

Fourteenth Loksabha

Session : 7

Date : 27-02-2006

Participants : Chaliha Shri Kirip, Prabhu Shri Suresh, Mukherjee Shri Pranab, Athawale Shri Ramdas, Yadav Shri Devendra Prasad, Dasgupta Shri Gurudas, Owaisi Shri Asaduddin, Singh Shri Mohan, Swain Shri M.A. Kharabela, Deo Shri Bikram Keshari, Satpathy Shri Tathagata, Reddy Shri Suravaram Sudhakar, Ahamed Shri E., Mahtab Shri Bhartruhari, Yerrannaidu Shri Kinjarapu, Pathak Shri Brajesh, Pilot Shri Sachin, Badnore Shri Vijayendra Pal Singh, Pal Shri Rupchand, Chandrappan Shri C.K., Khanduri AVSM, Maj.G Bhuwan Chandra, Bangarappa Shri S., Bose Shri Subrata, Ramadass Prof. M., Singh Shri Dushyant

Title : Discussion under rule 193 regarding India's vote in IAEA on the issue of Iran's Nuclear Programme.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the House shall take up the Item listed in the Supplementary List of Business regarding discussion under Rule 193. I shall now request Shri C.K. Chandrappan to raise a discussion on the Statement made by the hon. Prime Minister on 17.02.2006 regarding India's vote in the IAEA on the issue of Iran's nuclear programme. The time allotted for this discussion is four hours [[r19](#)].

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN (TRICHUR): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to initiate this discussion under Rule 193 on the Statement made by the hon. Prime Minister on 17th February, 2006 regarding India's vote in IAEA on the issue of Iran's Nuclear Programme.

Sir, in the Statement, the hon. Prime Minister has said that we have very close relations with the country of Iran. He said that it was civilisational in nature, and also on issues we had very close relations throughout the period. But now we are raising this discussion to show the world that this House does not agree with the position taken by the Government of India in the IAEA meeting. A large number of Members belonging to different parties, cutting across the parties, including the Members on the

Government side, are not in full agreement with the position taken by the Government of India.

Sir, in this discussion the Government's position will be questioned and also we will see the acrobatics that my friends on this side, especially the BJP, will do during the course of this discussion because they consider America as our natural ally, and we have to see how that natural ally is behaving in this context.

Now, Sir, coming to the Government's position, I agree with the Prime Minister that India and Iran were a part of ancient civilisation in this world. Not only that, after the Independence, during the post-war period, India and Iran took more or less similar stand on many of the critical issues on which India was interested.

Sir, I would like to bring to the attention of the Government a few issues. During different Indo-Pak wars, Iran took a position which was rather in favour of India. It was very difficult for a Muslim country to take that position but they took that position because they thought that India was just.

On the question of Kashmir, we received support from Iran in various international bodies. When *Babri Masjid* was demolished and the whole country was in great crisis, again it was Iran that took a position that it was not to be taken as a confrontation with Muslims, and the Muslim community in India should have a patient view about it. They helped India to preserve peace at that time.

Sir, one of the rare gestures of friendship Iran has shown is its agreement regarding the energy and oil with India, which is a non-Muslim country. India is one country which received a Most Favoured Nation treatment from Iran. So, these are all things that happened in the recent past[\[lh20\]](#).

Iran always took a position in favour of India on issues which we were confronted by India's enemies abroad, and it is to that Iran we have done injustice. I could understand if the Government did not want to favour Iran due to its own reasons. I can understand that. But there are countries favouring Iran in the IAEA. But why

India failed to abstain? The argument advanced by the Government is not very convincing. First of all, it is not the national consensus that India should vote against Iran.

Secondly, if the security concerns are the great things about which we are concerned, then who does not know that in our neighbourhood Pakistan is having bomb? China is having bomb. Undeclared piles of nuclear arms are there with Israel. Israel is threatening the whole of West Asia, the countries whom they consider to be their enemies that they will use nuclear weapons against them. So, if in the neighbourhood another nuclear bomb is coming and that is the great concern that we are worried about, then I do not think it holds good because we live in a world, in Asia where, as I explained, there are countries in our neighbourhood having nuclear weapons with them. That does not mean that everyone should have nuclear weapon. I do not subscribe to that view. But that is precisely the argument that America is advancing.

They are asking why we are not signing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Apparently, it looks very good that nobody should have nuclear weapons. Only those who have it, they will have it. No more countries will have it. We cannot agree with that. We are not agreeing to that.

Now, President Bush says that if Iran does not fall in line, they will attack that country. There are threats: "Iran and Syria are outlaw regimes." Who is to decide that regimes are outlaw regimes? Iran and Syria are outlaw regimes and they deserve no patience from the victims of terror. Do you know who made this statement? It is was President Bush. It is a unilateral decision. He thinks that he can take unilateral decision and commit aggression on any country of his choice in the world today. We cannot agree with that. India cannot agree to that position. Some others might agree. We have seen this.

With whose sanction, America committed aggression on Iraq? This House did not support that. It was discussed in the United Nations, not once but several times. The Security Council never gave permission. Then, President Bush and his Administration found that they would not get permission from the Security Council and they defied the UN. They called the NATO, their military allies, and they unleashed an attack on a poor country like Iraq.

It is not the question whether you support Saddam Hussein or not. Forget about Saddam Hussein. A country was ravaged. A country was attacked with all the weapons

under their possession, excepting probably the nuclear weapons. A country was bombed to rubbles. One of the ancient civilisations of this world had been destroyed there, which was there on the banks of Euphrates and Tigris. That was done by President Bush. What was the excuse? He said: “They have weapons of mass destruction[m21].”

The UN inspectors, one after another inspected, but could not find anything. Then, they said: ‘CIA has said so’. My goodness! The CIA said that and it becomes more important than what the UN inspectors say. In the name of what the CIA has said, they attacked a country, a non-aligned nation, one of the developing countries and attacked them and brought them to submission and the aggression still continues. They are there. Several thousands of their military-men are still there in Iraq. While saying that it is an outlawed regime, President Bush points his finger at Iran - ‘we will treat you like Iraq’. Can we agree to this? He said of two countries outlawed regime like Iran and Syria.

Sir, now, let me mention this. The hon. Leader of the House is present here. There was an answer given by my friend, Shri E. Ahamed, the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs, in this House. The question was like this – whether there is an American pressure under which a certain agreement we have entered into with Syria is not being implemented. The answer he had given was no and the rest of the portion he said “does not arise”. ... (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI E. AHAMED): Sir, with your kind permission, I would like to say that he has mentioned about Iran and not Syria. ... (*Interruptions*) As a matter of fact, there are similar questions in the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha. That question has been corrected. Quite unfortunately ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That has been corrected.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI E AHAMED: I had already corrected it. The Minister has a right to make corrections in the answers given in the House. I had given the correct answer.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : The hon. Minister has to come here to correct to the House. ... (*Interruptions*)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मगर उन्होंने करेक्ट कर दिया था।

SHRI E. AHAMED: Sir, I have already given a notice to the hon. Speaker for permission to correct the answer to the Hon. Speaker. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : Sir, we have given a notice of privilege against him for giving this answer. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before that he has corrected.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : No, he has to come to this House to correct the answer. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI E. AHAMED: Yes, I have given the notice. I sought the permission of the Hon. Speaker. ... (*Interruptions*)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : उसमें उन्होंने करेक्शन के लिये नोट किया हुआ है।

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : He has to come and correct the answer on the floor of the House. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI E. AHAMED: I am very sorry. My learned, good friend, who is a senior parliamentarian, is trying to mislead the House like this. As soon as it was brought to my notice, I had corrected it. I have asked the permission of the hon. Speaker to correct the answer in the House. I am told that I had to wait till Wednesday only because that is a question day for my Ministry. Then I will correct the answer in the House. At least, believe me. My answer in the Rajya Sabha was corrected. He is unnecessarily creating a disturbance in the House. ... (*Interruptions*)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मि. मिनिस्टर, आपने करेक्ट कर दिया था।

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : He has given a notice for correction. ...
(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AHAMED: I have already submitted to the Secretary-General. I have expressed my regret also as to what had happened in the Ministry. The same question I answered correctly in the Rajya Sabha. If there is any intention to mislead, then why should I give one reply here and one reply there? It was the mistake happened in the Ministry. I regret that and I corrected. I gave the notice for the permission of the hon. Speaker. ... (Interruptions) This is very bad. Every Minister has a right to correct the answer. ... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the chapter should be closed. He has given a notice for the correction.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : It is because we have given a notice of privilege on which we are waiting the hon. Speaker's decision. We will raise it in the House. The question is when they say that this is a rouge country, they say that this is also a rouge country. Are we to dance accordingly? Are we expected to do that?

Now, we have discussed the American Ambassador's conduct in the House. I am not going into it as several discussions took place. ... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please listen to me. He has given a notice. और उन्होंने इस बात का अफसोस ज़ाहिर कर दिया है। जब उन्होंने अफसोस ज़ाहिर कर दिया है तो फिर नहीं कहना चाहिये था।

... (Interruptions)

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : Sir, you are misunderstanding. I am not referring to that issue. That issue is over. We will discuss it when the privilege motion comes in the House.

SHRI E. AHAMED: Sir, he has given a notice of privilege after I have corrected it. ...
(Interruptions)

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : The hon. Minister is excessively worried about the notice it seems. The Kerala elections also will not help. ... (*Interruptions*)

Sir, coming to the point about the American Ambassador, I do not use harsh words because he is the Ambassador of America. He said that unless we vote with the United States the nuclear agreements would die in the American Congress. My Goodness! From where does he get this audacity to threaten a country like India like this? He is threatening us – it will die there. I do not know whether it will die or whether at all it is coming up. I do not know.

Now the U.S. President is already slipping out. He said that India may not be given the right to reprocess the nuclear waste because we are not scientifically so developed. We are given, probably, the option that ‘you buy it from us, we will sell you’. I do not know whether that is what the Government of India bargained for. But that is what President Bush said in unmistakable terms in the Asia Tie Society meeting in Washington.

That is again doubtful whether we are getting it. But we are told even then that it will die in the Congress ‘unless you vote with us’. Is it not shameful that that Ambassador has been called to the Ministry? Did he regret? I could have understood if he had expressed ‘I am sorry for it’. He did not say so. He is a mighty Viceroy-type person. He said – ‘I am quoted out of context’. We got thrilled. He said – he is quoted out of context. What is that out of context? He is the Ambassador representing a country. If he said anything, it has to be taken that it is the opinion of that Government. After saying that he said that he has been quoted out of context, we should have had the guts to tell him that we will not take that explanation. But the Government seems to have swallowed that explanation. He is still here. He is speaking about FDI, he is advising the Chief Ministers, he is giving us advice on policies.

Here the question is – let us remember for a while the National Common Minimum Programme. It says that ‘we will uphold the traditional policy of non-

alignment, independent foreign policy'. Is the Government doing that? What is this anti-imperialist foreign policy of non-alignment? It is not something that the Communists say. Now, nobody should think like that. It is a policy evolved through ages. India fought against imperialism along with more than 100 countries all over the world who were once colonies of the imperial powers. In those days, those colonial powers used to tell us that they are carrying the white man's burden of civilising the society. They always found a reason why they were in countries like India, in the continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They had a civilising mission.

Today we have united States. Especially after the demise of the Soviet Union, in a unipolar world, how does President Bush behave? He behaves as if he has the right to decide who is a rogue country, whose policy is good or bad or everything. He is deciding, at his sweet will, defying all the international laws, defying all the international organisations to which we are all already members. He can commit aggression against countries of his choice[\[krr22\]](#).

Sir, we do not think that even today the countries of the world are so poor or so weak that they have to submit to the United States like that. There are many issues on which countries, including India, take strong positions, but the USA hardly cares for them. Is it not a fact that they came out of the Kyoto Agreement on environment unilaterally? That is their respect for international agreements.

I told about the UN with what scant respect the US had defied UN and attacked Iraq. In the United Nations General Assembly, America stands so isolated that they have only two allies - Israel and Marshall Island. I do not know which part of the world it belongs to! With these two allies, they are continuing. The world has denounced the economic embargo on Cuba in successive sessions of the United Nations. They have only these two friends, but they are strong. They deny the normal right of that country to survive in this globe. They may declare war against Cuba. Already undeclared wars are there. So, U.S. is a country that does not respect international laws, a country that does not respect its own commitment to other countries. Now the case at present is our own case.

Our Prime Minister signed an agreement, about which the Prime Minister is going to make a statement today, thinking that we are going to get reprocessing facilities of the nuclear waste, that facility will be there and it help us so that we catch

up with the time. They say, probably you will not get as you are not so much developed scientifically and there are other countries which are developed and they will process it for you and we will send it to you. This is what President Bush said. He has not come so far. Now the Press has already reported that he will come, but he will not sign probably the nuclear agreement.

This is the kind of friend for whom we have betrayed a country that stood with us in those days when we were in difficulty, stood with us like a rock. Not only that, we should also see how they threatened and how we bend. I am sorry to say that it was the Prime Minister who made one of the first statements about the viability of Indo-Iran pipeline project, when he was in Washington, USA to sign the agreement with President Bush. Everybody was surprised because in this House, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar was repeatedly saying that that is going to be an agreement which will make India self-sufficient in fuel, self-sufficient in energy. When our Prime Minister was visiting USA, he said 'I do not know. Probably the viability has to be studied.'

Now in this statement under discussion, he says that we are looking at it and professional experts are working on it, but Press reports said that the head of Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar was rolling because here the American Ambassador is threatening that you do not go with Syria. President Bush is saying that Syria is a rogue country. My sympathies are with Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar. He lost his portfolio. ... (*Interruptions*) I am waiting to hear your speech on this. You will have a good acrobatic show here. I will hear you.

Coming to the point what we should have done.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have taken more than 25 minutes.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : I am going to conclude. I will not put you in an embarrassing situation [[reporter23](#)].

How we could have voted? We could have easily abstained. There were countries who are friends of India like Brazil, Argentina, etc. I have a list of countries who were all abstaining, and we voted with the European Three and P-3 great powers. Now, they say that we are in good company. No, Sir, you are not in good company.

As regards the great powers, you may say that China is there, Russia is there -- though Russia is a different Russia today -- but who does not know that they have the veto power. If the problem comes in the United Nations Security Council and if a decision is taken which is not to their satisfaction, then they can veto it. On the other hand, we are not even a Member of the Security Council. We can only sit and watch on the ringside of the Security Council. This is our position. Therefore, we should have abstained from it to show the people of Iran -- I am not saying the regime of Iran -- that you are not betraying the faith that they have bestowed in India all the time in the past.

While concluding my speech I will say that again a voting is coming on this issue in the first week of March, namely, on 6th March. We should put this shameful episode behind us. I do not say that we should vote for the Motion and I do not say that we should vote with Iran -- if you have very great difficulties -- but you should abstain to show the world that India is not supporting those who are twisting our hands.

Sir, you might have read Macbeth. The Government's position today reminds me of four lines of Macbeth, which I will try to recall from my memory

though I am not very good at memorising :

“All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this tiny little hand.
All the waters of the seven seas would not wash this blood from your hands...”

This is what lady Macbeth has been told for the historic betrayal. This is a tragedy, which the world remembers even today. Shakespeare told that all the perfume of Arabia will not sweeten this hand. It was eminent leaders like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who evolved the policy of Non-alignment. The policy of Non-alignment is no concern, but Bush's browbeating becomes a concern to you. I do not say capitulation and I do not say surrender, but you have given a dirty tilt to India's policy of Non-Alignment, which the people of this country will not accept. They will reject that policy, and I am sure about it. Therefore, I appeal, through you, to the parties in this House to make their position very clear as to what they think about it. I wait eagerly to hear what my friends from BJP will say about their natural friend.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI (GARHWAL): Thank you, Sir. Today, we are discussing a matter consequent to the hon. Prime Minister's *suo motu* statement given in the House on 17th February 2006 with regard to the India's vote on Iran in the IAEA.

We all know the background of this issue, but just to recapitulate in brief, the whole issue started in September, 2005 when some sort of vote had to be given. ...
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please maintain silence in the House.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : India was put in an awkward position apparently because the Government were not properly prepared[\[ak24\]](#).

Fortunately, for us, at that time, that Resolution was amended, and we could have an excuse for seeking more time. But even after that, on 4th February, 2006 we did not seem to have reacted properly with the kind of thought process that ought to have gone into it much earlier, from the very day when they took over in May, 2004. Even from September till February this year, when the second vote had to be given, and this time the Resolution was clearly against Iran, India again voted for it, and hence this problem had come up.

Before I get on to the objections and comments we have, I want to bring to the notice of the House and the Government that the way, as I said, this Government had handled this issue clearly indicates that ever since they came into the power in May, 2004, they did not seem to have given the type of importance that we should have given to Iran.

The hon. Prime Minister, in his Statement, has said that our relationship with Iran was 'civilisation' in nature. We have very old relationship with them. In fact,

before partition, our boundary was, till 1947, with Iran. Before that and even after that, we have had good relations. The NDA Government had tried to keep this relationship going. With proper diplomatic activities, we had been able to keep the situation in such a way that it was prevented from escalating. But after 2004, this Government seems to have either presumed or ignored, and I cannot imagine why, but we became suddenly remote from this problem of Iran getting weaponised nuclear system.

I think, the entire thought process of the Government as regards Iran was one-line agenda, and that was “gas pipeline-centred.” Everything else did not matter to them. Apparently, they were under some impression that things would keep going. This problem of Iran getting into weaponised nuclear field is not new. They have been carrying out nuclear research for a long time. Some three to five years back, it was known that they were in the process of acquiring some capability for nuclearising their weapon system. It was not unknown; it was known. With proper diplomatic skills, backdoor diplomacy, making use of our historical friendship with Iran, and also the fact that we are one of the Founder Members of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and, therefore, we ought to have had much better say. We could have manipulated our way or used our position there in a manner that you could have, if not frozen, at least, kept this whole process going slow and tried to solve it. However, apparently, as I said, this Government did not think of doing any such thing and with the result, voting was forced, in a way, on this Government and forced on everybody. They were not prepared, they were taken aback, and they reacted in a knee-jerk manner. Having not planned their strategy properly, they just followed the leader. As Mr. Chandrappan said before me, I think, they were dumbstruck. They were shell-shocked, and they did not know what to do.

My objection and observation is that in diplomacy, these things should have been thought. It is not a one-day affair. It is a long process. But unfortunately, this Government with so many experienced people -- they claim that they know how to govern; and we see that in some of the areas, they do really know how to survive -- did not tackle it properly. In this context, I also want to say that it was known that Pakistan was helping them in becoming nuclear[R25].

14.00 hrs.

It was known not only to us but also to the entire world. In the IAEA meeting, our representative has said this as far back as in November last year. I just quote from the letter that he had written to the IAEA. It reads: "Information made available will shed greater light on the clandestine proliferation activities of foreign intermediaries, particularly of Pakistan based A.Q.Khan laboratories." So, it is known all over. I am really surprised to hear the Prime Minister say in para 7 of his *suo motu* statement: "Hon. Members are aware that the source of such clandestine proliferation to sensitive technologies lies in our neighbourhood." I do not know for what reason he was very hesitant to name Pakistan. I do not know why he was hesitating to tell Pakistan that we know what they were doing, that everybody in the world knew it. This sort of confusion is in no way a diplomatic necessity. First of all it is known everywhere. Secondly, we are directly affected by it.

The USA started alleging that Iran is violating the NPT and is working on its programme to weaponise its nuclear systems. Then these two meetings took place and we voted against Iran. What was the repercussion of that vote? As per the statement of the hon. Prime Minister, up to 2003-04 Iran was helping, coordinating and cooperating with the IAEA. After 2004, gradually they started building up their nuclear programme. That is what I said. That was the time when this Government did not do anything of what it ought to have done. The repercussion of the vote is that Iran has now stopped cooperating with IAEA. They have started processing enriched uranium openly. I do not know how that has helped the whole process.

We are emerging as a world power. We are proud of it. The nation is proud of it. But we also have certain responsibility. When we started landing up in that position of an emerging world power, powerful player in this area, we have the responsibility to see that this area, all areas about which you are talking, does not become an erupting volcano. It is already a volcano with the type of various problems that are taking place. Apart from this there are many problems taking place in this area which are threatening not only our country but also the whole region. Therefore, being an emerging world power, we ought to have taken active part. What did this Government do? It has made no use of our ancient relationship with Iran. The Government could have tried to convince them; seen their point of view; held discussions with them; and then tried to reach a stage where a mutually agreeable solution could be found.

I have read in today's newspaper that the idea of Uranium being enriched in Russia is again taking shape. Why is this happening after the vote? Could all this have not been done much earlier during 2004? Could we not have tried to explain to Iran, tried to meet what they wanted, tried to prevent them, tried to advise them, or tried to suggest them that their going nuclear was not in the interest of the entire world? That area is already a volcano and it is ready to erupt. So, as a nation, apart from other things as an emerging world leader, we have some responsibility. I think this Government has totally failed on this issue.

I would like to now bring other things to the notice of UPA Government and its leaders. I do not know why the Opposition was not properly consulted on this issue. I am quite sure the Opposition leaders could have conveyed their views. They may have agreed or disagreed, the Government may have accepted their views or not accepted. But the Government did not even consult the Opposition leaders. On major issues, whether this issue or the issue of US Ambassador's statement on this - which the Prime Minister has not talked about but I will - there has been no substantive consultation. We have all been saying that foreign policy of the country is a continuous process. It is neither your policy nor our policy. It is a continuous process. We should rise above party politics. I say it with great sadness. I do not know why you have kept to yourselves as if it is an internal affair and did not consult the Opposition [\[KMR26\]](#).

All this leads me to wonder that after the 4th of February, 2006 and even after 24th September, 2005, why this Government reacted the way it has reacted. The only thing I can surmise is that this Government is not prepared. Again post-September, 2005, then, even after 4th February and until now, as I said, they started feeling shell-shocked. They seem to have been mesmerized and did not know what to do. Then they gave a knee-jerk reaction, and on 4th February, 2006, they voted. They followed the "leader," follow the "boss" and vote. They had not taken the step in their own interest. We have not taken the step based purely in our national interest. If they had taken the step in the national interest, the entire nation should have known the same. There would have been no opposition. I do not think anybody would disagree if it

concerns the national interest. If it was very much in the national interest, that should have involved everyone. But our impression is that this Government was so shell-shocked. If you are going in an area, which is not thickly populated, particularly in the forest areas, when you see a rabbit, the moment the rabbit sees the light, he freezes or mesmerises. If there is a *shikari* sitting inside, he takes the potshot. I think that this Government just did that. There was no consultation, no planning and no proposals with the result we have now landed in a state where our friends from the Left are making very serious noises, quite rightly some time.

The Government should have handled the whole situation better. Now, having said all that, I wish to make one thing very clear. The strategic interest of the nation must always come first - everything, everywhere. In this case, our national interest is clear, at least, according to us, we do not have to have another nuclear weapon State in this region, which I have already said that it would be a 'volcano'. We have no doubt about it. We do not want another nuclear weapon State in this region. But was forcing a vote, only option was available to us. It was not. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Maj. General (Retd.) Khanduri, please do not address the individual, address the Chair.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : I am sorry, Sir.

I can see my *bhanja* sitting there and smiling. This smile will vanish very soon when you see the consequences.

Sir, again I am only stating that there is no diverse thinking if national interest is taken care of but the Government has failed to take the nation in confidence in both votings. It is both creating enemy and also not putting its points properly in regard to a nuclear weapon State in the region. This could have been done. There is no difficulty. I would like to remind the Government as to how we have been managing the matter of a nuclear weapon State in the Region. As I read out, another nuclear weapon State would be added in the Region, along with Pakistan. This is a very important point. I do not think that if it had been addressed properly, this situation would not have arisen. Even the Left, I think, must see the reason. Of course, I do not know if they would, because they are very agitated about our trying to obstruct Iran becoming a nuclear weapon State. But what did they do when Pokran-II happened in India in 1998? On

India becoming a nuclear weapon State in 1998, the left objected to it vociferously, objecting and hurling adjectives and abuses at the then Indian Government. All the same, the Government should have seen the national interest and consulted all political parties particularly the main opposition. And the Left parties are their “co-partners.” They have been speaking against the Government many times but ultimately they support the Government. They are not going to walk out of the Government. Therefore, in this case, I would like to repeat that even at the cost of misunderstanding, misinterpreting, we have no difference of opinion and that we do not want Iran or any other country in this Region to be a nuclear weapon State. But my objection is only to the way the Government had reacted. They have mishandled the whole issue and in the bargain, India is being treated as if there is a lack of friendship or devoid of friendship with Iran, which is a long-standing friend. The Government also have not been able to put up our national interest in proper perspective [\[R27\]](#).

Thirdly, what have they merely done? Their action is that of the “camp follower” of USA. Our vote was not based on our national interest but because somebody is telling them to do this or that. This is the impression Government have created. Therefore, the Government has totally failed on this. We are of the opinion that proper home work, active anticipatory diplomacy, back-stage diplomacy, utilising our ancient friendship with Iran and also trying to convince the USA that they cannot go too far every time and everywhere, should have been done. But in our opinion, this was not done. That has resulted in a very awkward situation. We did not utilise our status as the founder member of the IAEA and also our growing international power.

Now, I come to another aspect, that is, about Mr. Mulford’s comment. We all know about those comments. They are related to our vote on Iran. I do not have to talk about what he said and what was his objection. But again, I wanted to see the reaction of this Government. Once again, they were thunder-struck, and dumb-founded. There was no reaction for two days when such an amazing statement was made by an Ambassador. It was virtually as if we are slaves. There was no reaction of the Government for two days. And then the hon. Prime Minister had to go to Assam and say that “to err is human.” It is very nice. When such a wrong statement has been made, when such an arrogant statement has been made, the Government of India has to say that “to err is human.” I want to convey to the hon. Prime Minister that in

diplomacy, just as in a war, there is no way that one can hide and seek shelter behind this statement – to err is human.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KIRIP CHALIHA (GUWAHATI): What is the objection in that? ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There should be no running commentary.

... (*Interruptions*)

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : When he was in Assam, he gave that statement. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record except what Shri Khanduri says.

(*Interruptions*)* ...

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI : I was saying that in a diplomacy just as in war, one cannot hide behind one's mistakes. One cannot say that to err is human. In a war, if one makes a mistake, he is shot dead. Similarly, in diplomacy, if one makes a mistake – it was not a mistake, it was an arrogant blunder – one gets dumped or sacked. One cannot just wish it away by saying that to err is human. It is more surprising and more insulting that the hon. Prime Minister in his reply to the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address in Rajya Sabha, spent some time on the letter written to the Chief Minister of West Bengal. He was expressing his anger and anguish. It was rightly so. I agree that he has got all the justification to show his anger for that letter. But there is no anger or anguish expressed when the nation is humiliated and insulted. There is no word for that except to say 'to err is human'. What message are they conveying? It is a shameful act. I do not know how the Prime Minister can do such a thing. I know, they have to please the Left. But, there are many ways to please them. Is it at the cost of the nation that Government want to please them? Please do not lean so much backwards and Leftwards; your back-bone might get damaged. I take it an amazing incident. I am not saying that he should not have said what he said about West Bengal, that it was a wrong action. But a much bigger blunder had been done by insulting and humiliating the nation. There is nothing about that, there is no castigation.

Before I end, I want to make two points. One is that we believe that the friendship between India and USA is necessary. The strategic friendship between India and USA is good in our interest also [\[p28\]](#).

* Not Recorded.

But this friendship must be on equal terms. At no point of time, you should seem to be or perceived to be following them as a younger brother, as if big boss is calling, you are following them, or as a slave just following the dictates.

Therefore, as the Left were just wanting me to make it clear, I am making it clear that we are for making strategic friendship with USA but not on their terms, not as unequal partners. It should be on the basis of equal partners. Here, I would like quote what President Clinton had said once, when he was talking about such issues: “Friends do not have to agree on every issue. They just have to have an honest relationship about it.”

We are now in a position, Sir, when nobody can push us around. Those days are gone when we were depending on PL-480 or somebody’s help. India does not need that sort of help now. India does not have to compromise. We are now a country, which can have friendship on our terms. But the impression that has gone is that we are just tagging behind somebody who is powerful. I hope that this impression is wrong, that it is not so; and this Government is not going to follow this sort of a policy towards USA or towards any country. We want friendship. A long-term strategic friendship with USA will be good and in our interest. Today, we have as much to give to USA as they have. They are no more the donors and we are no more the receivers.

Therefore, Sir, in the end, I would make three points. Our national interest and strategic interest has to be protected. There should be no compromise on it. We will always support this Government as long as the things are in the national interest. In this context, I would also want to convey to the Government that they as a Government of the largest democracy, which is emerging as a world power, have a responsibility in this entire region. It is the responsibility of this Government to help in defusing the situation and prevent its eruption as much as it is possible.

The second point that I would like to make is that we must develop our relationship with Iran. It is our ancient friend. This incident has taken place. We should try and remove the misunderstandings. Iran is, as the Prime Minister himself said, our civilisation friend. As has been brought out, they have helped us in times of our difficulties. We must not be ungrateful to anybody. Our national interest has to be explained to them. Similarly, their national interest has to be understood. As I just quoted President Clinton, we do not have to agree on everything, friends do not have to agree on every point. They do not have to agree with us and we do not have to agree with them. But there must be an honest attempt to convey to them that we want to be friends with them, and of course, it has to be subject to the limitations of their interest and our national interest.

With that I complete my statement by saying that the handling of the situation by this Government, as regards the Vote on Iran has been pathetic and most unsatisfactory. I hope, they have learnt a lesson from this, particularly, in relation to consulting all parties, all Opposition leaders.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have listened two hon. Members expressing their views on the issues of Voting on Iran at IAEA on two occasions on nuclear related issues to Iran.

An impression is attempted to be created that by these actions, we have entered into some sort of hostile relationship; or some sort of animus has been created between India and Iran. Mr. Chandrappan has gone to the extent of using the words that we have betrayed the interests of Iran [\[KD29\]](#).

Factually, it is not correct. On 21st February, after the voting on 4-5 February, my colleague Shri E. Ahamed had been at Tehran and he had the privilege of calling on His Excellency the President Ahmadinejad on 21st February.

Once again he explained our position and that position is this. Our strong and abiding commitment to maintaining and promoting the most friendly and mutually beneficial relations between our two countries is there. It was appreciated by His Excellency the President in right spirit and he conveyed, through Shri Ahamed, that friendship between India and Iran must be maintained and nothing should be allowed to disturb that relationship.

I would like to comment on the rationale of two voting in September and in February; but before that, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members to the statement which the hon. Prime Minister made and which speaks of the relationship between India and Iran.

When we take part on sensitive issues like our relationships with very old friends, we should avoid or at least try to avoid, being too hyperbolic or being too rhetoric. After all, what is foreign policy? Foreign policy of every nation including India is an extension and promotion of its basic fundamental national interests. It is applicable to USA; it is applicable to India; it is applicable to Iran; and it is applicable to everybody. That policy is being pursued not only after Independence, but that was being pursued even before Independence.

I would not like to score a debating point by referring to the views of some of the political parties who have forgotten what they said – because foreign policy is a continuing one – about the role of India at a very particular momentous historical point[\[R30\]](#).

I would just like to point out that the policies which we are pursuing is the enlightened national interest. What is that enlightened national interest? I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members to what the Prime Minister informed in the House in his Statement. It is from the bottom paragraph of Page 2 where the Prime Minister stated:

“Our unshakeable conviction that such a sensitive issue, which concerns the rights and international obligations of a sovereign nation and a proud people can only be addressed through calm, reasoned diplomacy and the willingness on all sides to eschew confrontation and seek acceptable compromise solutions ”

We are trying to do so exactly the same and nothing more, nothing less. What did we do in September?

The hon. Member may recollect that in September there was a Resolution of EU III, UK, France and Germany, two of which are the Permanent Members of the Security Council. Germany is not the Permanent Member. EU III brought a Resolution and the substance of that Resolution was to refer the matter to the Security Council. It is not that we did not take any initiative. We took the initiative. We talked to everybody concerned. As Gen. Khanduri has pointed out, of course he has used very strong words like an ex-General. In the battlefield he cannot make a mistake because a mistake wins a shot on the spot and death. In diplomacy also he used such words. There may not be death but some moment of embarrassment or awkwardness. ... (*Interruptions*) I am saying that the language and the phrases which you have used have the military sense. That is the lighter side of the story.

The point which I am trying to drive at is that at that point of time our negotiating position was that if EU is dissuaded from referring it to the Security Council and given a chance of diplomacy to play some more time within the IAEA family, we should try to do that. We did that exactly. It was not referred to. It was deferred till November. Time was given. Most respectfully I would like to submit that even in IAEA, as like all international fora, decisions are taken through consensus. In IAEA only twice they were through votes. One was in September and another in February. What happened in February? Efforts were being made. Russia was also making efforts. They were talking. We were also talking. We explained our position that we do believe, we stated in a very clear unmistakable term, that Iran has the legal right to develop peaceful uses of nuclear energy consistent with its international commitments and obligations. It is incumbent upon Iran to exercise its right in the context of safeguards that it has voluntarily accepted upon its nuclear programme under the IAEA. We are exactly trying to do that with the help of other countries.

When the discussions took place informally amongst the various leaders, suggestions were made to try to evolve a consensus among the NAM countries. You have noticed the voting pattern in February. Out of 16 Non-Aligned Countries, including one Observer Brazil, three - Syria, Cuba and Venezuela - voted against it.

Five remained abstained and eight of the Non-Aligned Countries including India were with P-5 countries. Whether at that point of time the option could have been taken to remain abstain or not is a matter of judgement. He has never stated, the whole text of the Prime Minister's Statement if you have studied, that the position is finally not yet clinched because the situations are evolving.

Certain stories have appeared even today in the newspapers that a serious exercise is being made by the Russians and I understand as per the newspaper report, Iran Nuclear Atomic Energy Chief, Shri Gholam-Reza-Aghazadeh said that we have reached a basic agreement on the creation of a joint venture to enrich Uranium[R31].

I do not know what is the authenticity of the report because the details are yet to be ascertained. But if such an arrangement is being agreed upon, to my mind, it is a welcome development. In international arena every moment and every opportunity is to be seized to defuse the tension. What is our basic policy? What was our nuclear policy prior to 1998 and after 1998? Even after 1974, the stated position of this country was -- and there was a broad consensus -- that we have the capacity, we have the competence. But when we told the whole world for going against nuclear proliferation, when we opposed the nuclear proliferation and stockpiling we did that from the high moral position that we have the competence, the strength, the technology and the capacity, still we are on the threshold level. We are keeping our nuclear options open. But in May 1998, we closed that option and went for weaponisation. I am not going into the merit whether we did the correct thing or incorrect thing as, that has happened. When it has happened and when you have done that, it is the *fait accompli*. The paste has come out of the tube and you cannot put the same paste in the same tube. It is simply not possible. India is a nuclear weapon State and very responsibly and unilaterally, India declared its nuclear doctrine of No First Use and No Use Against Non-Nuclear Weapon State. But at the same time, we must have credible deterrent, if we are attacked. As we have declared No First Use, it may happen that we may have to retaliate after being first attacked and that attack should be such which will be unacceptable to the attackers. That is the nuclear doctrine which we have. Till date, we are truthfully pursuing that policy. There is no deviation. It has been recognised. But does that mean that we have given up the path of non-proliferation? We have accepted the obligation of NPT of nuclear weapon States responsibility and obligation of following certain discipline but we did not sign NPT and we have no

intention of signing NPT because we consider it as a flawed Treaty and it is discriminatory. But those who accepted the NPT and are signatory to NPT and have accepted the obligation, is it wrong to expect or to say that you have every right to pursue your programme for peaceful purposes but whatever obligations you have accepted under the safeguard arrangements please do pursue them? We have exactly done that and nothing more or nothing less. We are pursuing that policy. We do believe every country has its sovereign right to pursue its own policy. Every country has its own right to meet its energy requirements through peaceful utilisation of nuclear sources. But when you have accepted the international obligation and discipline of the international organisation, please try to do that[\[r32\]](#).

Shri Chandrappan had asked as to whether we agree with the concept of somebody's rogue State. Who told we have accepted that? We have never accepted that. We neither had accepted it before, nor shall we accept it now or in the future. We have our own perceptions about each country. The very basic fundamental of our foreign policy is that we have no territorial ambition at the cost of others. We have no ideology to export. Therefore we are neither exporting any ideology, nor we have any territorial ambition. We believe, in letter and spirit, in the peaceful co-existence of each and every State. That is the fundamental policy we have accepted.

Where is the deviation? So many things have been brought within the purview of India's decision to vote on two occasions in the IAEA. I have mentioned that even without being a signatory to NPT India became a nuclear weapon State, whether it is recognised or not recognised is a different matter. What would happen to the nuclear energy agreement which the hon. Prime Minister and President Bush signed on 18th of July? The hon. Prime Minister will make a statement on that and the hon. Members would have ample opportunity to discuss about it. We need not bring it within the purview of this discussion. But the short point that we are trying to arrive at is that this decision was taken independently keeping in view the broad consensus that we wanted to have. Surely, diplomacy is not Don Quixotic and we cannot play the role of a Sancho Panza.

India is a responsible State. India is a responsible country and its behaviour must be responsible. That is why I gave the example of what transpired between the Minister of State Shri E. Ahamed and His Excellency, the President of Iran on 21st of

February when the interactions took place. Every country understand that. These nuances, these diplomatic usages are to be kept in view. Somebody may have a particular perception about a country. But it is not necessary that one will share that perception with that country. In the past it has happened. We have not shared that perception. When India had to help in the liberation struggle of Bangladesh, many countries had different perceptions. But that did not mean that we should have to sever our relationships with every country that had different perceptions.

Shri Chandrappan had used the word 'betrayed'. Betrayed whom and why? Please do not depend on incorrect factual positions. Every country takes its own decisions keeping its national interest in view. We do recognise the value of our friendship with Iran. That is why the hon. Prime Minister twice stated that it is their legitimate right as a sovereign nation, as proud people to pursue their own policies. No country can interfere with it. But at the same time, most respectfully we are pointing out about certain obligations that you have to accept. Please try to see that those obligations are fulfilled and that too not a decision has to be imposed upon.

What did we say? The hon. Prime Minister in his statement, in the last part has said,

“We have a strong and a valuable relationship with Iran which we would like to take forward in a manner that is mutually beneficial. We have great respect and admiration for the Iranian people with whom our fraternal ties go back to several million years. We have every intention to ensure that no shadow is cast on these bonds[[snb33](#)].”

On a number [\[bru34\]](#)of occasions, friendly countries differ and take different decisions. There is nothing new in it. In international practice, this is common. We never supported Iraq issue when it was brought up. I do not think there is any similarity or there is any relevance in this. We never believe in even unipolar world. We believe that many more power centres are emerging. Russia is emerging; China is emerging and economic power centres are emerging. In the whole history of the world, in the whole history of diplomacy, if you just try to categorize a period of ten to fifteen to twenty years, to my mind, it would be some sort of a misinterpretation of event and history. Our foreign policy is firmly wedded with our ideological value

systems which we have evolved through our Independence struggle and which we have pursued from the very beginning. There is no question of deviating from there. But, at the same time, it is to be kept in view that the world is not stagnant. It does not remain in a particular time frame and in a particular ideological frame. We have seen that in the first half of the last century there were countries fighting against each other. You shut your eyes and try to remember the littoral States of the Mediterranean. The history of Europe has been dominated for almost 300 years by those countries, by fighting against each other including the First World War and the Second World War in the first half of the last century. England, France, Germany, Belgium, Spain and Italy are the countries who fought against each other for 300 years. But we have seen a metamorphosis in the last 50 years of the last century. These very countries were not merely talking of a common market. They started with a common European market. Today, they are talking about common currency, common security policy, common foreign policy, European Parliament and new political ideologies which are emerging from the horizon. Can any dynamic policy remain stagnant of the old theory of Balance of Power which prevailed before the establishment of UNO in the first half of the last century? Is that old concept of Balance of Power (BOP) relevant today?

Therefore, Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, my most respectful submission is, we greatly honour and value our relationship with Iran. In IAEA, we will continue to pursue to evolve a consensus, to evolve an arrangement which will be applicable and acceptable to all the concerned countries. We do feel that in a sensitive matter like this, we should have more time, more patience and more talks and not to precipitate by taking a confrontationist position. We should try to eschew as far as possible rhetoric and high sounding words. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. BANGARAPPA (SHIMOOGA): Sir, I would like to have a clarification.

We do agree with the Minister as regards our friendly countries. As far as the Sixth Meeting to be held in Vienna with the Board of Directors of the IAEA, should we to take that our country is not going to participate in the matter of discussion? Even in case we participate, should we to take that we are not going to vote against Iran? This is my first question[bru35].

If it is not there on some diplomatic reasons, as you rightly said, Sir, that uranium enrichment, if it is made on the soil of Russia, if Iran agrees for that, that is a good diplomacy. We do agree. If it is going to be done in Iran, others may not agree as per the guidelines of IAEA. Are we to take that, on that force, matter will be again put off as far as voting is concerned on sixth? If it comes up for voting, how will you take it?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : The hon. Member is a knowledgeable person. As I mentioned, in IAEA only, twice the voting took place – in September and the last February. Earlier, every decision was taken through consensus. I do not have the full facts. Details are yet to be made available. But what appears in the newspaper, as per the statement of the Chief of the Nuclear Energy of Iran, is that in the discussion which is taking place between Russia and Iran, some solution is possible. If it actually takes place, I have stated that it is a welcome development and we should try to pursue it, yet if it is possible. But, at this point of time, it is difficult to make any commitment as to what will happen on the sixth.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGHLY): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, my disappointment with the conduct of the Government has been further deepened after the Prime Minister's statement, by the intervention of the hon. Defence Minister. Once a management trainee asked the teacher: "Sir, what am I to do when I cannot convince the buyer about my product?" The teacher said: "Confuse him." If you cannot convince, confuse him." The Prime Minister has tried to confuse and the Defence Minister has tried to further confuse. The issue is not whether there will be a joint venture with Russia or, for that matter, whether it will be a consensus on the sixth of March or not. The first thing is whether the Government has changed its stand from the pre-24 September to the post-24 September and the February 3 voting. Why is this change? It is because changes have taken place in the world; changes have taken place in Europe. It is not like that. The Prime Minister is speaking about the changing times. The Defence Minister is waxing eloquent about changing time. Why is this change between the pre-24 September stand of the Government of India and the latest stand? Is the Government of India convinced that Iran has violated? There is no proof. IAEA has never stated this. A country has been trying to engage itself in peaceful nuclear use

and its centrifuges being used on a very, very small scale. The experts have opined, the global experts on nuclear weapons have opined that the status of Iran with regard to uranium enrichment is at such a low level that Iran will take several decades to reach that stage. Iran has voluntarily accepted additional safeguards. Go anywhere, speak to anyone and inquire anything you like [\[mks36\]](#).

Iran also agreed and said: “You can see anything you like; visit any place in any location; you can do whatever you like to do but we have a right to pursue our independent nuclear programme for peaceful purposes.” That is the situation. It is a re-doing of the Iraq scene. The same thing is happening. It is said that Iran is an axis of evil. This is there in the State of the Union Address of the American President. The regime changed long back.

What do the pre-emptive interventions mean? I have nuclear power. I threaten you. I will not allow anyone else to have it. As a country, India was suffering from nuclear apartheid policy for 30 years from 1974. I am not using the word ‘betrayal.’ Iran has always stood by India on the issue of terrorism, on the issue of Islamic country doing some thing else, on the issue of Kashmir, extending a helping hand in the Iranian gas pipeline, and almost on every issue. Even in respect of meeting the Taliban menace, India was having an access to West Asia because of Iran. I am not using the word ‘betrayal.’ What has Iran done against you? Please tell me about that. Has Iran done anything? But what has the US done? It used Iraq against Iran.

Speaking about terrorism, I would submit that it is the super terrorist who created Osama Bin Laden, who encouraged the Shah of Iran to have the nuclear weapons, to start the nuclear programme. When democracy started gaining ground, the Shah was patronised and tried to be helped by America. It is destabilisation. We have to see the context of the American game plan. It is not only about sanctions for decades against Iraq. More than one lakh Iraqis were already killed. It was said that Iraq was having Weapons of Mass Destruction. They sent the inspector. They suddenly stopped it. There is no inspection. Dr. Hans Blix, the most reputed inspector, said that the US has a game plan. They are not interested in any inspection; they are not interested in finding out the truth. Ultimately, what happened? It was found out that Iraq had no

Weapons of Mass Destruction but the country was destroyed, looted and democracy is gone for ever.

14.53 hrs.

(Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan *in the Chair*)

Mr. Saddam is in jail. It is doing so not only in the case of Iraq but it is doing the same thing in Iran, Venezuela. For decades, sanctions against Cuba are continuing. Many Latin American countries are suffering. It is said: "You visit America. You are my friend and I am with you." It is not any discovery. The theme is: "Be with us or against us." There is the State of the Union Address saying "Be with us or against us. India, be with us. Or, we shall consider you are against us. We will not allow you to pursue your independent, sovereign nuclear research programme." The same thing is happening in the case of Iran.

So, with a heavy heart and full of anguish, I would say that in the last 56 years, many things happened to India. There were many ups and downs. But, never before, has any Government surrendered in such a manner and succumbed to the threat. Has it ever happened before?

The US Ambassador Mr. David Mulford was saying: "Vote in favour of America, along with America against Iran. Otherwise, our US Congressmen will kill your Indo-US Defence Treaty." Is he not sermonising how the Left Parties should behave? Is he not writing a letter to the Chief Minister of West Bengal, going beyond his diplomatic jurisdiction? He is threatening. Is the threat coming only from Mr. David Mulford? Please refer to the speech of Ms. Condolezza Rice on 26th January.

If you go back, several Congressmen, several important individuals belonging to the American Establishment are threatening. Have we come out with any public statement by the Prime Minister or by anyone in the Government? If this is not pressure what is it? We are not convinced about it. It is unacceptable. The Left has been consistently trying to convince and caution the Government. You are committed in the CMP for an independent foreign policy. Do not go. You are already getting isolated. Look at what is demonstrated in elections. The Congress is losing ground. It is getting isolated. It is forgetting its own legacy. I am not using any hard word but as if they are ridiculing their own past by trying to redefine nonalignment. What does they say? One new nuclear weapon State in our neighbourhood is not in national

interest. Is Israel not there? Have you spoken a word about Israel which is always threatening, threatening daily, and which has a plan to attack Iran with US? No. Iran is to be targetted. We remember here they say that the world has changed. No, it is they who have changed. In this very House, when the Iraq resolution came – India has a track record – let us not use the word ‘condemnation’. ‘निन्दा’ हिन्दी में चलेगा लेकिन वह धमकी देते हैं। धमकी खाने वाले एन.डी.ए. वाले थे और कांग्रेस ने भी दिखाया। तब कांग्रेस ने कहा था, we do not agree with the position taken by the NDA Government. Now, what has happened? You have changed. You are succumbing to ‘with us or against us’.

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO (KALAHANDI): Can I just... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : No, I am not yielding... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is not yielding.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I am not yielding.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: This will not go on record. Nothing will be recorded.

(*Interruptions*)* ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: If he agrees, I have no objection otherwise I would not allow.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be in the air. Nothing will go on record. You shall continue.

(*Interruptions*)* ...

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, still I am not using any hard word. The Congress Party has a glorious legacy of anti-imperialism. It is India which is not only a founder member of NAM, it has always championed the cause of NAM. But what happened on the sidelines of this February debate, February resolution? It was Malaysia. Malaysia had to Chair the NAM meeting. Sir, amongst 16 members, three were against it and five abstained. Had the UPA Government taken the initiative – everyone

was waiting – the story would have been different. But India has forgotten its leadership role in NAM. That is the tragedy. That is the thing. But still I am not using any hard word because they may salvage the situation. We believe in their sincerity. It happened in the past also. We believe that when another occasion will come on 6th of March, they will rectify the situation. It is

* Not Recorded.

because if they do not rectify the situation, what will happen? What is the post-September and post-February situation? Iran has voluntarily accepted the additional protocol. Go anywhere, see anything, speak to anyone but we have a right to pursue our nuclear programme for peaceful means. You know that it is such a small measure. The centrifuges are so small that nuclear weapon State level cannot be achieved by it. We know that. They are very conscious about their obligations, so they had accepted voluntarily additional protocol but they were conscious about their sovereign rights[\[a37\]](#).

15.00 hrs.

All the acquisitions were made prior to 2003 and more than 15 countries have violated it in various ways. In 2003, what was the position of Indo-Iran relationship? On 26th January, 2003, India had invited the President of Iran as the Chief Guest of our Republic Day. What was the agreement signed? There was a civil airlines agreement? Pakistan got panicky that Iran may allow India to go forward in such a manner that it will not be helpful for Pakistan. You know all these things, but what happened? You have been consistently taking a position that the solution will have to be found on the basis of consensus. Yes, the IAEA framework is on the basis of consensus and it will be done within that framework only. But how will it be referred to the UN Security Council now? Now, they have decided to withdraw from the additional protocol and said that they would remove inspections and shall continue to pursue their peaceful nuclear programme.

Sir, on this, there is a relationship to the Indo-US defence deal made on the 18th July, 2005 and it is not in India's national interest. If I say that it is in national interest to kill somebody, will it be right? If the Government does something wrong in the name of national interest, the people of this country will not accept it. Even the supporters of this Government are not accepting it, even the partners of this Government are not accepting it, leave alone the people of India. You are already getting isolated from the people of this country. The people are proud of their anti-imperialistic heritage and legacy, the heritage and legacy of the Non-Aligned Movement and if you pursue this wrong path, if you show your back to them, I caution you that the people will also turn back from you. I caution you again that Iran has not done anything wrong till today. I am not holding any brief for Iran. But as you know, inside Iran, the moderate people are raising their voice of democracy against the fundamentalism. After hearing the American President's State of the Union speech, even the moderates were infuriated. That is their game plan. There is a game plan of regime change. Ms. Condolezza Rice has taken a huge fund, for the regime change, to be used in Iran. They plan pre-emptive intervention. What does it mean? What have they done in Iraq? In the face of such a situation where a helpless country facing the blackmail of the imperialist power militarily threatening along with Israel, we have left the country which never left us. Is it a change of course?

Sir, when the Prime Minister speaks about change within the Congress Party, I do not believe that he is speaking with introspection. Why is there this sudden change, sudden turn-around? It is unacceptable to us. I think this Government will revise its position and on the 6th of March, more pressure should be mounted. The American President is coming here. So many stories are going on. We have listened to the speech of the American President which he delivered at the Asia Society. It is containing certain dangerous things. We do not know what will happen. But he has his eyes on the huge Indian market of upper middle class. He says that Indians will be looking forward to the US for refrigerators and washing machines. The American President is speaking about Indians who are dominating the IT field in his own country[k38].

We [r39]have our 35,000 boys and girls doing excellent jobs in international bodies and we are looking forward to America for washing machines. What idea has the American President about India? But still what can be done? He has his own views.

The New York Times has stated that India has acted in such a manner under US pressure. It is not the Left's mouthpiece nor any other progressive Left newspaper, but it is the New York Times which has stated this. The advice of the Left has been ignored, the views of the partners of the Government have been ignored and the Government has decided itself to go it alone under pressure. This will be disastrous for this country because there is no proof that Iran has done anything wrong. If any suspicion was there with regard to the pre-2003, Iran clearly offered itself to examine, to visit, to inspect, to speak and to go to any location and stated, 'if you want additional safeguards, we are agreeable to the additional protocol'.

The hon. Defence Minister said, 'we have not signed NPT and we consider it to be a flaw, we consider it to be discriminatory'. Yes, but within the NPT, America's game is to divide between the NPT countries also. That is the American plan to perpetuate the additional protocol. If you look into the whole scheme of things, sanctions continuing, the regime changed, funds are being taken, Israel is being prepared for a military attack and ultimately where voting has never taken place, voting has taken place in IAEA.

There has been a change in India's stand along with that of US after 18th of July. We should speak about 18th of July Indo-US Defence deal when the situation comes, when the occasion comes. But India has committed a grave mistake. It is unacceptable to us. It is in violation of the commitment made by the Congress and the UPA through the NCMP to the nation. This is the plan of America and we are just being a party to it and knowingly or unknowingly we are being put into a trap.

I am not quoting the eminent physicists, but after almost three years of going anywhere, seeing anything, interviewing anyone, inspections, etc. the IAEA inspectors have not found any indication that Iran had or ever had a nuclear weapons programme. That is the view. Iran is committed to non-proliferation. Iran is pursuing its peaceful nuclear programme. America does not like it. America wants to redominate West Asia. They have a plan similar to the plan they had in Iraq and now, we, in India, are being a party to this game plan. It will be disastrous for a country which is known for

its non-aligned role, for its role as independent and anti-imperialist throughout its history.

Sir, I am concluding and adding two-three things to it. The Government is taking a position that P-5 countries have taken such a position, what can we do. Is it independence? China, Russia and other P-5 countries are in the Security Council. Will they support India to be a member of the Security Council? What is the US position? Even after the Indian Prime Minister had gone there and pleaded for it, they refused it bluntly. They were considering Japan and not India[r40].

Those who are in the Security Council can take a particular stand. Some NAM countries may take a particular stand. But we have a leading role and we have an independent position. Instead of trying to redefine nonalignment, you are over-emphasizing things like changes that have taken place or might have taken place. Rather this Government should have introspection. I am not using any hard word. 'Introspection' is never a hard word. If you do introspection, it will be good for them, it will be good for the country, and it will be good for the UPA Government. They should not forget that on the basis of the Common Minimum Programme only, this Government came to power. If they consistently ignore the correct and rational views of the Left Parties, then they will have to face the consequences. This is a sensitive issue. I am just cautioning them once more. This Government will get one more chance. Let the Government take a corrective measure. There is time even now to retract the position. Please do not succumb to the US pressure. Be independent in the true sense of the term so that the people of India can know that this Government has demarcated itself from the NDA Government, and do not speak in the tune of the RSS:

“We do not want any new nuclear power in our western neighbourhood.”

The RSS has said: “We do not want any Islamic nuclear power anymore.” Please do not speak in their voice. You differentiate from them. Otherwise, your fate will be similar to theirs. They had been into the dustbin. Please do not pursue their path, demarcate yourself, emphasize your independence and just revise and review your role on the 6th of March when you get another chance.

श्री मोहन सिंह (देवरिया) : सभापति महोदय, पहले में आपको धन्यवाद देता हूं क्योंकि आपने मुझे इस बहस में हिस्सा लेने का मौका दिया। हम लोग ईरान के संबंध में अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परमाणु एजेंसी में भारत ने जो कदम बढ़ाया है वह कितना जायज है, कितना भारत के हितों के अनुकूल है, भारत की परम्पराओं के अनुकूल है और अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों के अनुकूल है, इस पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं।

महोदय, मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया और उसकी आज रक्षा मंत्री जी ने जिस तरह पुटि की, उन दोनों को सुनने और पढ़ने के बाद, मुझे घोर निराशा हुई और इस बात की पुटि हुई कि जिस भारत की ख्याति दुनिया में गुटनिरपेक्ष आन्दोलन के जन्मदाता के रूप में थी, जो विश्व के तनाव के बीच में एक सुखद वातावरण तैयार करने के लिए मशहूर था, आज वह स्वतः एकतरफा विश्व शक्ति हो रहे देश का कहीं खिलौना और कहीं हथियार बनकर अपने सारे कदमों को उठा रहा है, यह एक दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण स्थिति है।

महोदय, रक्षा मंत्री जी ने एक बात जरूर कही कि हर 10-15 वर्षों के बाद दुनिया की परिस्थितियां बदलती हैं और उन परिस्थितियों के अनुसार हमारी गुटनिरपेक्ष नीति और हमारी विदेश नीति में भी परिवर्तन आता है। जहां तक विदेश नीति और गुटनिरपेक्ष नीति का प्रश्न है, राष्ट्रीय हित में समय और परिस्थितियों के अनुसार उसकी रणनीति में तो बदलाव हो सकता है, लेकिन उसके जो बुनियादी उसूल और सिद्धान्त हैं, उनमें परिवर्तन एक कमजोर देश ही करता है।

महोदय, हमारे देश की विदेश-नीति, हमारे राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन की उपज थी और हमने प्रारम्भ से ही यह स्वीकार किया है कि दुनिया के साम्राज्यवाद के विरुद्ध, उपनिवेशवाद के विरुद्ध, लोकतंत्र के लिए और धर्मनिरपेक्षता के बुनियादी उसूलों के लिए भारत निरन्तर प्रयत्नशील रहा है।

इसलिए दुनिया के जिस किसी भी देश में लोकतांत्रिक संघर्ष होते रहे, हमने अपने देश की सीमा से बाहर जाकर, उन लोकतांत्रिक आन्दोलनों का न केवल शाब्दिक समर्थन किया, बल्कि हथियारी समर्थन भी अपने देश से उन देशों के प्रति, जो संघर्षशील लोकतांत्रिक शक्तियां थीं, उनकी हमने मदद की। लेकिन आज अफसोस हो रहा है। भारत की विदेश नीति में जब कभी भी इस तरह के नाजुक मोड़ आये, देश की सरकार ने सर्वानुमति देश की बनाने की कोशिश की। रक्षा मंत्री जी और प्रधानमंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में कहा है कि हमें ईरान के खिलाफ वोट इसलिए देना पड़ा क्योंकि हम दुनिया में सर्वानुमति बनाना चाहते हैं। दुनिया में सर्वानुमति बनाने से पहले किसी भी कदम पर देश के भीतर सर्वानुमति बनाना किसी भी सरकार का अपना बुनियादी दायित्व है। जब

सितम्बर महीने में वोट करने का प्रश्न आया, हमारे देश के प्रधानमंत्री जी इस देश के बाहर थे और यह उनका अकेले लिया निर्णय था। उन्होंने कह दिया कि हमें ईरान के खिलाफ अमेरिका के हक में वोट देना है। उससे एक सामान्य वातावरण बना कि प्रधानमंत्री अमेरिका के इशारों पर कुछ झुक रहे हैं और यहां आकर उन्होंने मंत्रिपरिषद की बैठक बुलाकर अपना जो निर्णय लिया था, उसका अनुमोदन कराया। भारत की विदेश नीति के इतिहास में यह पहला अवसर था, जब हमने अपने मंत्रिमंडल में भी विचार नहीं किया गया। प्रधानमंत्री ने खुद इस देश की सरहद से बहुत दूर बैठे अपने आप एक निर्णय ले लिया और बाद में उनके मंत्रिमंडल की उप-समिति ने उसका समर्थन किया। उसके बाद, जो उनके अपने मंत्रिमंडल चलाने वाले साथी हैं, उनको विश्वास में लेने की कोई कोशिश नहीं की गई, जो बाहर से समर्थन करने वाले लोग थे, उनको दूर से, बाहर से बुलाकर समझा दिया गया।

इस देश में पहले क्या होता रहा है, उसे हम सब लोग जानते हैं। 1998 में जब देवेगौड़ा जी की सरकार थी, जिसे इस देश में बहुत थोड़ा समर्थन प्राप्त था और उस सरकार के ऊपर भी सी.टी.बी.टी. पर हस्ताक्षर करने का अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दबाव पैदा हुआ। उस दबाव के आगे उस सरकार ने सारे विपक्षी दलों को ही नहीं, पूरी संसद को विश्वास में लिया। यहां बहस हुई और हमने फैसला कर दिया कि सी.टी.बी.टी. पर इस सरकार को हस्ताक्षर नहीं करना चाहिए। आज आप कहते हैं कि हम दुनिया में अकेले न हो जायें, इसलिए हमने ईरान के खिलाफ वोट दे दिया। उस समय भी हम दुनिया में अकेले पड़ गये, लेकिन हमारे अन्दर हिम्मत थी और हमने निर्णय किया कि हम सी.टी.बी.टी. पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं करेंगे, क्योंकि यह परस्पर विरोधी है और डिस्क्रिमिनेटरी है, पक्षपातपूर्ण है, इसलिए हम इस पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं करेंगे और हमने हस्ताक्षर नहीं किया, उसका नतीजा हुआ कि सुरक्षा परिषद् में भारत को मिलने वाली सीट भारत को गंवानी पड़ी। लेकिन इस सरकार ने क्या किया, हम सभी जानते हैं कि जब इराक के ऊपर आक्रमण हुआ, वाजपेयी जी की सरकार थी, हम उस सरकार के कटु आलोचक हैं, विरोधी हैं, लेकिन उन्होंने पूरे देश को और राजनीति के जितने पक्ष थे, सब को विश्वास में लिया और सब को विश्वास में लेने के बाद इराक पर जो अमेरिका का आक्रमण था, इस सदन ने उसकी निन्दा की, आलोचना की। अंग्रेजी और हिन्दी शब्द पर विवाद हुआ, अंग्रेजी में डिप्लोर कहा गया और हिन्दी में आलोचना की गई, हमने उसकी आलोचना की। इस देश में एक ऐसा समय था, जब चन्द्रशेखर जी की सरकार थी, उसे एक कमजोर सरकार हम कह सकते हैं। उस सरकार के पीछे इस लोक सभा के अन्दर उस पार्टी के बहुत थोड़े से लोग थे। उस समय इराक के ऊपर अमेरिका ने आक्रमण किया। भारत में तेल भरने के लिए उनके युद्धक विमान आने लगे। उस सरकार ने सर्वानुमति बनाई और भारत ने एक स्वर से कहा कि यह इराक और अमेरिका के बीच का मामला है, अमेरिकी युद्धक विमानों को भारत किसी भी कीमत पर तेल भरने की इजाजत नहीं देगा और मजबूती के साथ भारत इस कदम के ऊपर खड़ा रहा। लेकिन यह अफसोस की बात है कि जब इस बार ईरान का मामला आया, शुरू से हम देख रहे हैं, कितनी लज्जाजनक बात है कि इतने सार्वभौम देश के प्रधानमंत्री जो 18 जुलाई को अमेरिका के साथ समझौता करके इस सदन में आये, इस सदन में चर्चा हुई, भारत के प्रधानमंत्री ने, जो भारत के राष्ट्रपति के प्रति जवाबदेह हैं, मुझको यह कहते हुए शर्म लग रही है कि इस देश में क्या हुआ, किसने इसका विरोध किया, यह राष्ट्रपति बुश के प्रति जाकर जवाबदेह बन रहे हैं। [i42]

इससे अधिक लज्जा की बात नहीं हो सकती है। सदन में किसी पार्टी ने उनके कदम का समर्थन किया और किसी ने नहीं किया - इसकी जबाबदेही क्या राष्ट्रपति बुश के प्रति हो सकती है। यह बात 26 जनवरी को कही गई, जब हम अपने देश का गणतंत्र दिवस मना रहे थे। हम एक सार्वभौम देश हैं। हम अपने देश के लोकतंत्र को, अपनी ताकत पर खड़ा करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। 26 जनवरी को हम अपने गणतंत्र की वर्गांठ मना रहे थे, तो यहां पर अमरीकी राजदूत डेविस सी. मलफोर्ड ने कहा कि आने वाले फरवरी महीने में यदि हिंदुस्तान ईरान के खिलाफ वोट कर दे तो ऐसा माना जाएगा कि हिंदुस्तान की नीयत ठीक है और उसके बाद भारत के प्रधानमंत्री और हमारे राष्ट्रपति के बीच समझौता हुआ है, उन समझौतों को पूरा करने में हमें आसानी होगी। उनके इस वक्तव्य के बाद भारत ने ईरान के विरुद्ध वोट किया तो यह भावना पैदा होना स्वाभाविक है कि हिंदुस्तान की विदेश नीति का संचालन हिंदुस्तान नहीं बल्कि अमरीका कर रहा है। इस संदेह को दूर करने के लिए भारत सरकार ने कुछ नहीं किया। यह बहुत ही दुखद बात है।

हम कहना चाहते हैं कि जिस जमाने में भारत एक कमजोर राष्ट्र था, जिस जमाने में भारत की 60 फीसदी आबादी गरीबी रेखा के नीचे रहती थी, उस जमाने में मिस्त्र के राष्ट्रपति श्री अब्दुल कमाल नासिर ने स्वेज नहर का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर लिया था और उसके विरोध में इज्राइल, फ्रांस, ब्रिटेन की सेनाओं ने मिस्त्र पर आक्रमण कर दिया। उस जमाने में इस आक्रमण के खिलाफ एक आवाज आई और वह आवाज पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू की थी। भले ही दुनिया के देशों पर उसका कोई असर नहीं हुआ, लेकिन ब्रिटेन की जनता पर इसका गहरा असर हुआ और हजारों की संख्या में ब्रिटेन की जनता ने जमा होकर प्रधानमंत्री के आवास को घेर लिया। इस विरोध प्रदर्शन की वजह से ब्रिटेन को अपनी सेना वापिस बुलानी पड़ी। उस जमाने में भारत की आवाज इतनी तेज होती थी कि सरकारें सुनें या न सुनें, उन देशों की जनता सुना करती थी और जनता के दबाव में सरकारों के निर्णय बदल जाया करते थे। लेकिन आज परिस्थिति क्या है? हमारे प्रधानमंत्री ने सदन में वक्तव्य दिया और वक्तव्य में कहा कि इस महीने हुए मतदान में जो प्रस्ताव था, उसका न केवल रूस, चीन सहित सभी पी-फाईव देशों का समर्थन हासिल था, बल्कि अर्जेंटीना, ब्राजील, मिस्त्र, घाना, यमन, सिंगापुर और श्रीलंका जैसे महत्वपूर्ण गुटनिरपेक्ष देश और विकसित देशों का भी समर्थन प्राप्त हुआ। चूंकि श्रीलंका ने समर्थन कर दिया, इसलिए हिंदुस्तान भी उसका समर्थन करेगा, इससे लज्जाजनक बात इस देश के लिए नहीं हो सकती है। पहले हिन्दुस्तान निर्णय लेता था और कदम बढ़ाता था और श्रीलंका, घाना और मिस्त्र भारत की मदद करते थे, अब परिस्थिति आपने बदल दी है, श्रीलंका पहल करता है और हिन्दुस्तान उसकी मदद में खड़ा होता है। इससे लचर परिस्थिति नहीं हो सकती है।

दुनिया के हर देश की सुरक्षा की अपनी चिन्ताएं होती हैं और भारत की भी है। वर्ष 1970-71 में जब भारत की सेनाओं ने बांग्लादेश को आजाद कराने का काम किया, उस समय भारत के ऊपर अमरीका के सातवें बेड़े ने डाएगो गार्सिया में अपना अड्डा बना लिया, जिससे भारत की चिन्ता बढ़नी स्वाभाविक थी। दुनिया में हम कहते थे कि निरस्त्रीकरण होना चाहिए और हर देश को अपने आणुविक हथियारों को चरणबद्ध तरीके से नट करना चाहिए, लेकिन वर्ष 1971 के बाद भारत ने अपनी सुरक्षा चिन्ताओं के बारे में नये सिरे से सोचा। इसके मद्देनजर पोखरण में पहला परमाणु बम का परीक्षण किया। दुनिया ने कहा कि भारत आणविक कार्यक्रम चला रहा है और परमाणु बम का निर्माण कर रहा है। उस समय श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने कहा कि अपने देश की तरक्की के

लिए, अपनी हिफाज़त के लिए हमें परमाणु बम का परीक्षण करना पड़ा। उन्होंने परमाणु बम का परीक्षण किया और दुनिया को यह संदेश दिया कि हम परमाणु बम बनाने में सक्षम हैं, लेकिन हम बम इसलिए नहीं बना रहे हैं कि हमारे सुरक्षा कंसर्न अभी उतने व्यापक नहीं हुए हैं।^[c43] ^[c44]

1998 में वह परिस्थिति आ गई जब सीटीबीटी पर हस्ताक्षर करने के लिए हमारे ऊपर दबाव पड़ने लगा। जब हमने सारे स्रोतों से यह समझ लिया कि अमरीका की मदद से, चीन की मदद से पाकिस्तान में भी अणु बम बनाने की हैसियत हो गई, तो हिन्दुस्तान ने भी अपने देश में अणु बम बना लिया। इसलिए हिन्दुस्तान को सोचना चाहिए कि दुनिया के हर देश की अपनी सुरक्षात्मक चिन्ताएं होती हैं। ईरान की भी अपनी सुरक्षात्मक चिन्ताएं हैं और इस मायने में हैं कि उसके बगल में इराक में आकर अमरीका की एक कठपुतली सरकार बैठ गई है।...(व्यवधान) अमरीका पूरी दुनिया में कह रहा है कि हम आतंकवाद के विरुद्ध वर्ल्ड वार लड़ रहे हैं, हम विश्व आतंकवाद के विरुद्ध विश्व युद्ध कर रहे हैं, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि उनका आतंकवाद के विरुद्ध जो विश्व युद्ध है, वह धर्म विशेषों के विरुद्ध युद्ध है। उसने पूरी दुनिया में अमरीका का ऐसा स्वरूप बना दिया, जिसके चलते ऐसा माना जा रहा है कि वह आतंकवाद के विरुद्ध नहीं, बल्कि इस्लाम के विरुद्ध अपनी जंग जारी किए हुए है। ऐसे में ईरान का चिंतित होना स्वाभाविक है और उसकी अपनी रक्षात्मक चिन्ताएं उसी रूप में हैं जिस रूप में भारत की 1971 में थीं। इसलिए मैं कुछ सुझाव भारत सरकार को देना चाहता हूं।...(व्यवधान)

मेरा सुझाव होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान मार्च में होने वाली अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परमाणु ऊर्जा एजेंसी में ईरान के हक में वोट दे।

दूसरा, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंचों पर एनपीटी और सीटीबीटी की शर्तों को बदलने के लिए भारत को कोशिश करनी चाहिए और यह प्रयास करना चाहिए कि अब दुनिया बदल गई, सभी देशों के अपने सुरक्षात्मक कंसर्न बदल गए, ऐसी हालत में जिन देशों ने एनपीटी पर हस्ताक्षर भी किए हैं, वे अपनी सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से एनपीटी की सारी शर्तों में नए सिरे से बदलाव करें।

तीसरा, यदि ईरान के पास अणु बम है, यदि इज़राइल के पास अणु बम है, पाकिस्तान के पास अणु बम है और अपनी सुरक्षा के लिए ईरान उसकी तैयारी कर रहा है, तो ईरान की इस तैयारी में भारत को अवरोधक नहीं बनना चाहिए और दुनिया की किसी भी शक्ति को उसमें अवरोधक बनने के बजाए इस बात की गारंटी देनी चाहिए कि उसकी अपनी जो आणविक तैयारी है, उसमें भारत भी मददगार हो सकता है।

चौथा, ईरान के खिलाफ मतदान होने के बाद, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय अखबारों में ऐसी खबरें छपने लगीं कि जैसे इराक के ऊपर अमरीका ने आक्रमण किया, ईरान के ऊपर भी वह करने वाला है - इसका कोई खंडन दुनिया की

किसी भी प्रैस में भारत ने नहीं किया। भारत को कहना चाहिए कि किन्हीं परिस्थितियों में इराक की तरह ईरान के ऊपर अमरीका ने अगर आक्रमण किया तो इस बार हिन्दुस्तान खामोश नहीं बैठेगा बल्कि ईरान के साथ खड़ा होगा। यह आश्वासन भारत को ईरान की जनता, ईरान की सरकार को देना चाहिए।

जो पहल आज रूस कर रहा है, जो पहल चीन कर रहा है, उसमें सर्वानुमति बनाने के लिए और ईरान की जो सुरक्षात्मक तैयारी है, प्रामाणिक तैयारी है, उसमें अपने कारखाने खोलने के लिए भारत को यह पहल अपने हाथ में लेनी चाहिए और कोशिश करनी चाहिए कि दुनिया के मंच पर ईरान सक्रिय ढंग से हिन्दुस्तान की नीतियों को अमरीका के इशारे पर नहीं चलाए बल्कि स्वतंत्र ढंग से जो ईरान की स्थापना है, उसमें हिन्दुस्तान भी मदद करे।

इन्हीं सुझावों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं और आपको धन्यवाद देता हूं।

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव (झंझारपुर) : सभापति महोदय, आज यहां ईरान के मुद्दे पर जो चर्चा हो रही है, इस चर्चा में कई तरह के स्वर निकल रहे हैं। उसका कारण यह भी है कि न केवल अन्य दलों बल्कि घटक दलों को भी विश्वास में लिया जाना चाहिए। इतने महत्वपूर्ण अंतर्राष्ट्रीय विषय पर आज चर्चा हो रही है, इस पर खासकर भारत का क्या रुख रहा है, क्योंकि भारत-ईरान का संबंध सदियों पुराना है, प्राचीन काल से अरब सागर के रास्ते से भारत और ईरान के सौदागर व्यापार का आदान-प्रदान करते [\[R45\]](#)।

माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सदन में दिये गये अपने वक्तव्य में स्वीकार किया है कि भारत ईरान का संबंध पुराना, पारस्परिक तथा मित्रतापूर्ण रहा है। भारत ईरान के बीच प्रगाढ़ मैत्री का ज्वलंत प्रमाण ईरान और भारत के बीच प्रस्तावित गैस पाइप लाइन परियोजना है, जिस पर सहमति है। मैं इसलिए कहना चाहता हूं कि जब हमारा ईरान के साथ इतने दिनों का संबंध है, तो क्यों हम गाहे-बगाहे इसमें खटास पैदा कर रहे हैं? विकसित राष्ट्र की धमकी से या अमेरिका के दबाव से ईरान के साथ हमारा जो संबंध है, जो रिश्ता है, उसमें यदि कोई ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा हो रही है, कोई प्रश्न चिह्न खड़ा हो रहा है, तो वह दीर्घकालीन परिस्थितियों में गंभीर होगा। इसमें परिस्थितियों, समय और नीतियां बदलने के जो तर्क दिये जा रहे हैं, वे भरोसा करने लायक नहीं हैं। पिछला जो उदाहरण रहा है, अमेरिका का जो रुख रहा है, वह भरोसा करने लायक नहीं है। ईरान ने स्पष्ट किया था कि वह परमाणु शक्ति सम्पन्न राष्ट्र बनना चाहता है, वह परमाणु बम नहीं बनाना चाहता। ईरान ने कभी यह नहीं कहा कि हम परमाणु बम बनाकर विश्व में अशांति फैलाने का काम करेंगे। ईरान की परमाणु नीति का मकसद शांतिपूर्ण इस्तेमाल के लिए है जैसे, ऊर्जा उत्पन्न करना, आदि। अब किसी भी देश का शांति प्रयोजन के लिए परमाणु अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम चलाना, उस देश का मौलिक अधिकार है, लेकिन परमाणु कार्यक्रमों का उद्देश्य असैनिक कार्यों तथा शांतिपूर्ण उद्देश्य के लिए नहीं होने देने की परिस्थिति में रुकावट पैदा करना, उसके खिलाफ विश्व भर में वातावरण बनाने का काम अमेरिका ने किया है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि अमेरिका के तर्क पर या अमेरिका की

दलील पर आप कैसे भरोसा कर रहे हैं ? मैं इसलिए इस बात को कहना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया के तीसरी दुनिया के देश भारत पर बड़ी निगाह रखे हुए थे। उन्होंने भारत पर जो भरोसा किया हुआ था, मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे उनको निराशा हुई है। भारत सरकार ने इस मामले में जो डिप्लोमेटिक पालिसी अपनाई है, उससे तीसरी दुनिया के देशों को बहुत निराशा हुई है। मैं इस बात को साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि भारत विश्व का विशाल, सार्वभौमिक और सम्प्रभु राष्ट्र है। पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू के समय से भारत की गुट निरपेक्ष नीति रही है। भारत का सिद्धांत है कि प्रत्येक स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र को अपनी विदेश नीति और कार्यक्रमों का निर्वहन अपने व्यापक हितों के अनुरूप करना चाहिए। मैं नैशनल पालिसी स्टडीज का एक उद्धरण देना चाहता हूँ। उस समय पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने क्या कहा था ? आप साल और परिस्थिति के अनुसार स्ट्रेटेजी बदल रहे हैं लेकिन इसमें कहां अंतर हो रहा है ? उन्होंने कहा था कि --

“Referring to free India's role in the world, in his broadcast to the nation as Vice-President of the Interim Government, on September 7, 1946, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had declared :

We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against each another, which had led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disasters on an even vaster scale. We believe that peace and freedom are indivisible and the denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war. We are particularly interest in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and peoples, and in the recognition in theory and practice of equal opportunities for all races[[reporter46](#)].

This by no means meant a neutral or negative approach to international affairs. India chose to adopt a policy of non-involvement in military or political groupings or blocs, and of involvement, as far as her circumstances permitted, in world affairs in the furtherance of world peace and freedom of colonial territories.”

इसमें क्या अन्तर हुआ, कौन सी पॉलिसी बदल गई है, लेकिन यूरोपीय संघ के दबाव में आकर भारत ने जो तर्क दिया है, इस मसले पर मैं व्यक्तिगत रूप से और दल की तरफ से भी सहमत नहीं हूँ। परमाणु मसले पर ईरान के विरुद्ध जिस तरह से वोट देकर, गुटनिरपेक्षता की जो हमारी पुरानी नीति है, मैंने अभी उदाहरण दिया है कि जो पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी के समय से हमारी नीति रही है, उसको अलविदा देने का संकेत दिया गया है। मैं नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि पूरी तरह से अलविदा कर दिया है लेकिन अलविदा का संकेत जरूर दिया है। हमने अपने पुराने मित्र ईरान के साथ अपने अच्छे रिश्तों में खटास पैदा की है। यह आगे जाकर दूसरा रूप ले लेगा क्योंकि अमरीका ने जब अफगानिस्तान पर हमला किया था और उसके बाद इराक में जैविक अस्त्रों का बहाना बनाकर हमला किया था, लेकिन अमरीका का निशाना जैविक अस्त्र नहीं थे बल्कि तेल का कुंआ ही

असल में उनका निशाना था। हमला जरूर जैविक अस्त्रों का बहाना बनाकर किया था लेकिन असल निशाना तेल का कुंआ ही था। जो असहाय देश होता है, उसकी आर्थिक व्यवस्था पर कब्जा करने की एक प्रवृत्ति, एक कल्चर अमरीका ने अपनाया है और मैं समझता हूँ कि उसमें वह सफल होता जा रहा है। वह नाम जैविक अस्त्र का देता है तथा असत्य आरोप लगाता है। उसी तरह से वह अभी ईरान को घेरे में लाया है। इराक पर आक्रमण से पहले उन्होंने जिस तरह का बहाना बनाया था, उसी तरह हमें संदेह है कि आगामी अब ईरान को भी घेरने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है। ईरान को घेरकर कहीं हमला की बात न हो, इसलिए मोहन सिंह जी और रुपचंद पाल जी ने ठीक ही कहा कि आज हम उसका साथ दे रहे हैं, कहीं ईरान पर हमले के वक्त भी हमें साथ न देना पड़े।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member, please conclude your speech.

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : जब ईरान पर हमले का वातावरण बनेगा, क्योंकि पिछला जो अनुभव रहा है, उसके हिसाब से अमरीका विश्वास के लायक नहीं है। अमरीका की तर्ज पर विश्वास करने की कोई जरूरत ही नहीं है क्योंकि इराक पर जिस तरह से अमरीका ने हमला किया, इस संसद में हम लोगों ने प्रस्ताव लाया था और कहा था कि यहां से सेना भेजिए। यह कदम जो हमने उठाया है, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस कदम पर सरकार को और विचार करने की जरूरत है क्योंकि अमरीका के आगामी हमले का तानाबाना बुनने में, भारत को किसी भी तरह से सहभागी नहीं बनना चाहिए, यह मेरी राय है। इसीलिए भारत को अपनी गुटनिरपेक्ष नीति पर कायम रहना चाहिए और इससे भारत को इससे दूर रहना चाहिए। हमें किसी भी देश का पिछलग्गू बनने की जरूरत नहीं है।

मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि परमाणु और अप्रसार संधि के एक हस्ताक्षर के रूप में ईरान के पास अपनी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रतिबद्धताओं और दायित्व के अनुकूल परमाणु ऊर्जा के शान्तिपूर्ण इस्तेमाल के कानूनी अधिकार की बात कही गई है। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है, उसमें यह नहीं था। मैं इसीलिए कहना चाहता हूँ कि ईरान शान्तिपूर्ण प्रयोजन से अपने देश के विकास हेतु परमाणु अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम चला रहा है, यह अमरीका को स्वीकार्य क्यों नहीं है ? ... (व्यवधान) सभापति महोदय, आपने घंटी बजा दी है, मैं एक-दो मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त कर रहा हूँ। भारत को हर प्रकार से अपने मित्र देश के हक में खड़ा होना चाहिए [\[R47\]](#)।

हमारा ईरान के साथ सदियों से सम्बन्ध रहा है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने खुद कहा है कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परमाणु ऊर्जा एजेंसी ने ईरान के परमाणु कार्यकलापों से उत्पन्न अनेक प्रश्नों का जो जवाब उससे मांगा था, उनमें से कुछ कार्यकलापों की जांच के लिए, उसने अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परमाणु ऊर्जा एजेंसी के साथ सहयोग भी किया था। फिर क्या औचित्य था कि ईरान के खिलाफ वातावरण बनाकर उसे जस्टिफाई करने की कोशिश की गई, जबकि वह किसी भी तरह के सहयोग के लिए तैयार था। ईरान द्वारा सकारात्मक संकेत

देने के बावजूद भी क्यों उसे परमाणु अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम के तहत बहाना बनाकर घेरने की कोशिश की गई और इस मामले को सुरक्षा परिषद में भेजने के लिए भारत का भी सहयोग रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अब सांप तो बिल

में चला गया, बिल खोदा नहीं जा सकता इसलिए आगे हमें उसके पक्ष में खड़ा होने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। अब तो जो हो गया, वह हो गया, क्योंकि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थितियां ऐसी हैं कि उसका हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते। लेकिन आगे जो 6 मार्च को उसके साथ खड़ा होने की बात होगी, हमें उसमें सावधानी बरतने की जरूरत है। हमारे निर्गुट आंदोलन को झटका न लगे, अब भी उसमें सुधार करने की आवश्यकता है।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सदन में बताया था कि ईरान मामले में भारत द्वारा लिया गया निर्णय हमारे विस्तारित पक्ष में परमाणु प्रसार कार्यक्रम से उत्पन्न हमारी सुरक्षा चिंताओं को ध्यान में रखकर किया गया है, प्रधान मंत्री जी के द्वारा यह तर्क दिया गया था। क्या इस्राइल द्वारा फिलीस्तीन पर हमला नहीं हो रहा है और क्या हमारे अन्य पड़ोसी देशों ने जो परमाणु अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम चलाए हुए हैं, उन पर यह समझौता लागू नहीं होता? क्या यह तर्क वहां उचित नहीं है और सिर्फ ईरान के लिए ही है कि उसके परमाणु अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम हमारी सुरक्षा के लिए चिंता का विषय हैं। हमारे कई पड़ोसी देश परमाणु अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम को चला रहे हैं। उनके बारे में सरकार का क्या रुख है, क्या रणनीति है, क्या स्ट्रेटेजी है और क्या कूटनीति है, इसे सरकार को स्पष्ट करना चाहिए?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude, your time is over. I have already called the name of the next hon. Member.

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : सरकार के सामने आज यह एक यक्ष प्रश्न खड़ा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि ईरान के विरुद्ध भारत के द्वारा जो निर्णय लिया गया है, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समुदाय के लिए, खासकर तीसरी दुनिया के देशों के लिए वह चिन्ता का विषय बना हुआ है। इसलिए मैं साफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें अमेरिका के दबाव में किसी भी प्रकार से आने की जरूरत नहीं है। हम एक सम्प्रभु देश हैं। हमें अपना निर्णय लेने का पूरा अधिकार है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: You must cooperate.

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : अभी 23 फरवरी को अमेरिकी राष्ट्रपति जार्ज बुश ने जो कहा है, वह समाचार पत्रों में भी छपा है, उनका कहना है कि भारत-अमेरिका परमाणु समझौते पर पहले से ही संकट के बादल मंडरा रहे हैं। उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि भारत को अपने सभी असैनिक परमाणु कार्यक्रमों को अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परमाणु ऊर्जा एजेंसी की सुरक्षा के दायरे में लाना होगा। अभी से उसने कंडीशन लगाना शुरू कर दिया है। एक बार आपने उस साम्राज्यवादी देश के साथ कदम बढ़ाया, उनकी मोनोपली में साथ दिया, तो देखिए उनका मुंह सुरसा की तरह खुलने लग गया है। वह अभी से हमें चेतावनी देने लग गया है। भारत और अमेरिका के बीच असैनिक परमाणु सम्बन्धों के बारे में हमारे परमाणु वैज्ञानिक सलाहकार श्री सी.एन. राव कहते हैं कि भारत फास्ट ब्रीडर रिएक्टरों, एफबीआर्स, को असैनिक कार्यक्रमों के लिए नहीं छोड़ सकता। यदि वह समझता है कि उसके राष्ट्रीय हितों में यह आड़े आ रहा है, तो वह हाथ खींच सकता है। यह हम पीछे से क्यों बोलते हैं, पहले ही हमें सावधान रहने की जरूरत है। उसने इस तरह से आपको धमकी देना शुरू कर दिया है। मैं साफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा देश विश्व में सबसे बड़ा लोकतांत्रिक देश है। इसलिए अमेरिका के सम्बन्ध में जो भी हमारी रणनीति तय हो, उस पर हमारे जो प्राचीन मित्र देश हैं, जैसे ईरान है, उनके साथ हमें खड़ा होना चाहिए।

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you were here, you would realise the difficulty. Please conclude now. If you were here, You would have realised the position.

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : मैं आखिरी बात कहना चाहता हूँ। बीत गई रात को कौन देखता है, दीए बुझाए जाते हैं सुबह होने के बाद। इसलिए वक्त आने पर वह आपका साथ नहीं देगा, यह बात आपको ध्यान में रखनी चाहिए। तीसरी दुनिया के देशों का आप पर विश्वास है और हमारे देश में तीसरी दुनिया के देशों का नेतृत्व करने की क्षमता है, क्योंकि हम सबसे बड़े लोकतांत्रिक देश हैं। इसलिए हमें इस पर विचार करना चाहिए।

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक (उन्नाव) : सभापति जी, जैसा कि सर्वविदित है, बहुजन समाज पार्टी आचार, विचार और सिद्धांत में “समतावादी एवं मानवतावादी” है और यही कारण है कि हमारी पार्टी पूरे देश में सर्वसमाज के स-वाभिमान व सम्मान का प्रतीक बनकर तेजी से उभर रही है। इसी के साथ ही साथ, एक प्रमुख राष्ट्रीय पार्टी होने के नाते हम अपना यह कर्तव्य समझते हैं कि देश की राजनीति के साथ-साथ सरकार की विदेश नीति पर भी अपनी पैनी नजर रखें और राष्ट्र हित से दूर रहकर समझौता करने वाली किसी भी सरकारी कार्रवाई का सख्ती से प्रतिरोध करें।

भारत की विदेश नीति आज अंतर्राष्ट्रीय जगत के साथ-साथ देश के भीतर भी एक बहस का विषय बन गयी है, क्योंकि प्रथम दृष्टि में ऐसा लगता है कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परमाणु ऊर्जा एजेंसी में ईरान के खिलाफ वोट करके भारत ने न केवल अपनी निर्गुण और निपक्ष विदेश नीति को आघात पहुंचाया है बल्कि स्पष्टतः अमरीका के दबाव में उठाया गया एक कदम भी प्रतीत होता है, ऐसा भारतीय जनता का मानना है।

इसके अलावा किसी भी देश की तरक्की के लिये तेल और गैस की लगातार आपूर्ति न केवल जरूरी है, बल्कि वास्तव में रीढ़ की हड्डी का काम करती है। स्वयं अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति का कहना है कि **American**

is addicted to oil अर्थात् अमरीकियों को तेल का नशा है, उसके बगैर उनका जीना मुश्किल है। इसी प्रकार चीन अपनी तरक्की की रफ्तार को बरकरार रखने के लिये आज दुनिया के सबसे बड़े तेल के खरीदारों में एक बन गया है और पूरी दुनिया में तेल की अपनी बढ़ती मांग की आपूर्ति आने वाले वॉर्षों में भी सुनिश्चित करने के लिए तेल के कुएं खरीदता जा रहा है जबकि भारत तेल और गैस की अपनी बढ़ती हुई आवश्यकता के विपरीत एक प्रमुख तेल सप्लायर और भरोसेमंद राष्ट्र ईरान को नाराज करने में जुटा हुआ लगता है। केन्द्र की कांग्रेसी सरकार शायद यह समझती है कि ईरान का संयुक्त राष्ट्र की एजेंसी आई.ए.ई.ए. में विरोध करके तथा फिर संयुक्त राष्ट्र के माध्यम से ईरान पर परमाणु कार्यक्रम जारी रखने के आरोप के तहत विभिन्न प्रकार की पाबंदी लगा करके पश्चिमी देश खासकर अमरीका की गोदी में बैठकर ऊर्जा की अपनी लम्बी-अवधि की समस्या सुलझा लेगा, तो ऐसा सोचना कम से कम आम आदमी के गले के नीचे नहीं उतर पा रहा है, क्योंकि जब-जब हमने पश्चिमी देशों पर भरोसा किया है, धोखा ही खाया है। कम से कम अमरीका के साथ अपने तमाम पिछले अनुभवों के आधार पर तो यह कहा ही जा सकता है।

ईरान के साथ भारत का एक करार बिल्कुल अंतिम दौर में है, जिसके तहत ईरान पाइपलाइन के जरिये, भारत को तेल और गैस की विशाल आपूर्ति करेगा। अमरीका इस तेल और गैस पाइपलाइन का विरोध कर रहा है और भारत को मजबूर कर रहा है कि ऊर्जा की अपनी जरूरत भारत परमाणु संयंत्र लगाकर पूरा करे। मगर वैज्ञानिकों एवं विशोज्ञों का कहना है कि अपनी अर्थव्यवस्था को चलाने के लिए आगामी लगभग दो-ढाई दशकों तक भारत को तेल और गैस जैसी ऊर्जा सामग्री पर ही भरोसा करना है। लेकिन मजे की बात यह है कि स्वयं अमरीका ने पिछले अनेक वॉर्षों के दौरान बिजली पैदा करने के लिए कोई परमाणु प्लांट नहीं लगाया है बल्कि कैसपियाई क्षेत्र व तजाकिस्तान, उजबेकिस्तान आदि देशों से तेल की आपूर्ति के लिये हजारों-हजार मील लम्बी पाइपलाइन तुर्की तक विछायी गयी है ताकि उन दूर-दराज के देशों से भी तेल की अपनी आपूर्ति पूरी की जा सके।

हम ईरान की कीमत पर अमरीका के साथ परमाणु सौदे का इसलिये भी विरोध करते हैं क्योंकि इससे हमारे अपने परमाणु कार्यक्रम के साथ-साथ देश की अस्मिता और सुरक्षा, अमरीका द्वारा लगाई जा रही शर्तों के कारण खतरे में पड़ती दिखाई देती है। संसद में प्रधान मंत्री डा. मनमोहन सिंह जी के बयान से मामला और उलझ गया लगता है, क्योंकि उसमें देशहित के साथ-साथ सुरक्षा की गारंटी के आश्वासन को सरकार तर्कपूर्ण ढंग से जनता के समक्ष नहीं रख पायी है।

कांग्रेस के नेतृत्व वाली यू.पी.ए. सरकार ने हमारे वैज्ञानिकों के इस तर्क का भी कोई जवाब नहीं सुझाया है कि अमरीका की लगातार बदलती हुई रणनीति के कारण भारत किस प्रकार अपने परमाणु संयंत्रों के रख-रखाव, तकनीकी व आंकड़ों को अपने नियंत्रण में लेने की अमरीकी कोशिशों से मुक्ति पायेगा। साथ ही, यह भी नहीं बताया गया है कि अपार-धन से खरीदा जाने वाला परमाणु रियेक्टर, अमरीका से आयात करने के बाद उसके लिए इस्तेमाल होने वाले खर्चीले आयातित ईंधन पर चलने वाला रियेक्टर किस प्रकार से भारत के लिए आर्थिक तथा सामरिक दृष्टि से युक्तिसंगत होगा।

आम आदमी की सोच है कि भारत, अब तक, बहुत हद तक विदेशी चंगुल से आर्थिक मामलों में बचता रहा है, लेकिन समय-समय पर अमरीकी तथा पश्चिमी पाबंदियों की मार झेलने वाला भारत, कहीं इस परमाणु डील के माध्यम से एक “परमाणु जाल” में तो नहीं उलझ जायेगा, जिसका खामियाजा देशवासियों को झेलना पड़ेगा और इसका सबसे ज्यादा प्रभाव इस देश के दबे-कुचले लोगों पर पड़ेगा।

सबसे ज्यादा शंका की बात यह है कि एक ओर अमरीकी दबाव में ईरान के विरुद्ध जाकर हम अपनी तेल और गैस की वॉ-वॉ की आपूर्ति को खटाई में डालने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं, फिर भी अमरीका, भारत को “दूसरे दर्जे का परमाणु शक्ति” देश से ज्यादा कुछ भी मानने को तैयार नहीं है, जिसके

दूरगामी दुपरिणाम दिखाई पड़ते हैं। परमाणु सौदा हालांकि भारत से कहीं ज्यादा अमरीका के लिये महत्वपूर्ण है क्योंकि इसके मार्फत अमरीका, भारत जैसे एक बड़े एशियाई देश को खासकर ईरान के विरुद्ध अपने चंगुल में कर लेगा और फिर ऐसी आशंका है कि इस माध्यम से अपना हित साधता रहेगा। हमें उन देशों से मझौता या सौदा करने से पहले देश का हित दस बार सोचना चाहिए जिनके साथ हमारे रिश्ते खट्टे-मीठे रहे हैं।

एक आजाद, संप्रभुत्व और स्वाभिमानी देश होने के नाते हम भारतवासी यह कैसे मान सकते हैं कि न केवल किसी बाहरी शक्ति के दिशा-निर्देश के अनुसार भारत अपने परमाणु संयंत्रों की सिविलियन और सैन्य परमाणु प्लांटों की श्रेणी का वर्गीकरण करे और साथ ही ऐसा वर्गीकरण करे जो अमरीका की नजर में विश्वसनीय, पारदर्शी अर्थात् सब कुछ साफ-साफ समझ में आने वाला तथा समर्थनीय [cÉä\[r48\]](#)।

आम आदमी की भाषा में कहा जाए, तो परमाणु केंद्रों का सिविल मिनिस्ट्री वर्गीकरण अमेरिका की निगाह में उचित एवं सही हो, भारत को अपनी जवाबदेही संयुक्त राष्ट्र परमाणु एजेंसी के प्रति होने के बजाए अमेरिका के समक्ष हो, लेकिन कोई भी प्रभुत्व सम्पन्न स्वाभिमानी देश इस तर्क को कैसे स्वीकार कर सकता है?

अंत में, मैं यही बात कहना चाहता हूं कि ईरान के मुद्दे पर एक सर्वदलीय बैठक बुलाकर कोई निर्णय लेना चाहिए था। भारत का हित सर्वोपरि है। अगर आपने निर्णय नहीं लिया है, तो अभी भी मौका है, एक सर्वदलीय बैठक बुला ली जाए, उसमें तय कर लिया जाए कि भारत की रणनीति क्या होगी, भारत की विदेश नीति क्या होगी?

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात को समाप्त करता हूं।

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU (RAJAPUR): Sir, our foreign policy has never been as controversial as it is now because in the past we really used to discuss our foreign policy on non-partisan lines. We always believed that foreign policy is that of a nation and that of a country. Therefore, each one of us, who are the constituents of the nation, will subscribe to that policy because that is in the best interests of the nation. Unfortunately, we have seen lately that we are debating it on partisan lines, creating a sectarian atmosphere as a result of which, it is not serving the nation as it should be. Therefore, I think, it is the best interests of the country that our foreign policy should be discussed, debated with all most all the constituents of the country, representing all the political parties. Then only, we should arrive at a consensus, which should be reflected in the positions that we take in the international arena to avoid a division, that appears to have taken place within the country. Therefore, my request is that the Government, in future, must take all political parties, all shades of opinion into confidence before shaping up the policy and taking a decision and position in the international arena.

Now a days, we are knowing about the foreign policy through newspapers - not only the Opposition members but also our Leader of the Opposition. When I was listening to the intervention of the Leader of the House, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, he also seems to be knowing about what is happening in the international arena through newspapers. He said that there has been a deal, which is likely to take place between Russia and Iran, and he said that he was saying this on the basis of newspaper reports. Our Defence Minister of India, a Member of the Cabinet Committee on Security, a very senior politician and a Leader of the House knows about what is happening in the international area only through the newspaper. So, it seems that our media has better access to what is happening world wide than our Leader of the House, which present a really sorry state of affairs. Therefore, it is not the Opposition, who has the prerogative of only knowing from the media but also seems to be the Leader of the House. Therefore, I think, now we should know about the foreign policy, not through the media, but what we discuss, debate between the different political groups, should be reported in the media. Therefore, I would like to make the first request that let the Government take everybody into confidence.

I was listening very carefully and therefore, I decided to speak to the intervention of the Defence Minister, who spoke very eloquently on various aspects. I

genuinely believe that the friends of a country can keep changing. It is a dynamic world. India is now one of the fastest growing economies of the world. We are a billion plus people. Therefore, I do not think anybody can cow us down. Therefore, I genuinely believe that we should take our decisions on foreign policy in the national interests.

In any case, the foreign policy is only a manifestation of our domestic policy. It is only an extension of what we are trying to do in our country. Therefore what is happening in the sphere of foreign policy should be a reflection of that. Therefore, I believe in what Chanakya said way back, who is one of the founders of the foreign policy of the world, and the principles of the foreign policy of the world. He said that the interests are permanent. Therefore, if our interests are permanent, we keep changing. We can always take positions. It has to be in the national interest, undoubtedly. But my request to Shri Pranab Mukherjee, the hon. Leader of the House, I am sorry, Sir, would have been to spell out what was that national interests which really forced us to take a decision in the IAEA meeting, referring Iran case to the United Nations Security Council. It is not just saying camouflaging. Our decision in the garb of saying that it was in the national interest is really imperative for us to know as to what was the specific national interest which compelled the Government to take that decision[\[R49\]](#).

If we know about it, I am sure, all of us will support it. Therefore, what is that national interest needs to be spelt out very clearly?

The second question that comes to my mind is this. When the Iran issue was referred from IAEA to the United Nations Security Council, what was the threshold that Iran had reached which compelled it to be referred to the United Nations Security Council? The threshold is not properly explained at the time of intervention. Therefore, I would request and I am sure that this debate which is going to continue for some time, will be replied to by the hon. Prime Minister who is holding the foreign portfolio with him realising the importance of it. I am sure, he will be able to respond to it.

When he responds to it, I would really like to know what was that threshold which was reached. Now that it is referred to the United Nations Security Council, what are the options that are there with us? In any case, India has been trying to be a permanent Member of the United Nations Security Council. It is not a member of that. What role can we play now after it is referred to the United Nations Security Council? Are we still feeling that there is room for diplomacy, and if so, on what lines is it progressing? That is something which, I am sure, we will be knowing from the hon. Prime Minister when he replies and also about what is the action that is going to be taking place.

Hon. Leader of the House mentioned about one more point. He said that the Minister of State for External Affairs, Shri E. Ahamed called on His Excellency, the President of Iran. He said, based on what transpired between them, Iran seems to be quite well disposed towards India even after this vote. I was very glad to know that. But this is our version. I would like to know whether the Iranian Government have issued any official statement confirming that Iran also believes in continuing the relations with India. I would like to know what is the status now of our on-going negotiations with Iran on various oil related issues, whether it is the pipeline or whether it is the supply of natural gas? What is the relationship that is going to take place now? I would really like to know about it.

Thirdly, the hon. Leader of the House mentioned about a very important point that India is a very responsible country and we always have taken that position. During the time when Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was the Prime Minister of India in 1998, we took a decision, a considered decision to go nuclear for the simple reason because that was in the best interest of India. We realised to have a credible difference which is really going to help India because in the backyard and even in the front-yard, we have got countries who could be posing threat to India by using nuclear weapons. So, nuclear deterrence was considered to be the problem of India's national interest. Therefore, we did it. Therefore, he mentioned very correctly that this is the India's stated position subscribed now more or less by all the parties in the country. In that case, if Iran tomorrow decides to take a similar position and say that it would like to be weaponised for the simple reason because that is in the best interest of Iran, what would be the Indian Government's stand? I would really like to know about it from the Government.

One more point is this. North Korea is likely to be also one of the cases similar to Iran because North Korea profess that they also have similar position. There is a dialogue going on. Suppose, a similar situation develops which compels the Government of India to vote against it in the IAEA meeting. What will be India's stand in relation to North Korea? I would like to know about it.

There are two issues and I will end. We have been for a long period of time, saying that we want a peaceful world, we want a world which is a nuclear free world. We believe that nuclear weapons should not destroy the humanity as is seen in front of the world. In this clear scenario, I would like to know whether the Government of India is thinking of pursuing this bigger picture, the laudable objective of making sure that the world becomes a real nuclear free world, if so, whether that agenda is spelt out. We have correctly taken a position that we are opposed to NPT because it is totally biased, it is totally blurred. Therefore, we oppose it. At the same time, in the absence of that, are we pursuing the same agenda? I would like to know about that. The Prime Minister has been saying and I agree that India does not want any more nuclear State in its backyard. In that position, what does it really mean? Where does that backyard extend to? How far we would like to go? What type of territories does it like to cover? I would like to know from the Government about this[\[p50\]](#).

16.00 hrs.

Mr. Rupchand Pal started his speech with a very interesting point that a salesman or a management student is told: "If you cannot sell, confuse." I am sure, he says that he is really confused. Now, I would like to know from him whether he would like to buy the product or he would like to reject the product.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, Mr. Mahtab. You have got five minutes to speak.

Before Mr. Mahtab starts his speech, I would request that whenever an hon. Member is addressing the Chair, please avoid frequent floor crossings.

SHRI B. MAHTAB (CUTTACK): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I stand here to discuss the Statement by the hon. Prime Minister regarding India's vote in the International Atomic Energy Agency on the issue of Iran Nuclear Programme. Here, in the *suo motu* Statement on Iran by the Prime Minister on 17th February, two things have been very notable.

The first thing is that Prime Minister has categorically stated: "As a signatory to the NPT, Iran has the legal right to develop peaceful uses of nuclear energy." The second thing is that "since 2003, when IAEA began seeking answers to a number of questions arising from Iran's nuclear activities, some of which were undeclared to the IAEA, in previous years." Subsequently in November, 2004, Iran agreed with the EU-3 -- France, Germany and the United Kingdom, to voluntarily suspend all enrichments and reprocessing activities until questions relating to its past nuclear activities were clarified. Since August last year, Iran has renewed production of uranium hexa fluoride and thereafter, has resumed uranium enrichment."

These are the four dates on which the Prime Minister has based the argument upon. I would like to dwell on these four points. The basic question which is being raised inside the House and outside the House is that if we can live with China and Pakistan, what is wrong with Iran going nuclear? If India is not a signatory to the NPT unlike China, why is India bothered about NPT violations? As India needs nuclear energy to produce electricity, so also Iran. Mere dependence on fossil fuel is giving rise to green house gases. These are the international issues.

What is that Resolution and how the Member-countries in IAEA have behaved? The first Resolution was on 24th September, 2005. Out of 35 countries in that Governing Board, 23 countries voted in favour, and India was also part of it; 11 countries abstained; and Venezuela was the only country, which voted against the Resolution. On 4th February, the vote was taken. In that vote, 27 countries voted in favour; three voted against, and five abstained. Among those who voted in favour, two were the Muslim countries, namely, Egypt and Yemen. Indonesia, Libya and Algeria abstained. Only Syria supported and voted in favour of Iran. Notable converts were Russia and China.

Sir, what is that Resolution which was adopted on 4th February?[\[KD51\]](#)

What are its implications? The Director-General of the IAEA, Nobel Prize Winner, Dr. D.L. Baradei has made it clear that the Agency's report on the Iranian compliance or otherwise has been under investigation since 2002 and it should be ready only next month, that is, March. Therefore, this Resolution is meant only to be a report to the Security Council and not a statutory referral. Russia and China which abstained last time on 24th September, have now joined hands with the West, that is, USA plus the three countries of the EU, to exert pressure on Iran to comply with the IAEA safeguards.

I would just mention here that in 1998, India unilaterally declared a moratorium on nuclear explosion during the NDA regime when Shri Vajpayee was heading the Government as the Prime Minister. This prepared a ground for agreement which was signed by the US President and Indian Prime Minister recently. Shri Vajpayee had offered military bases – this is no news and it is open to everyone – to the US when Mr. George W. Bush took military action in Afghanistan against Al Qaeda.

Iran, in 1965 and during the Bangladesh War, supported Pakistan. The Shah of Iran blamed India instead of Yahya Khan and Bhutto and called us aggressor. In the Organisation of Muslim Nations, Iran backed Pakistan in its claim over Kashmir. In 1965, during Johnson's regime, the Johnson's Administration had asked Pakistan to take tanks and arms from Iran, supplied by US, via West Germany and other European countries.

During the last 50 years, Non-alignment has undergone various changes. India has bitter memories both during the Chinese aggression and during Bangladesh war. Most of them did nothing in favour of India. Even Sukarno sided with Pakistan, who was supported to power by Jawaharlal Nehru. Nehru had never encouraged NAM to be a third force or a forum to mount a campaign against USA or the West.

I would ask a very simple question here. Recently, the CPI(M) Politburo has passed a Resolution. In that Resolution, the Government was condemned for casting its

vote in the IAEA Board of Governors' Meeting. It has condemned US; it has also condemned the other three European Union countries. But there is no mention about Russia; there is no mention about China. Why?

What is Iran's history and what is its present policy? Iran has signed a Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1968. IAEA has asked Iran to come clean. Iran permitted the UN inspectors to go through its nuclear programme. They have reported that Iran was seriously pursuing a plan to build a nuclear plant to make a bomb. Iran's Nuclear Research Programme began in 1967. US supplied nuclear research reactor to Iran. It signed the NPT in 1968 and ratified it in 1970; and it planned to construct up to 23 nuclear power stations by 2000 with the help of US and other countries[R52].

IAEA inspected most facilities regularly but in November 2005, reported that Iran has not been transparent. The problem lies that Iran today wants to be compared in its treatment as a signatory to the NPT with three nations that have not signed the Treaty; Israel, India and Pakistan, all nuclear weapon States. Can we accept Iran with the plants to enrich Uranium and re-process Plutonium which will put them just a screwdriver turn away? It is unfortunate that the Prime Minister had to be defensive on an issue of national importance. What is vitiating the atmosphere today is the attempt by some to present the vote as some kind of an affront to a specific community. This seems an insult not only to the secular character of this country but also to the common sense and patriotism of the minority community. What India has done is more of national interest. Yes, it coincides with the US viewpoint. Do not project this as some kind of a surrender ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : You may highlight only important points. Please do not go into details because time is very short.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : Sir, I would just like to mention that the foreign policy is not a holy cow. Political Parties have every right to differ with the Government. There is no rational section in India today which wants Iran, which has been quite irresponsible in its international dealings, to go nuclear. I have also mentioned that our domestic lobbyists for Iran are activated by two considerations; one stream driven by blind anti-Americanism and the second stream has other parochial considerations. I would say that India's decision is based on genuine national interest. Those who say that the Indian policy on Iran is not independent should explain whether Russia and China do

not have independent policies. How supporting Iran and opposing 26 other nations would serve India's national interest, especially shielding the 16 years of clandestine proliferation. Is it not interesting to note that those who fervently support Iran are also opposed to India having nuclear arsenal? It is difficult to understand the rationale. With these words I say that the manner in which the Government has voted in favour that it should be decided in the Security Council, I think no wrong has been done. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Gurudas Dasgupta. I may tell you that Shri Chandrapan has already taken more than half an hour. You will get only five minutes. Please cooperate.

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : सभापति महोदय, हमारी पार्टी की तरफ से चार माननीय सदस्य बोलने वाले हैं और अभी तक एक ही माननीय सदस्य बोला है, बाकी मेम्बर्स को कब बोलने का समय मिलेगा?

MR. CHAIRMAN: After him your Party Member will get a chance to speak.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA (PANSKURA): I am sorry, Sir, I must say that I am extremely sad. We are saddened, we are sorry because it seems our traditional historic and the policy which was a gift of Nehru is now sought to be forgotten. Undoubtedly, gradually India is distancing itself from Non-Alignment. India and the present Government led by Congress is also distancing from the economic policy that was pursued earlier[R53].

Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was saying that there has been a change in the world. I accept there has been a change but what is that change? The change is that the world has become uni-polar. Secondly, America -- particularly Mr. Bush -- considers itself to be the guardian of international politics. There is a change, of course, because the strong Non-Aligned Movement that we had and of which we are proud of is fast disappearing. Thirdly, India which was the leader of the Non-Aligned Movement for the reasons known to it is gradually diluting its policy. That is the change, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was talking about.

My simple question to the whole nation is that what was the need for India to vote for the resolution. We could have remained neutral. The argument that is being

given is that Russia and China voted for it. Therefore, India should vote for it. I do not buy that argument. No country is a model to us. We are our own conscience keepers. Therefore to lean upon the argument that Russia and China have voted for it therefore there was no reason why we should not vote for it, I do not buy this argument.

Then, voting for the resolution without being neutral means what. It means this will be referred to the Security Council where India has no role to play. Therefore, why do you want the matter to be referred to the Security Council? The matter could have been discussed in the Atomic Energy Commission itself. In the Atomic Energy Commission, there are enough provisions by which the violations of the Agreement can be taken care of. The whole method that America is taking today is to take the controversy to the Security Council and have a stamp on its decision and being strengthened by the so called decision of the Security Council to intensify their aggressive attack. That is what we are afraid of. Our feeling is whether we did it intentionally or without intention. We are abetting the policy of the American imperialism. That is the question I am putting to. Let us remember for once at least that it is not a question whether Iran stands betrayed. There may be a linguistic difference but the fact remains, we did not stand by Iran in the crucial hour of their own peril. We did not stand with them. What was the need for that? There was a need because we have our own economic interest with Iran. That economic interest we do not have with Pakistan but with Iran we do have.

More importantly, the Government of India is trying to influence even our economic policy. The hon. Minister has corrected his position and I thank him because the truth has come out. What is the truth? The Government of India's own public sector ONGC and China wanted to have a joint venture in Syria. Now this gentleman working in the American Embassy comes and advises not to go to Syria. Mr. Mulford advises India on economic policy. Mr. Mulford writes a letter to the Chief Minister of West Bengal and the Embassy of the same country advises India not to invest jointly even with China with whom you seem to have developed some intimacy for the time being[r54].

The Government is very intimate with them now. Even they are opposing a joint investment in Syria. Therefore, taking all these factors together, the American imperialism, the Bush Administration would like very much to influence the economic

policies of India. At the same time, they would also seek to dictate or try to influence, if the Congress party is little allergic to the use of the word 'dictate' then I can replace it with 'influence' and if they are angry with the use of the word 'surrender' then I can substitute that word with 'tilt', and this tilt is taking place in the background of their overall supervision of Indian politics. America is, in fact, supervising India. It reminds me of a book, titled 'American shadow lengthening over Indian sub-continent'. That was by Shri Natarajan many

years ago. Today it seems that it is applicable. Therefore, we are alarmed; therefore, there is an element of suspicion; therefore, there is an element of distrust and therefore, there is an element of anger.

Why did the Government vote? Why did the Government not remain neutral? What would have been the difference? The hon. Prime Minister has opted not to reply to the debate today. I take exception to this. The hon. Prime Minister had the time to make a statement on the Atomic policy, but he does not have the time to reply to the debate because he feels that after only Mr. Bush has left India that he can speak out freely. I am sorry that I have to ask this question. After all, it is great India that he represents. Is it that Dr. Manmohan Singh, the hon. Prime Minister of the country believes that the reply should be given after Mr. Bush has left India? What could have been the reasons for that?

Sir, I have a definite feeling that India is deviating from the policy of non-alignment. The meeting that took place on the sidelines of the Energy Commission, that meeting was presided over by Malaysia and not India. We are losing our position. We are losing our position amongst many non-aligned nations. We are losing our position with regard to America. Why did India vote and not remain neutral? India had to vote for it because we have accepted America virtually as the undeclared guardian of Indian politics. Mr. Mulford is here to speak on regional trade, another gentleman is here to ask India not to make investment in Syria and America is there to speak on the politics of the Left. This was not the environment during the time of the late Indira Gandhi or during the time of the late Jawaharlal Nehru. Maybe, this is the change that Shri Pranab Mukherjee was referring to.

Sir, living in a uni-polar world, India must stand on its own foot firmly to speak firmly and take a stand saying that thus far and no further. Let us not speak of world

changes, but let us say that we have our own courage to face even the strongest military power of world. By doing so India can re-emerge as the leader of the non-alignment movement. Perhaps, now we are losing much and gaining

nothing. Maybe, the Government is gaining the friendship of Mr. Bush but we are losing the goodwill of the non-aligned nations and definitely they are losing the goodwill of the Left, at least on the issue of foreign policy[[snb55](#)]. This is not [[bru56](#)]a warning. This a sad expression of the unfortunate development that is overtaking the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Sachin Pilot may speak now.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA : Sir, what about the proportional time to be given to different parties?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will be called later. The second round has not begun.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA : Second round means our turn will come after 43 Members..

MR. CHAIRMAN: You would not lose a minute. You will get the time allotted to you without losing a minute. All your party Members will be called. I assure you on that point. Nobody will lose even a minute. From Shri Sachin Pilot, we will be taking the second round. With Shri Sachin Pilot, the second round is starting.

SHRI SACHIN PILOT (DAUSA):Sir, we are debating, in this august House, a very important topic and, I think before I proceed, it is important to place on record a few facts.

A lot has been said earlier about the relationship between India and Iran. The previous speaker was talking about how the Indian people and the Indian Government have let down or betrayed the people of Iran. Let me reassure you Sir, and through

you to this august House, that when it comes down to supporting the Iranians in their crisis and in their natural calamities, the Indian people and the Indian Government have stood by the Iranians and will continue to do so in future. Many centuries before even Christopher Columbus discovered United States of America a few hundred years ago, the Indian people and the Iranians were trading, having links, were travelling and doing commerce. It is in the late 1960s that Iran chose to sign the Non-proliferation Treaty. Trade between India and Iran is approximately around 5.5 to 6 million dollars. The relationship between the two countries will continue to be strong. But, as on today, India has certain needs. India has to import 75 per cent of its energy requirements from overseas and its percentage is bound to grow by 90 per cent by 2015. We have energy independence, and energy security is of crucial importance. That is why, the Prime Minister has stated that the proposed pipeline is under consideration. Experts are evaluating it and we are committed to the pipeline.

A question was raised about what was the need and what was the national security concern in which Government of India took the stand that we took at the IAEA Board. The Middle East has 35 lakh Indian nationals working there. It is stated that the Government policy is that we do not want to have another nuclear power in our extended neighbourhood.

16.29 hrs.

(Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav *in the Chair*)

Keeping in mind all the decisions that are taken at the IAEA, we find that there are only two occasions when vote was required to be cast. In the past, India has favoured diplomatic efforts and it has favoured dialogues to resolve long pending issues. And 2003 was the time when certain events came to light and certain clandestine nuclear activities were directly linked to the now famous A.Q. Khan of Pakistan. It was not in our national interest to allow any country in our extended neighbourhood to possess such a nuclear capability.

Iran is a very important country for India. It has 900 trillion cubic feet of natural gas which is second only after Russia. We look forward to having energy cooperation with Iran. It is important also to understand the circumstances which arose when the Indian Government took the stand that it took [\[bru57\]](#).

There was a talk about why we did not abstain from voting.

Sir, I would like to point out that it was because of the efforts of the Indian Government that many times this decision was deferred and voting was not required. When it came down to the vote, of the 35 members of the Governing Body of the IAEA, only three countries, namely, Syria, Cuba and Venezuela voted against it. Indonesia, Algeria and South Africa were among the five countries who abstained. More importantly, now I felt, and the Government also feels, that there is a growing world opinion and India has long stated that we stand for complete disarmament. But India is a country that has not signed on the NPT. Therefore, it is wrong to equate any other country with India. We are not a signatory to the NPT. We stand by 'No-first-use'. We stand by peace. In our thousands of years' history, there has not been a single instance of external aggression. The only time we have had armed conflict is to protect our own territory. We stand as a peaceful country. I think, it is important for us to export that ideology around the world.

The hon. Prime Minister also made a *suo motu* statement in Parliament about our position on Iran. Sir, it is very clear that the Government's policy is to extend all support for any country which engages in producing energy through nuclear means. France, for example, produces 85 per cent of its energy through nuclear means. India is also reaching out to do the same and follow in generating electricity through nuclear power. It is a legitimate right of every country, including Iran, to engage in generating electricity through nuclear technology. India has been a supportive of that. But if a certain country is not living up to its obligations to its people and to the world community, it is also important for us to realize that India is now being looked upon a global power. We have to discharge our responsibility according to our position, our geopolitical position, not only in South Asia but on a multilateral platform, on world

platform. That is why, the Government took a decision to understand and to realize the changed global realities. It is wrong to say that we are choosing between US and Iran. India is not a small country where we have to make a decision under pressure.

I would like to remind you that during our late Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, when we were engaged in liberating the then East Pakistan in 1971, the Americans threatened to send the seventh fleet to the Bay of Bengal. We did not deter. In a large country of a billion people we are much stronger than we think we are. It is all that confidence which gives us the courage to take a decision on world platform, on global platforms, which only follows these strategic national interests of our country. That is the only objective of the Indian Government. The foreign policy is not a case of ownership of this Government or that Government. It is a continuous policy. This Government has nothing but strengthened our national interest not only in the neighbourhood but around the world.

Sir, I am hopeful that not only this august House, the political parties they represent here but the people in the country will realize that while moving forward into the future, the kind of responsibility that is being pushed, ushered upon the shoulders of the Indian Government, we are in a position of strength to discharge them. As far as the nuclear issue is concerned, if it is for peaceful purpose which India is always professing. Iran is more than welcome to do that. But if the obligations are not met, if responsibilities are not discharged, then, I think, the world looks upon India to play a crucial and important role which is what the Indian Government has done. I hope, this august House and the people outside will continue to support the Indian Government and its policies to make a point and to prove that we are here for nuclear energy that is processed on peaceful means. But any activity that is undertaken, which does not serve our national interest, we will stand up and we will make sure that we are heard.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, I endorse the foreign policy stand taken by the Government with regard to Iran, though I do not appreciate the way it was done[\[mks58\]](#).

It is not in India's interest to see that Iran acquired nuclear weapons. India can clearly neither ignore nor minimise the strategic implications and the adverse consequences of Iran acquiring nuclear weapons.

With regard to that, when we discuss about the IAEA Board Meeting and the Resolution of 5th February, 2006, we have to compare it with the Resolution that was taken up on 24th September, 2005. When we compare the two, we can clearly see that there is a climb down by the Western countries led by the United States of America. The new Resolution does not find that Iran's action constitutes any non-compliance in view of the article XI (LC) of the IAEA Charter. It simply requires the Director General of the IAEA to report, not to refer as mentioned by Shri Pal, to the Security Council that certain steps are required to be taken by Iran. This Resolution will not trigger any punitive action by the Security Council on Iran. The report is intended to keep diplomatic efforts on track; to enable the Director General of the IAEA to pursue his line of investigation including interviewing the relevant scientists to get to the bottom of Iran's nuclear activities. The new Resolution is also not a value judgement on Iran's action. It is only expected Iran needs to satisfy the international community that its nuclear programme is exclusively for peaceful purposes. Being a signatory to the NTP, should Iran not discharge its obligations and its commitments? India has no quarrels with the list of Confidence Building Measures which are considered necessary such as suspension of enrichment of uranium; ratification of the additional protocol, implementation of the transparent measures. By bringing the Confidence Building Measures to the Security Council, the Board has established new parameters for the responsible behaviour by Iran.

I will make another point. Is it not true that the new Resolution takes note of a document in Iran's possession which deals with production of uranium metal hemisphere which is related to fabrication of nuclear weapon components? What does it mean? It means that Iran has left all options open in its pursuit to nuclear technology. That is why, it is potently in India's interest to have been in the forefront of the vast majority of the international community questioning the many clandestine devices through which nuclear technology, nuclear materials have been transferred to Iran from Pakistan. My point is here. Why did the UPA Government, the Prime Minister or the External Affairs Minister, not do so? Please contrast the behaviour, the attitude of the Government of India with the assertiveness of Egypt in the IAEA vote. What is it that the Egypt did? Egypt did get a reluctant United States of America to accept an amendment to the Resolution implicitly critical of Israel's nuclear monopoly of the Middle-East. But it is very much surprising that while making a statement in this august House, the Prime Minister did not even mention the name of Pakistan. What did he say? He rather said that Iran's use of centrifuges were imported from third countries. I repeat the words "third countries[R59]."

Which are the countries from where this was imported? It was only from Pakistan. Everybody knows that the father of the nuclear bomb in Pakistan, Dr. A.Q. Khan opened a super market, a black market of this nuclear technology in the world. He supplied this nuclear technology clandestinely not only to Iran, he supplied it to North Korea, to Libya and everywhere. But we kept mum. Why did the Government of India not insist that this resolution should be passed only after it is ascertained that from which country it has been imported by Iran? So, that is a failure. Sir, the impression that this UPA Government has given, it might have done certain things, but the impression that it has given is that it has functioned under pressure. It has functioned just like a rubber stamp. It has functioned under pressure from some other country, whereas India should have taken the lead. If India wants to become a superpower, is it the behaviour of this country to simply follow the dictates of another country? This is the impression that has gone to the people. This is the impression that has gone to the entire world. So, that is where my objection lies that this Government has failed there.

Secondly, the hon. Members from the Left are specifically talking about the Non Aligned Movement. India was a leading member of this Non Aligned

Movement. So, that is why Iran was with us. So, it is our responsibility to be with Iran for all time to come. Sir, what sort of Non Aligned movement we were in? I will just give you one example. Forcing this country to pass a resolution against the United States of America for attacking Iraq and keeping mum while USSR was attacking and was entering Afghanistan, occupying Poland, occupying Czechoslovakia, was it the responsibility of a nonaligned country like India? India was never a nonaligned country. During the time of the cold war, India was with USSR. That was the main reason for which we lost 50 years in quarreling with the biggest democracy of the world which is the United States of America. That was the main reason for which the United States of America was against us. Now, the entire world saw that. Anybody who was born before 1917 saw during his lifetime the evolution of an ideology and the fall and collapse of the same ideology also, which was so fragile. That is what I meant to say. The UPA Government should not listen to what the Left says. They should only go by the national interest. They should only go by, as has already been mentioned, by the enlightened self-interest of this country. To me and to BJP what is the meaning of this enlightened self-interest, the Non Aligned Movement? The Non Aligned Movement for India means being able to take its own decision independently. I fear that probably we have not been able to do it. India was able to take...
(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I will just complete, Sir. India was only able to take this independent decision during the time of the NDA Government led by Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee and which this UPA Government has failed miserably. That is what my charge is.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : My name has been taken, Sir. I am just reading a part of the 4th February report.

“Request the DG to report on the implementation of this and previous resolution to the next regular session of the board for its consideration and immediately thereafter to convey together with any resolution from the

March board that report to the Security Council, convey to the Security Council for the benefit.[\[a60\]](#)”

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI (HYDERABAD): Mr. Chairman, Sir, India's vote in favour of the Resolution at the IAEA was not simply a foreign policy issue, but a question related to the direction the country was taking while entering a new world order. At the same time, our foreign policy was compromised. We departed from the age-old tradition of Non-Alignment Movement, which, I still feel that in the present international scenario, there is more need for the Non-Alignment Movement than it was before. To stop the hegemony of US, I think the nation should rise once again to revive the Non-Alignment Movement.

Sir, the whole controversy started on the 9th of February, 2003 when then Iranian President Mohammad Khatami had gone on record and stated and showed Iran's programme and efforts for building sophisticated facilities at Natans Nuclear Reactor. One of the IAEA Safeguards Agreement says that a country has to declare the starting of construction or they have to stipulate within 180 days before introducing any nuclear facility. Iran did not violate any of the agreements of the IAEA by showing the facility at Natans.

Secondly, what would be the stand of US if tomorrow Iran says that the IAEA Charter gives it the right to go out of the IAEA because it is in their country's superior interest?

Thirdly, Iran's nuclear programme started in 1960s under the auspices of the US. They had a bilateral agreement. The United States of America had encouraged Shah of Iran to go for it. In fact, Stanford Research Institute had done a survey in 1973 stating that by 1990 Iran would require 20,000 megawatt of electrical power supply. Then, in 1975, Massachusetts Institute of Technology signed a contract with the Atomic Energy Department of Iran to train Iranian nuclear engineers. So, this programme was started by the US. After the Islamic Revolution of 1979, America developed cold feet. Iran was not interested in its nuclear programme. After the

bombing of Israel on the Iraqi nuclear reactor, Iranians had said that they have to go in for a nuclear programme and that too for civilian purposes.

Sir, as of now, Iran's oil production is 70 per cent compared to pre-revolutionary level. Does Iran not have a right to go for civilian nuclear energy programme when it is a member of NPT? This is a blatant example of American imperialism. America is using IAEA to settle its scores with Iran. It has clearly stated that in the axis of evil North Korea is there, Iran is there and Syria is there. They have destroyed Afghanistan, they have destroyed Iraq and now they want to go and destroy Iran under the guise of IAEA Resolution.

My next point is, Iran had always stated that any Western country is welcome to come and complete the Buser II Civilian Nuclear Reactor. It was agreeing to any Western country could come and do that. But Americans had always stopped the Czechoslovakians and the West Germans from going and completing that nuclear reactor. Here I want to give one example. The nuclear plant in the Czech Republic which was started by the then Soviet Union was halted in 1992. In 1994, a guarantee of \$317 was given by the US Export Import Bank and an American electrical company participated and completed this nuclear reactor.

Sir, I would now bring out the political fall-out of this decision of our country. First of all, it gives a bad taste in the mouth, especially for my party to stand in the same league wherein the BJP is supporting the Government. The formation of this UPA Government was for upholding certain principles and I believe and my party believes that we cannot stand with any decision wherein the BJP is supporting this Government. ... (*Interruptions* [\[k61\]](#))

When [\[r62\]](#) America asked them to walk, they crawled. We do not want this Government to do that. I do not want to argue. Let me complete please... (*Interruptions*) They did crawl. We know what happened with all other things. I do not want to mention them over here... (*Interruptions*) I know it is in the national interest. I am laying my view point in the national interest.

Sir, what are the apprehensions of Iran? The apprehensions of Iran are that US will attack it, Israel will attack it, in its neighbourhood there are 150,000 US troops in Iraq and also already President Bush has signed, in January 2003, a plan called CONPLAN 1822, wherein President Bush has clearly stated that this plan envisages a deployment of mini-nukes to target underground sites in Iran.

What will be the fall-out of this Iran issue? India imports 90 million tonnes of crude oil. If there is a slight increase of one dollar, there is an additional burden on the Exchequer of 650 million dollars. I would request the Government that on March the 6th when the issue comes up, we have to change our stand. You must also look into this that after Iran there are more than two crores Shia Muslims living in our country. There is going to be a huge political fall-out. They can get their own information on what is happening in Kerala, what is happening in West Bengal, what is going to happen in Tamil Nadu. We are here so that the secular forces get strengthened.

Sir, I would like to bring one last point to the notice of this House and then end my speech that this decision has not gone down well with the secular minded people, especially the Muslim minority.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Now, this Government has come to this phase... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record. Shri Swain, please take your seat.

(Interruptions) ...*

* Not Recorded.

SHRI SUBRATA BOSE (BARASAT): Mr. Chairman Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to participate in the discussion under Rule 193 initiated by hon. Member Shri C.K. Chandrappan.

When we recall the Government of India's action in the last meeting in February of the Atomic Energy Agency and also think about the next meeting of the same authority on the 6th of March, we cannot but recall the happenings in Iraq before the American onslaught on the country took place. There also, more or less, a similar situation took place. You see, accusation and allegations were made against Iraq, which were ultimately found to be wrong or not based on facts. But we saw the onslaught of America on Iraq.

Since, for the last so many months, after the Iraq assault, America has been threatening Iran and Syria. We can foresee what the Americans' intentions are vis-à-vis Iran in the near future. In this matter, I think, India's decision at the last meeting of referring Iran's matter of the nuclear energy to the Security Council, which is again going to come up on the 6th March, has certainly not being well received in the country.

I have been listening with great attention to the intervention made by the hon. Minister of Defence, where he spoke at length, I felt that his intervention did not really explain India's change in stand between the period pre-September and post-September[r63].

What necessitated India to vote in favour of the Resolution which wanted or desired that this matter should be referred to the Security Council, I think, has not yet been very clearly explained to the people of India.

Sir, we have been talking about independent foreign policy of India, which India has been pursuing and which we want India to pursue. The foreign policy of a country is always guided by the fact that whether an issue is in its national interest or it is not in its national interest. If we always remember that what will be in the interest of our country, then we can be sure also that an independent foreign policy will emerge on

all issues facing the countries of the world. I think, in this matter India has to consider very deeply whether, in the meeting on the 6th March, we should reverse the stand that we have taken last February. I think, the time is still there for us to make our position change and clearly tell the world that we follow an independent policy and we are not guided and not pressured by any country however powerful that country may be.

I, therefore, appeal to the Government and also to the hon. Prime Minister who holds today the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to consider deeply what the country feels about it, what should be in the interest of India, and then only take steps or take a stand on the 6th March, which stand should satisfy the people of India that the Government has taken the stand in the national interest and we are following an independent foreign policy. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude now.

SHRI SUBRATA BOSE : Sir, I have done.

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO (KALAHANDI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this discussion has been initiated by Shri C.K. Chandrappan. When I heard him speaking, there was a lot of China-centric views which he projected here. China has abstained from voting in the IAEA meeting, and so also he suggested that India should have abstained from voting. But, Sir, in today's world, the biggest threat facing us is fundamental terrorism. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : Religious fundamentalists like RSS ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : Not RSS but like *fidayeen*, *jihad* which have disturbed the entire world and has disturbed the equation. ... (*Interruptions*)

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी : ज़ेहाद का ईरान के साथ क्या लेना-देना है ?... (ब्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : कोई असंगत बातें प्रोसीडिंग में नहीं जाएंगी। Please take your seat.

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : Sir, it was only after 9/11 the Americans realized the threat of terrorism but India had been fighting terrorism since 1947[[lh64](#)].

17.00 hrs.

We have been fighting terrorism since 1947. So, when the question of voting against Iran's nuclear facilities came in the IAEA, I think it was right on the part of the Government which has taken this step. But at the same time, there has been a diplomatic flaw. There has been a flaw by the MEA of the ruling Government because previously it had been seen that whenever a foreign policy decision is taken—foreign policy is a non-partisan issue—all the Parties get united, then a foreign policy framework is initiated and it is moved. This was done by the last NDA Government. So, this flaw should not be repeated in future. When a foreign policy statement or a resolution of a reference is made, the view of the Opposition, the view of the House and the view of the people should have been taken whereas this UPA Government unilaterally took action. This is completely wrong as per India's diplomatic statesmen.

Here I would not like to repeat the voting pattern because everybody has said about the same thing. It is because we have got a research paper from the same place. Here, I would like to refer to the speech of the hon. Leader of the House, hon. Pranab Mukherjee. He was mentioning about the old theory of balance of powers, which is not relevant today. What is relevant today? Terrorism is relevant today. We have to fight it. We have to fight terrorism and to do that, action should be taken against all the terrorists, fundamental countries and theocratic States which are uniting against democracies to disturb democracies. They have initiated a lot of action.

For example, today the President of Iran goes on record. He has said Israel should be wiped out from the map of the world. He has gone on record. A homeland was created for the Israeli people. They suffered during the Second World War in the gas chambers and in the prison camps of the fascist regime. A homeland was created for them. Do you want to wipe out that country? It cannot be done.

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI : From whom? From whose land, Israel was created? It is from the Palestinian land.

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : It is their own land. It was their land before.

Therefore, now the connection between Iran and Pakistan comes to fore. When the hon. Prime Minister made his statement, he never mentioned about Pakistan. He never mentioned about the A.Q. Khan connections. A.Q. Khan was the profounder of the Islamic bomb. I am not saying this from my own brain. I am reading this from the newspapers. From magazines and from articles, we come to know that the profounder of the Islamic bomb was Mr. A.Q. Khan who supplied P2 centrifuges to Iran. This was known through his Malaysian connections.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : Therefore, I would like to say here that the move, which the UPA Government made unilaterally, should not have been done. Otherwise, we support it because the same terrorism could have been imported to our country in future. We have already faced it in Parliament. The terrorist attack, the *fidayeen* attack had taken place here in Parliament. It had taken place in Ayodhya. It had taken place in various parts of the country. Recently, our scientist was killed in Bangalore.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record.

(*Interruptions*)* ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. Now, Prof. M. Ramadass.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record except the speech of Prof. M. Ramadass.

(Interruptions) ...*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record except the speech of Prof. M. Ramadass.

(Interruptions) ...*

* Not Recorded.

PROF. M. RAMADASS (PONDICHERRY): Sir, I rise to support the *suo moto* statement made by the Hon. Prime Minister on Iran issue. In fact, I appreciate and applaud his transparent approach of providing the factual position leading to India's vote in International Atomic Energy Agency on 5.2.2006. When large amount of concerns were expressed and apprehensions were mounting high in the country, the hon. Prime Minister came to the House of the People of India and he was willing to give the factual position about the Iran issue in the House of the People. Therefore, we should all appreciate whole-heartedly his bold approach of coming on his own and presenting the case.

Sir, I perused every word of the statement of the hon. Prime Minister which gives the whole background to the issue, affirms our long-term ties and friendship with Iran and also promises that India will continue to maintain this friendship with Iran without any jeopardy. It also gives a commitment that before the UN Security Council initiates its action, it will pursue all the diplomatic efforts to resolve this issue in an amicable way.

Sir, I am unable to agree with many of the views expressed by our friends on the other side who said that India, by voting on Iran issue, has bartered its interests, that it has betrayed Iran, that it has surrendered its independent policy to USA and it is trying to dance to the tunes of somebody. I totally disagree with all these allegations because they have not been borne out of substantial facts.

I listened with rapt attention to what Shri C. K. Chandrappan spoke. He spoke for 30 minutes. Only at the last one minute, he said that India should have abstained from voting. No other argument is given as to how the interests of India would suffer on account of voting against Iran on 5.2.2006. They have not also substantiated as to how our independent policy has been sacrificed. In fact, if you look into the background in which the Iran issue has come up, we have nothing to fear that Iran has been building up arms. But there are a number of suspicions on the Iran's capability of using nuclear power both for civilian purpose as well as for the nuclear weapons. Iran is suspected to be enriching uranium in order to produce nuclear weapons.

A.Q. Khan of Pakistan named Iran as one of the countries, others being Libya and North Korea, which was involved in clandestine nuclear proliferation by his network. The threat of a nuclear-weapons State in the neighbourhood would be detrimental to India's interests. This concern is exacerbated by the local politics of the region which has seen a number of conflicts like Iran-Iraq war and two Gulf Wars as well as there is a regime change in Iran in 1979. The possibility of an unstable political control in a nuclear-weapons armed-State could have grave consequences for India. For example, the statement by Iran's current leadership to wipe out Israel off the map indicates its willingness to tread dangerous ground.

Now, our stand in IAEA may help us to know the intention of nuclear programme of Iran. We have not done anything against Iran in this regard. We want only an intentional suspicion about Iran to be cleared. We have not voted for a war on

Iran nor for military occupation by the US and, therefore, we should not say that our interest is jeopardised or the interest of Iran is at stake by our vote.

We have been trying to find out an acceptable solution to Iran issue through various compromises. In fact, we are caught in a dilemma and had to strike a balance. On the one hand, we had to uphold Iran's rights under the NPT and at the same time look at the concern of the international community. From 2004 India has been playing a leading role in arriving at a consensus on Iran issue. We have tried to mobilise the world opinion in favour of Iran and we should remember that we are only one among the 35 countries and we alone cannot do anything in the Board of IAEA except going along with the bigger powers. India being one of the major parties of the world had to vote for the Resolution of 5th February.

What is the nature of this Resolution? This Resolution says that the Director General of IAEA will inform the U.N. Security Council about the negotiations that are going on and secondly before March there will be a Board meeting where the final decision will be taken. Even if a final decision is taken, it is not going to a war against Iran or against anybody; but it is only to ask Iran to show whether they have weapons or not. Therefore, the Government has not done anything against betraying the interest of Iran in this case. It also says that the U.N. Security Council should not precipitate any action before March. So, only if all these negotiations fail, then the U.N. Security Council will enter into the scene.

The argument that India has been subjected to pressure by U.S. is also not correct. We have not succumbed to any pressure. Our hon. Prime Minister would be the last person to yield to any pressure of the U.S. The Hon. Prime Minister is first and foremost a patriot, a nationalist and then only an economist and Prime Minister. Therefore, nobody need to have any doubt about his integrity. By voting against Iran, the Government has not sacrificed any of the public interest of India. Therefore, I fully support the statement of the Government. I would only wish to say that when our interest coincides with the interest of the international community we should not say that we are aligning with the U.S. We have never danced to the tunes of America whenever they wanted. For instance, when America wanted India to send its troops to Iraq, when Iraq was in hostility with the U.S., we did not send our troops. At that time

NDA was in power. The whole Government, including the Congress Party, pledged not to send the weapons or the Army to Iraq and we defied the whip of USA.

Therefore, when something is not in consonance with the public interest or national interest, we have not sided with anybody. But whenever the interests are coinciding, we are supporting and they are supporting us.

Today we must understand that India is a global power. India is emerging as one of the major powers and we cannot isolate ourselves for various reasons. Therefore, I would only request the people not to emotionalize this issue but think calmly with a restraint and understand the issues and lead the people of this country to greater achievements. Let us not blame each other by giving rhetoric statements.

SHRI DUSHYANT SINGH (JHALAWAR): Sir, I rise to speak on a very important debate. I would like to endorse the view of the UPA Government, but not in the way as they have carried it out on the Iran vote. The way they carried it on with the Iran vote I do not endorse that. I would begin by saying that India and Iran have traditional ties and we had friendly relationships with Iran during the ancient times. India has always worked on wide range of issues with Iran. Especially in recent times we are working on the issue of Iran-Pakistan-India pipeline. I must bring to your notice that Iran is a major oil and gas centre. We need gas to be used for the *aam aadmi*. So, we need to work and cooperate within the region also.

At this stage, I must also mention that Iran signed the NPT and it should conform to the NPT. The Iran issue could be seen since 2003 and it is mentioned in the Prime Minister's statement in the first page[\[krr65\]](#).

It says that these rights and obligations must also be seen in the context of the development since 2003 when IAEA began seeking answers for a number of questions arising from Iran's nuclear activities. I must say at this stage that the UPA Government has grossly mismanaged India's vote in the IAEA regarding Iran issue and it did not take into consideration the entire Parliament, all the political parties. When the Government was led by our former Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, everyone was consulted. Under his leadership, he took into consideration all the

political parties. He brought everyone together and considerations of all political parties were taken into account.

The Prime Minister's statement goes on to state that our neighbour has always assisted Iran. I would like to ask the UPA Government who is this neighbour. In the statement, he has mentioned at page 2 that such clandestine proliferation of sensitive technologies lies in our neighbourhood. Who is that neighbour which has been providing assistance to Iran? Let the Government state who that neighbour is.

Sir, I must also say that India is a sovereign country. We must think for our nation as a whole, cutting across party lines and no one should be directing us in any manner, in any of the things. We feel that it has been the West. The western powers have always looked at us as an emerging market-country. Right now, we are becoming a global super-power. We have our own foreign policy and no one should be telling us what to do. I must say that we have been pressurised and hassled by the West and the US with regard to this vote, but we must consider our national issues ourselves and we must have broad consultations to bring the state of our national issues together.

-

17.18 hrs.

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

At this stage, I must say that we are proud of our former Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee for making India a nuclear power State and creating new avenues and vistas for our country. He has created a step on which we have taken the country forward.

I must end by saying that we must bring all of us together, and proper consultations should have taken place prior to the Iran vote. I wish, this would happen in future.

SHRI KINJARAPU YERRANNAIDU (SRIKAKULAM): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on this very important matter. This is the testing time for India and India is at the crossroads whether to follow the path of Non-Aligned Movement and independent policy that we have been pursuing since our Independence or to succumb to the pressure of a few developed countries.

We are not opposed to the US as such; we are only opposing the policies being adopted by the US administration under the leadership of Mr. Bush. You know and all the Members are also aware of the stand the US had taken during our 1971 conflict with Pakistan. The US had moved its fleet to wage a war against us during 1971 War. Hon. Prime Minister has said in his statement that it is a matter of concern for us that there is tension in this region where our vital political, economic and security interests are involved, which affect us. Do we sincerely feel that Iran is the only potent threat to India? Does this region not have any threat from the other Middle East countries? We are also surrounded by three nuclear powers. Let us build national consensus on this issue. What happened during the NDA regime? We had to send our troops to Iraq, but the Government of India, at that time, had debated that issue on the floor of the House. We had a national consensus on the issue of our foreign policy[\[reporter66\]](#).

Why are we unnecessarily deviating from our norms, and our independent foreign policy? This is my question.

I earnestly urge our hon. Prime Minister that we have had to vote twice, and we voted against Iran in the IAEA. It would be better if we abstain from voting the third time. A lot of countries are abstaining from voting including the NAM, and developing countries also. This time also we have to vote on the Iran's proposal with Russia. Therefore, we have to come out with a proposal. If there is a proposal and it is settled peacefully, then there is no question of any conflict. Hence, we have to use our diplomatic channels also.

Once a matter is reported to the United Nations Security Council, then it comes under the purview of the United Nations Security Council. Therefore, all that happened with Iraq will happen tomorrow with Iran also. If you go through *the Telegraph* newspaper or other newspapers, then you will find that preparations are already going on in this direction. Now, negotiations are going on, and America is preparing itself to attack Iran. They are a signatory in the NPT, and there are some obligations and duties also that they have to follow. Iran also have to follow certain obligations as they are signatory in the NPT.

We are not a signatory in the NPT, but we are now going against Iran's interest. We have carried out the Pokhran test, and we have atomic power. They also have to produce energy for civilian purpose for their own country. Therefore, they are going for this. US is planning all these things because they want to wage a war against Iran.

I would humbly request the hon. Prime Minister, through you, that there should be a national consensus on this issue. Many parties are supportive on this issue. On the other hand, the Communist Party and certain other political parties are not supporting it. It means that there is no unanimity on this issue. I feel that we have to unitedly fight for our foreign policy on national issues. Therefore, my Party is against the Government's action for support in the IAEA against Iran.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Next speaker is Shri Vijayendra Pal Singh. You will be allowed to speak only for two or three minutes.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH (BHILWARA): Sir, I stand to debate on the discussion under Rule 193 on the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister on 17-02-2006 regarding vote in the IAEA on the issue of Iran's nuclear policy.

Sir, a lot has been debated on this issue, and a lot of views have come forward. One of the views that was expressed by my friends between was that : "We need to have a consensus on the foreign policy." I have always thought that we have always had a consensus on the foreign policy. In an occasion like this it is not surprising that the BJP is supporting this move. Now, you can take it that we are supporting the US

move, but it cannot be said like this. We must get together and support any move in the foreign policy in the interest of the country. This is the view that we are projecting here.

Sir, I am making the point that this support does not mean that, as such, we are against the Iranians. We have had links with them both historically and otherwise, but when it comes to the issue of national interest, then it becomes of prime importance. Therefore, we support them.

I remember in the days of Pokhran-II atomic blast, most of the countries, which were very very friendly with us like Japan, Australia, a lot of European countries, etc. became our enemies at that time[\[ak67\]](#).

They thought that India has done something which is not in their interest and they thought that they must not support India on this issue, but that does not mean that they became enemies for ever. That is what I am saying here that we have had very good relationship with Iran. There were times when they were against us also on the issue of 1965 War and on other issues. But in this post-Cold War era, we have to consider our national importance as the main theme.

Let me also talk about NAM, which my friends had referred to. NAM is not today, what it was at one time. It has lost its relevance. I do not know what NAM means today. In the post-Cold War, I feel that NAM has lost its importance and that is not an issue today.

SHRI TATHAGATA SATPATHY (DHENKANAL): Sir, there is a saying in Oriya: “.रु वर्ग कु निसुणी नाही, बडा बढिया कु जवाब नाही।” The loose translation of that would be, “There is no ladder to Heaven, and you cannot retort to the biggies.”

Sir, many learned colleagues have already spoken extensively on this issue and we see a common platform for both the biggies -- the Congress and the BJP. They join hands where it suits them. It has to be taken into consideration that the enlightened foreign policy of an illustrious ex-World Bank Economist must be very clearly understood. Rome had enlightened Europe. We have to now consider which part of Europe is enlightening the foreign policy of India. Is it the same enlightenment that made this Government to take a head-count of all Muslim soldiers in the Indian Army? It has to be given very serious thought.

We, members of the Biju Janata Dal, are all small fries, I mean, the small, little parties in this august House. When the biggies join, like I said, obviously, we have no role to play, whether it is my friend sitting at the back or people like us. ...
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That interruption will not go on record. Only the speech of Shri Tathagata Satpathy will go on record.

(Interruptions) ...*

SHRI TATHAGATA SATPATHY : Article 6 of the NPT says that all five acknowledged nuclear countries “have to make progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons clearly with the ultimate aim of eliminating these weapons.” Ultimately or unfortunately, the very five acknowledged nuclear countries are using their position and ability today to increase their economic power. Today, nuclear power is taking secondary position to economic power. We have to understand that.

* Not Recorded.

America invaded Iraq or Afghanistan or whichever other territories not with an aim to diminish the threat from terrorism or the Muslim fundamentalists, but to grab

the oil, to grab the economic resources that are available in those countries. It is a pity that we, as a country, have not been able to evolve a very clear, precise, independent foreign policy. India may dream of a world where there is complete disarmament, but Sir, it has to be taken into consideration as to whether it is possible in today's world[R68].

To be precise, there are 915 installations world-wide that are under the IAEA scrutiny. Out of these 915 installations, only 11 installations are in the known nuclear-power countries. The interesting fact is, when a country like India opts for scrutiny under IAEA and certain reactors, certain installations come under their scrutiny, they are there under their scrutiny forever. However, for those five countries, the installations that are under scrutiny can change. Today it will be that installation and tomorrow it will be another installation. There is a choice which they can play on, there is freedom.

Russia or China should never be our ideals. They are playing their own games. In our economic policy whenever we talk about anything we always compare ourselves with Russia or China. They might be biggies in their own right but India has its own path, which it has followed from the days of Mahatma Gandhi. We have to adhere to that policy. Unfortunately, the two biggies in this House have drifted away, miles away from the ideals of Mahatma Gandhi.

It is time that we also looked at our own convenience and our own needs. When we talk about energy needs of India, we only talk about sporadic supply of energy to the rural India, the true India where the agriculturists, where 85 per cent of our population lives. Electricity is a commodity which they get for two-three hours in a day. When we base our calculations, we base our calculations on that sporadic supply of energy to rural India, which the user would be best able to speak on. When we vote against Iran, we forget where our convenience lies. It is in the interest of India and we all have to be very clear about it whether anybody admits and speaks or not. It is in the interest of India to see that our energy demands of tomorrow are taken care of. Are we doing that? No, we are not doing that because America does not want us to do that.

We can remove the Petroleum Minister in India at the behest of America. He is not a colleague of mine; he does not belong to my party although it would have been great if one of my party members would have been the Petroleum Minister. The

Petroleum Minister can be removed because he does not suit the desires of America. Like the WMDs of Iraq, which never ever surfaced even after Iraq has been under occupation for a year, when they talk about the nuclear possibilities or nuclear capabilities of Iran, they are possibilities or capabilities as thought of, or as dreamt of, by the US. It is not the situation in reality.

If the US thinks that it now needs the oil of Iran, India will raise its hand and say, 'Yahoo! Let us do it.' If you have China which is an atomic power sitting next to you with lots of bombs, if you have Pakistan sitting right next to you with more bombs, what difference does it make if Iran also has bombs?

To sum up my speech I would say this much. You have today a unipolar world. You have to consider what exactly you want. Total disarmament is India's dream. Very good! But is that possible? No. So, what is the alternative? Total armament. Let everybody be armed. That is the best deterrent against any mischief monger.

We have to consider this and we have to take a view where the enlightened opinion of an economist does not come into play in our foreign policy but the enlightened opinion of the people of this country comes into play.

श्री रामदास आठवले (पंढरपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यहां एक गंभीर विषय पर चर्चा चल रही है।... (व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप भी गंभीर ही रहें।

श्री रामदास आठवले : हमारे सभी दिलों का कहना है कि विदेश नीति पर हम सब की सहमति होनी चाहिए। इसलिए मैं एन.डी.ए. को इतना ही बताना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधानमंत्री जी ने यह स्टैंड लिया cè[R69]।

मानव हो या देश हो, सब को आतंकवाद से नुकसान होता है। ईरान न्युक्लीयर मामले में सरकार ने वोटिंग की है, यही हम पूछना चाहते हैं। जिस प्रकार प्रेजीडेंट बुश के सामने कोई मुस्लिम नाम आ जाये, उन्हें गुस्सा आ जाता है, उसी प्रकार अगर बी.जे.पी. के सामने कोई मुस्लिम नाम आ जाये तो उन्हें भी गुस्सा आ जाता है। मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधानमंत्री और यू.पी.ए. की सरकार ने इस मामले में जो स्टैंड लिया है, उसका हम सब को समर्थन करना चाहिये। चाहे विरोध अंदर से होता है लेकिन जब प्रेजीडेंट बुश आ रहे हैं तो अपनी अच्छी छवि दिखाने के लिये एक ऐसा वातावरण तैयार हो जायेगा तो हमें उनसे पैसा मिलेगा।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, स्व. इन्दिरा गांधी के जमाने से हम सब ने हमेशा ही आतंकवाद का विरोध किया है। अब अमरीका भी हमारी साइड में इसलिये आ गया है क्योंकि उस पर भी हमला हो चुका है। और उसने सारी दुनिया से आतंकवाद खत्म करने के लिये आह्वान किया है। इसलिये आतंकवाद के खिलाफ सब लोगों को एकत्रित होने की आवश्यकता है क्योंकि सारी दुनिया से हम लोगों को आतंकवाद खत्म करना है। बाबरी मस्जिद पर हमला करने वाले आतंकवादियों के खिलाफ एक होने की आवश्यकता है। इसलिये डा. मनमोहन सिंह ने न्युक्लीयर के बारे में जो पौलिसी बनायी है, उसका समर्थन एन.डी.ए. करे। श्री वाजपेयी जी यहां बैठे हुये हैं। हमने उन्हें इस मामले में पूरा समर्थन दिया और देश हित में हम उनका समर्थन करते रहे। अब यह काम उन लोगों को करना चाहिये। इस नीति का हमारी पार्टी समर्थन करती है। अगर आप नहीं भी करेंगे तो भी हमारा समर्थन जारी रहेगा।

SHRI SURAVARAM SUDHAKAR REDDY (NALGONDA): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are discussing the hon. Prime Minister's statement on the Iran issue. We believe that India's vote in the International Atomic Energy Agency Board of Governors in favour of United States of America is a big mistake and it is against the non-aligned policy and against the national consensus on the foreign policy. We heard several discussions from this afternoon. Of course, there are differences of opinion as to whether we are really non-aligned and as to what is non-alignment. Our learned friend, Shri Swain's interpretation of non-alignment, I do not think, even the B.J.P. will agree. The non-aligned policy of India has emerged as a consensus of all the political parties in this country, through there were some slight differences. It is an anti-imperialist policy and it is because of the anti-imperialist traditions of this country, this policy has emerged. Now, on the question of Iran, several arguments have been

raised, and I am sure, I do not think that those who are arguing in favour of this vote against Iran are really convinced of this [\[R70\]](#).

It is really not in the interest of the nation but it is in the interest of Uncle Sam. It is a very clear thing. Unfortunately, in the last one and one and a half years, we believe that the pressure on the Indian foreign policy and on the internal policy is on the increase from the USA, from the WTO, from the World Bank and all these types of organizations. It is getting reflected somewhere or other. It is not a surprise. Suddenly this type of a vote is not a surprise. What shocked all of us is this. After the first debate when there was a discussion on the Iran issue throughout the country, there was a shocking statement or a comment by the US Ambassador in India Mr. Mulford in which he openly threatened that if India votes against the wishes of the US, the nuclear deal between India and US will be stopped and the Congress may reject it. It is an uncalled for statement. We believe that the Ambassador of such a big country, openly threatening and trying to force the Government of India to change its policy is totally uncalled for. Almost all the political parties in this country have condemned it. The explanation given is that his statement was quoted out of context. It is very much in the context. The statement is in the context of the Iran vote in the International Atomic Agency. The statement is very clear. We all thought that at least after this statement, if there is some sort of indecisiveness in the Government of India whether to vote on this side or that side, as a country of self-respect, India would vote against the US pressures. But, unfortunately, instead of taking at least a neutral stand, India has decided to vote along with United States of America. It is a very unfortunate thing that even the Government of India did not feel it fit to demand that he should be called back because of this type of blatant interference in the internal affairs of any country.

Now, there are several arguments that have been raised that this voting is done in the enlightened national interest. Is it against the national consensus of this country? Has it not emerged after a long long years of debate in this country? Hon. Defence Minister Shri Pranab Mukherjee has explained at length about this national interest. He said that there was no betrayal towards Iran. He has said that Iran is a country which stood with us several times when there was a need. A country in need is a friend indeed. Unfortunately, we did not take into consideration even this aspect whether it is a betrayal of Iran or not. But it is definitely a betrayal of the non-aligned movement; it

is a betrayal of the Nehruvian policy on foreign affairs. This should be taken into consideration and this should be set right.

I think, in the last few years, never has this national consensus been so blatantly rejected. This national consensus should be kept in mind. I suggest that, like in the United States of America, this Parliament should have the right to ratify every foreign policy and it should not be left only to bureaucrats or to the decision of the Government. In the United States of America, every international agreement is to be ratified by the Congress. Our Constitution should be amended so that these types of mistakes are not repeated in future. I even say that it is not too late to set things right and the national consensus should be taken into consideration

[p71]

.

Independent Foreign Policy should be restored and India's prestige should be restored in the Non-Aligned Movement.

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to inform this august House of the status of discussions with the United States on Civil Nuclear Energy Cooperation. Substantive aspects of this are reflected in the Joint Statement of July 18, 2005 that President Bush and I agreed upon during my visit to Washington DC last year. I would like to use this occasion to outline the context and core elements of the Joint Statement, before detailing the status of the ongoing negotiations.

Hon. Members are aware that our effort to reach an understanding with the United States to enable Civil Nuclear Energy Cooperation was based on our need to

overcome the growing energy deficit that confronts us. As India strives to raise its annual GDP growth rate from the present seven to eight per cent to over 10 per cent, the energy deficit will only worsen. This may not only retard growth, it could also impose an additional burden in terms of the increased cost of importing oil and natural gas, in a scenario of sharply rising hydrocarbon prices. While we have substantial reserves of coal, excessive dependence on coal-based energy has its own implications for our environment. Nuclear technology provides a plentiful and non-polluting source of power to meet our energy needs. However, to increase the share of nuclear power in our energy mix, we need to break out of the confines imposed by inadequate reserves of natural uranium, and by international embargos that have constrained our nuclear programme for over three decades.

* (Placed in Library, See No. LT 3711/06)

Established through the vision of Pandit Jawarhal Nehru and sustained by the commitment of scientists like Dr. Homi Bhabha, our nuclear programme is truly unique. Its uniqueness lies in the breadth of its overarching vision of India mastering a three-stage nuclear programme using our vast thorium resources, and mastering more complex processes of the full nuclear fuel cycle. Consequently, our civilian and strategic programmes are deeply intertwined across the expanse of the nuclear fuel cycle. There are hardly any other countries in a similar situation. Over the years, the maturation of our nuclear programme, including the development of world-class thermal power reactors, has made it possible to contemplate some changes. These are worth considering if benefits include gaining unhindered access to nuclear material, equipment, technology and fuel from international sources.

However, international trade in nuclear material, equipment and technologies is largely determined by the Nuclear Suppliers Group -- an informal group of 45 countries. Members include the United States, Russia, France and the United Kingdom. India has been kept out of this informal arrangement and, therefore, denied access to trade in nuclear materials, equipment and various kinds of technologies.

It was with this perspective that we approached negotiations with the United States on enabling full civilian nuclear energy cooperation with India. The essence of what was agreed in Washington last July was a shared understanding of our growing energy needs. In recognition of our improved ties, the United States committed itself to a series of steps to enable bilateral and international cooperation in nuclear energy. These include adjusting domestic policies, and working with allies to adjust relevant international regimes. There was also a positive mention of possible fuel supply to the first two nuclear power reactors at Tarapur. US support was also indicated for India's inclusion as a full partner in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Research Project and the Generation IV International Forum[\[KD72\]](#).

But more importantly, in the Joint Statement, the United States implicitly acknowledged the existence of our nuclear weapons programme. There was also public recognition that as a responsible State with advanced nuclear technologies, India should acquire the same benefits and advantages as other States which have advanced nuclear technology, such as the United States. The Joint Statement offered the possibility of decades-old restrictions being set aside to create space for India's emergence as a full member of a new nuclear world order.

On our part, as the hon. Members may recall from my *suo motu* statement on July 29 last year, we committed ourselves to separating the civilian and strategic programme. However, this was to be conditional upon and reciprocal to, the United States fulfilling its side of the understanding. I had stressed that reciprocity was the key and we expected that the steps to be taken by India would be conditional upon and contingent on action taken by the United States. I had emphasised then – and I reiterate today – that no part of this process would affect or compromise our strategic programme.

I now come to the negotiations that have taken place in the past few months. While these have been principally with the US, there have been discussions with other countries like Russia, UK and France as well. At the political level, I have maintained contact with President Chirac of France, President Putin of Russia, Prime Minister Blair of the UK. I have also raised this subject with the Heads of State or Government of Norway, Republic of Korea, Netherlands, Czech Republic and Ireland – all members

of the Nuclear Supplier Group. I also met President Bush in New York last September and discussed implementation of the July 18 statement. In the same period, several American Congressional leaders and policy-makers have visited India in the past few months, many of whom met me. We have amply clarified our objective in pursuing full civil nuclear energy cooperation for our energy security and to reassure them of India's impeccable non-proliferation credentials.

At the official level, we have constituted two groups comprising key functionaries concerned with strategic and nuclear matters. They included the Department of Atomic Energy, the Ministry of External Affairs, the Armed Forces and my Office. These two groups were respectively mandated to draw up an acceptable separation plan, and to negotiate on this basis. The directive given to both groups was to ensure that our strategic nuclear programme is not compromised in any way, while striving to enlarge avenues for full civil nuclear energy cooperation with the international community. The negotiations by our officials have been extensive and prolonged. These have focussed on four critical elements: the broad contours of a Separation Plan; the list of facilities being classified as civilian; ... (*Interruptions*) the nature of safeguards applied to facilities listed in the civilian domain; ... (*Interruptions*) and the nature and scope of changes expected in US domestic laws and NSG guidelines to enable full civilian nuclear energy cooperation with India[\[R73\]](#).

Hon. Members may be assured that in deciding the contours of a separation plan, we have taken into account our current and future strategic needs and programmes after careful deliberation of all relevant factors consistent with our Nuclear doctrine. We are among very few countries to adhere to the doctrine of 'No first Use'. Our doctrine envisions a credible minimum nuclear deterrent to inflict unacceptable damage on an adversary indulging in a nuclear first strike. The facilities for this, and the required level of comfort in terms of our strategic resilience have thus been our criterion in drawing up a separation plan. Ours is a sacred trust to protect succeeding generations from a nuclear threat and we shall uphold this trust. Hon. Members may therefore be assured that in preparing a Separation Plan, there has been no erosion of the integrity of our Nuclear Doctrine, either in terms of current or future capabilities.

The Separation Plan that is being outlined is not only consistent with the imperatives of national security, it also protects our vital research and development interests. We have ensured that our three-stage nuclear programme will not be undermined or hindered by external interference. In fact, our three-stage nuclear programme may continue to receive the full support of our Government, including through the construction of new facilities. We will offer to place under safeguards only those facilities that can be identified as civilian without damaging our deterrence potential or restricting our R&D effort, or in any way compromising our autonomy of developing our three stage nuclear programme. In this process, the Department of Atomic Energy has been involved at every stage, and the separation plan has been drawn up with their inputs.

Therefore our proposed Separation Plan entails identifying in phases, a number of our thermal nuclear reactors as civilian facilities to be placed under the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards, amounting to roughly 65 per cent of the total installed thermal nuclear power capacity by the end of the separation plan period. A list of some other DAE facilities may be added to the list of facilities within the civilian domain. The Separation Plan will create a clearly defined civilian domain where IAEA safeguards apply. On our part, we are committed not to divert any nuclear material intended for the civilian domain from designated civilian use or for export to third countries without safeguards.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, negotiations are currently at a delicate stage. In our dialogue with our interlocutors, we have judged every proposal made by the US side on merits but we remain firm in that the decision of what facilities may be identified as civilian will be made by India alone and not by anyone else.

At the same time, we are not underestimating the difficulties that exist in these negotiations. There are complex issues involved. Several aspects of the nuclear programme lend themselves in the public discussions to differing interpretations, such as the Fast Breeder Programme or our fuel-cycle capabilities such as re-processing and enrichment requirements. The nature and range of strategic facilities that we consider

necessarily outside safeguards constitute yet another example. We have however conveyed to our interlocutors that while discussing the Separation Plan, there are details of the nature and content of our strategic requirements that we cannot share. We will not permit information of national security significance to be compromised in the process of negotiation[R74].

18.00 hrs.

It is essential to recall that the July 18 Statement was not about our strategic programme. It was intended to be the means to expand our civilian nuclear energy capacities and thereby to help pave the way for faster economic progress. In seeking to achieve this objective, we appreciate the need for patience to remove misperceptions that abound. I reiterate that India has an exemplary record on non-proliferation and this will continue to be so. All in all, one major achievement so far is that a change is now discernible in the international system. We believe that when implemented, the understandings reflected in the Joint Statement will give India its due place in the global nuclear order. The existence of our strategic programme is being acknowledged even while we are being invited to become a full partner in international civil nuclear energy cooperation.

I must emphasize that the nation is justly proud of the tremendous work of our nuclear scientists and the Department of Atomic Energy in mastering all the key aspects of the full nuclear fuel cycle, often under very difficult circumstances. The tremendous achievements of our scientists in mastering the complete nuclear fuel cycle – the product of their genius and perseverance – will not be frittered away. We will ensure that no impediments are put in the way of our research and development activities. We have made it clear that we cannot accept safeguards on our indigenous Fast Breeder Programme. Our scientists are confident that this technology will mature and that the programme will stabilize and become more robust through the creation of additional capacity. This will create greater opportunities for international cooperation in this area as well. An important reason why the US and other countries with advanced nuclear technologies are now engaging with India as a valued partner is precisely because of the high respect and admiration our scientists enjoy internationally, and the range and quality of the sophisticated nuclear programme they

have managed to create under the most difficult odds. This gives us confidence to engage in these negotiations as an equal partner.

As I said, many aspects of the proposed separation plan are currently under negotiation. It is true that certain assurances in the July 18 Statement remain to be fulfilled – the supply of imported fuel for Tarapur I and II, for one. Some elements, such as US support for India's participation in the ITER programme, have materialised. The issue of the nature of safeguards to be applied to facilities designated civilian also remains pending resolution. I seek the indulgence of this House not to divulge every single detail of the negotiations at this time. However, this august House can be assured that the limits are determined by our overarching commitment to national security and the related issue of the autonomy of our nuclear programme. Our Government will take no step that could circumscribe or cast a shadow over either.

I am aware that concerns have been raised over information being shared with outsiders, but not with our own citizens. Members may be assured that nothing that could compromise our nuclear deterrent has been shared with anyone. On this aspect, there is no reason for concern or doubt.

As I said at the outset, our approach is defined by the need to utilise the window of opportunity before us, to find a solution to our energy deficit. We have also been guided by the need to dismantle international restrictions, which, when achieved, could unleash our scientific talent and increase commercial potential in the nuclear and related sectors. The nation will be kept informed, through this august House.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर हाउस के माननीय सदस्य चाहें तो सदन का समय बढ़ा दिया जाए।

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री तथा सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री प्रिय रंजन दासमुंशी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, खादी और ग्रामोद्योग आयोग विधेयक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है, इसलिए सदन का समय बढ़ा दिया जाए।...(व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : ठीक है।

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Sir, when will the discussion on this take place?... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, it was decided in the meeting of the leaders in the morning that response to the Iran debate shall be made by the hon. Prime Minister and that too before six o'clock... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : When will the discussion on this statement take place?... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: You may give proper notice under the rules for a discussion on this. It is not my duty to decide about that... (*Interruptions*) First you will have to give a notice for a discussion on this ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA (PANSKURA): Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has commented upon very important points. We would like to have the opportunity of sharing our views with the hon. Prime Minister and the Government... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, if they give any notice for having a discussion on this, we have no hesitation for a discussion... (*Interruptions*)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वह बीएसी डिसाइड करेगी।

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA : Sir, but we wish that this discussion takes place as early as possible and not be linked to the visit of any dignitary... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please give notice to the office of the hon. Speaker.

The discussion under rule 193 will continue and now the House will take up Khadi and Village Industries Commission (Amendment) Bill. If the House agrees, we may extend the time of the House by one hour.

