. Secondly, he referred to Rome. May I know from the Treasury Benches whether that reference was made just because Shri Sangma is a Christian and not a Hindu? This kind of a reference was not made when the former Prime Minister Shri Chandra Shekhar spoke and is it because he is a Hindu? If this kind of religious divisions are going to be made by the Treasury Benches, let me warn them that it is going to alienate the North-Eastern States which are not culturally a part of our society. In this cultural resurgence that is taking place all over, the world will have effect in this country also we have to behave politically; we may have difference of opinion; we may not belong to the same religion to which you belong, but let not religion cast aspersions on our national interest and the national integrity of any person.

With these words, I conclude.

">SHRI BIR SINGH MAHATO (PURULIA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on this subject.

Foreign policy of our country is not a policy of any particular party; it is the policy of the nation. There is no contradiction and there is no conflict regarding our foreign policy. We spoke in the same voice. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister - now he has also come here - as to what prompted him to go in for nuclear explosions on 11th and 13th of May? Are we doing this to show our strength to Pakistan? What is the benefit of these explosions?

What have we gained through this explosion? The Defence Minister and the Home Minister have hijacked the right of the Ministry of External Affairs. The hon. Defence Minister publicly stated that China was our main enemy while the Prime Minister contradicted it. The Home Minister and the Defence Minister publicly took contradictory positions. So, this type of contradictory statements have damaged the reputation of our country.

On the 6th August, 1945, when America dropped a bomb over the people of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, our party was banned and even then it propagated through underground against the brutal murder of the people of Japan. We need food. Our people need food, employment and health. We do not need nuclear test. India and Pakistan were initially one country. People were not in favour of dividing our country. Even Gandhiji was against division. Still our country was divided. We need good relations and good neighbourhood. During the last fifty years, we have adopted a foreign policy on the basis of fraternity, cooperation, peace, austerity and living together. So, a confederation between Bangladesh, Pakistan and India should be formed.

">SHRI SURESH KURUP (KOTTAYAM): Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the subject.

It is a sad thing that since 1992, no discussion had taken place in this august House regarding our policy on external affairs. This is all the more serious since all these years showed us a gradual ascendancy of the US restoring as a superpower which in turn needed our patriotic reactions also. So, I am happy that this sort of a discussion is taking place now, even though it is belated. Thus, the chain circumstances warrant the reevaluation of our foreign policy. Some quarters say that since the era of power blocs is over and since it is a unipolar world, we have to reassess our perceptions regarding our foreign policy. It is a very sophisticated and subtle way to say that we should obey the dictates of the US. Sir, is it necessary that our foreign policy perspective should be reassessed which is based on the firm pillar of non-alignment?

I am surprised that a very few hon. Members have mentioned about the Non-Aligned Movement. The Non-Aligned Movement, in which our country played a crucial role was saved during our freedom movement. Everybody knows it. The thrust of the movement was on anti-imperialism and against domination of the newly independent Third World countries by the imperialist countries. In the new world dominated by the United States of America, the same problems are still dominant and nonalignment has got its relevance more than ever.

For India, 'nonalignment' means asserting its national identity and also arguing for the downtrodden people of the world. The word 'nonalignment' in the recent context is defined by one of our experts on foreign policy. I quote:

"'Non-alignment' has got only one meaning. The absence of any permanent relationship of effective subordination with a more powerful country or a group of countries."

I think, this definition is very relevant. It is also relevant to our foreign policy perspective. Now, this Government has not put forward a concrete statement on foreign policy. In 1977, while the hon. Prime Minister took charge as the Minister of Foreign Affairs, he made a categorical statement that a time-tested foreign policy will be pursued by the Government. But till now, no such statement has come from any quarter.

The only statements that have come are contradictory statements emanating from certain Ministers which gave wrong signals to the international arena. After the initial euphoria, which this Government created over the Pokharn test, if we look at the balance-sheet, what remains, as already mentioned, is the internationalisation of the Kashmir problem. After 35 long years, this issue has been internationalised and every pressure is exerted upon our country for accepting a third-party mediatory role. Pakistan is stalling every effort for bilateral discussion because they want to have some third-party intervention on this issue. This is the balance-sheet of the Pokharn test.

I would like to know the position of our Government regarding its relations with China. I am mentioning this because our Prime Minister was one of the most important political functionaries who visited China in 1979, that is, after the War in 1962. After that, the former Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, visited that country. An era started when a process of normalisation of relations with China was initiated. The whole country welcomed it. The statement by the Minister of Defence that 'China is number one enemy' has reversed the whole process. If you go through the entire diplomatic history of the world, such a statement has never emanated from a leader of any country pinpointing another country saying that it is our number one enemy. Shri K. Natwar Singh has already made it clear.

I would like to know what is our perspective regarding relations with China. What initiative is this Government going to take? After the Pokharn tests, they have sent emissaries all over the world except China. What is the present position regarding this issue?

This House and the people in the country want to know what is actually happening behind the scenes. This Government is going out of way for anything, for pleasing even a junior official of the Clinton Administration. At the same time, they are denying visas to our scientists.

श्री शकुनी चौधरी (खगड़िया): समता पार्टी को भी टाइम दीजिए ताकि उनका जवाब हम भी दे दें।

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI SURESH KURUP (KOTTAYAM): They are denying visas to our eminent scientists. They are sending back our scientists who are working there. The country is kept in the dark about the developments regarding the discussions with the representatives of the United States. This Government has not put forward a comprehensive foreign policy perspective. This Government has no right or authority or mandate of the people of this country to change the time-tested foreign policy perspective. If at all they want to change, they should take the country into confidence, which they are not doing. That is all I would like to say.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Saifuddin Soz, please do not take more than two minutes.

प्रो. सैफुद्दीन सोज़ (बारामूला): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे तकलीफ देने का कोई शौक नहीं है लेकिन मेरा भाषण दो मिनट में नहीं होगा। दो-चार मिनट में होगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: दो-चार मिनट में नहीं दो मिनट में ही अपनी बात कहिए।

">

प्रो. सैफुद्दीन सोज़ : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे तकरीर नहीं करनी है, इसलिए अंग्रेजी में नहीं बोल रहा हूँ। मैं आज ही श्रीनगर से आया और श्रीनगर में सब खेरियत है लेकिन दिल्ली में खेरियत नहीं है, यही मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। मुझे इल्मिनान है कि जो मैं बातें कहूँगा, वे और साथियों ने नहीं कहीं होंगी क्योंकि

It pinches my body and soul.

जिसको आप कश्मीर की समस्या कहते हैं तो मुझे अच्छा नहीं लगा। जब आपने मुझे इंकार किया था, आप चाहे एक मिनट का समय ही देते लेकिन मेरी बात कहे बगैर कश्मीर की बात इस सदन में कैसे कहेंगे? मैंने पहली तकरीर में कहा था कि जब इनका कांफ़ीडेंस हुआ था, इनकी शख्सियत के लिए मेरे दिल में बड़ी मोहब्बत और इज्जत है। मुझे गिला यह है कि वाजपेयी जी की सरकार दुनिया को वह सब कुछ नहीं बता रही है जो पाकिस्तान कश्मीर में कर रहा है और जिससे मुझे इल्मिनान हो जाए। यह ठीक है कि इन्होंने जसवंत सिंह जी को श्री तालबॉट के साथ बात करने के लिए भेजा। बड़ा अच्छा है, जसवंत सिंह जी को मैं जानता हूँ, बड़े काबिल आदमी हैं और वाजपेयी जी का विश्वास उनको हासिल है। लेकिन आप इतने बड़े टेलेंट को क्यों नहीं इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं? आखिर कश्मीर की समस्या भारतीय जनता पार्टी की या कांग्रेस की समस्या नहीं है। यह पूरे देश की समस्या है, यह नेशनल इश्यू है। इस सदन का टेलेन्ट, दूसरे हाउस का टेलेन्ट, पूरे मुल्क की सौ करोड़ आबादी का टेलेन्ट सामने है जिसे इस्तेमाल नहीं किया जा रहा है। सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि कश्मीर के लोगों ने आतंकवाद को मुस्तरद कर दिया। वे अमन और चैन की जिंदगी गुजारना चाहते हैं। जिस तरह और प्रांत हैं, वैसे ही वे लोग भी भारत के एक अटूट हिस्से की तरह अपनी जिंदगी गुजारना चाहते हैं। लेकिन इस बात को इस सरकार ने और मेरे खयाल से पूर्व सरकार ने भी दुनिया के सामने कितना कहा था? मुझे इल्मिनान नहीं है कि वाजपेयी जी ने इसमें पूरी कोशिश की है ताकि दुनिया को पता लगे। सिर्फ अमरीका जरूरी नहीं है, अभी कुरुप साहब बात कर रहे थे। ठीक है, अमरीका में यूनोपोलर सिस्टम हो गया है। लेकिन क्या यूरोप जरूरी नहीं है? क्या जापान जरूरी नहीं है? अभी अहमद साहब यहां बात कर रहे थे। आपने तमाम इस्लामी मुमालिकों को मुस्तरद किया है, एकतरफ रखा है। आपको यह कैसे खयाल में है कि वे भारत के दुश्मन हैं? कौन सी कोशिश आपने की थी? क्या आपने बनातवाला जी को या अहमद जी को बुलाया कि कुछ मदद कीजिए? इसलिए मुझे इल्मिनान नहीं है कि आप सब कुछ ठीक कर रहे हैं।

इस वक्त गुलमर्ग में बीस-तीस हजार लोग रात और दिन में ठहरते हैं। पहलगांव भी लोगों से भरा हुआ है। तमाम ट्यूरिस्ट्स भरे पड़े हैं। मैं आज एयरपोर्ट से आया तो मुझे लगा कि कश्मीर में बिल्कुल सामान्य स्थिति है लेकिन दिल्ली में मुझे लगता है कि कश्मीर में गड़बड़ है।

This is a paradoxical situation.

यह कैसा पैराडॉक्स पैदा हो गया? मैं इसमें नहीं जाना चाहता कि कैसे यूरोफिया हो गया? इसको एक नेशनल इश्यू मानें और दुनिया को बताएं। अभी वाशिंगटन से दो-चार दोस्त आ गए थे। इन्हीं दो-तीन दिनों में उनसे मुलाकात हो गई।

18.00 hrs.

उनको मैंने कैसेट दिखाया कि मेरे इलैक्शन में किस तरह से हजारों लोग शामिल हो गए थे। उन्होंने कहा कि भारत के एम्बैसडर क्या काम करते हैं, वे सऊदी अरब के एडीटर्स से जाकर मिलते क्यों नहीं हैं? यह कैसेड उनको देते क्यों नहीं है? मैंने कहा - उस जमाने में कश्मीर में जो इलैक्शन लड़ा जा रहा था, यहां का मीडिया उसको नहीं दिखा रहा था। वे कहते हैं कि हमारा सिस्टम खराब हो गया है। अब जालन्धर के जरिए कोशिश की जा रही है। मेरा गिला यह है कि मीडिया को हरकत में नहीं लाया जा रहा है। दूरदर्शन ही नहीं, जी-टीवी और स्टार में भी कोशिश नहीं हो रही है। इस बारे में मेरा गिला आडवाणी जी से भी है। मैं इस सदन में पांचवी बार चुनकर आया हूँ और थोड़ी सी सीनियोरिटी हासिल कर ली है। अगर मैं पहली बार भी आया होता, तो भी उनका हक बनता है, क्योंकि वे

होम मिनिस्टर हैं और जॉर्ज साहब डिफेंस मिनिस्टर हैं, वे हम दोनों सदस्यों को बुलाते। हमारे तीसरे साथी, श्री सैय्यद हुसैन, बाहर हैं, जो करगिल से हैं। करगिल में गोले फट रहे हैं, ऊरी में गोले फट रहे हैं और करना में गोले फट रहे हैं। क्या यह नहीं होना चाहिए था कि आडवाणी जी हम को बुलाकर बात करते और पूछते कि वहां क्या हो रहा है? हम लोगों ने फैसला किया था कि आज आडवाणी जी और जॉर्ज साहब को किसी तरह से यहां पकड़ लेंगे और पूछेंगे कि आप अपना दुःख क्यों प्रकट नहीं करते हैं? आप क्यों नहीं पूछते हैं कि इसको कैसे रोका जाए?

Sir, This is crux of the situation. Pakistan has become nervous because of the normalcy that is prevailing in Kashmir and the Government is failing to show to the world the kind of normalcy that has returned to Kashmir. How Kashmiris have rejected terrorism of all sorts? How they want to live for peace and progress.

मेरी दरखास्त है, आप बतायें कि इस टैलेट का किस तरह से इस्तेमाल करते हैं?

I do not grudge Shri Jaswant Singh talking all the time to Mr. Talbott but the rest of the world is also important because America will have ultimately to rise to the occasion and show the responsibility. Nothing is happening in dialogue with Muslim countries, Europe, China and Japan.

एक चीज और मैं कहना चाहता हूं। डोडा के बारे में तो आडवाणी जी बतायेंगे। वहां लोग मारे जा रहे हैं। मेरी जानकारी है कि जम्मू में कत्लोगारत हो गया है। कश्मीर में मुसलमान लोग नजारा देख रहे हैं। यह जख्म तो उनके सीनें पर उतर रहा है। जब वजीरे आजम जवाब दें, तो बतायें कि कश्मीर में अमन है, नामैल्सी है और कश्मीर के लोग भारत का हिस्सा बनकर सुख और चैन से जीना चाहते हैं। यह मेरी आपसे दरखास्त है।

(इति)