

>

Title: Further discussion regarding issues arising out of Prime Minister's recent visit to foreign countries.

MADAM SPEAKER: The House shall now continue with the Discussion under Rule 193. Shri Basu Deb Acharia to continue.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA (GHATAL): Madam, where is the Minister?

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Madam, the External Affairs Minister is not here.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): I am taking notes.

श्री शैलेन्द्र कुमार (कौशाम्बी): महोदया, यह बहुत गंभीर मामला है। कम से कम विभाग के मंत्री जी को यहां होना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदया : ठीक है, आप शांत होकर बैठिए। अभी लीडर ऑफ हाउस बैठे हैं और उन्होंने बता दिया है कि वे नोट ले रहे हैं। आप शांत हो जाइए।

Please continue Shri Basu Deb Acharia.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Madam, yesterday while intervening in the debate the Prime Minister said with regard to availability of ENR technology, "As far as the G8 is concerned, the fact is that we have no civil nuclear cooperation agreement with G8 bloc *per se*. We have, however, signed bilateral agreements with France, Russia and the United States." We know that India first signed a bilateral agreement with the United States of America and subsequently signed bilateral agreements with France and Russia. But these are member countries of the G8 grouping. All the representatives in the meeting of G8 countries decided that they would not allow ENR technology to a country which has not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty. When they have decided so jointly and collectively, how can one of those countries separately decide to supply this technology to our country? There are three countries with nuclear weapons - India, Pakistan and North Korea - which have not signed the NPT and India is being isolated in the case of availability of enrichment and reprocessing technology.

13.37 hrs (Dr. M. Thambidurai *in the Chair*)

Sir, you know that there is a consensus in our country that we will not be party to an agreement that is discriminatory. Non-Proliferation Treaty is a discriminatory agreement. We did not agree to sign the FMCT and CTBT because those are discriminatory agreements. We will not be party to such discriminatory agreements. From the very beginning the Government of India knew that the United States of America, even after signing the agreement, made it clear that they would not supply reprocessing technology to our country. We are proud of our indigenous technology. We have our technology but this has to be updated. The main interest of the United States of America is to supply reactor and nuclear fuel. Other than reactor and nuclear fuel, they agreed to supply no item to our country. Then, how can the Prime Minister say that the exemption is unconditional and the exemption is clear? Exemption that has been given in regard to nuclear fuel is unconditional, and no conditions have been imposed.

How has he said this : The USA has proposed or rather the G-8 countries have decided collectively that they would not supply the reprocessing technology to a country which has not adhered to the non-proliferation architecture? How would the other country disobey if it has been decided like that in the G-8 countries? What will happen to our R&D in regard to nuclear technology? We will be deprived of that and we will not be able to reach the third phase, that is the thorium-phase in nuclear technology.

The Prime Minister stated in his intervention that we have developed our indigenous technology, why did we agree to sign the nuclear cooperation agreement? What was the need and necessity if we will not get ENR technology? Why should our country be deprived even after our Prime Minister said that we have got clean waiver?

The second question is on end use monitoring agreement. The Prime Minister said that this end use monitoring was in existence since 1990. Whatever equipment we have purchased from the USA, all of them are subject to end use monitoring by the USA. But it was on an *ad hoc* basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please wind up.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : There was no agreement with the USA; that has been stated by the Prime Minister, while intervening yesterday. When the agreement has been signed by India and the USA, what will happen?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Acharia, please conclude.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : This is very important, but that question has not been addressed by the Prime Minister yesterday.

The US will have the right to check whether India is using any purchased weapon for the purpose for which it was intended. This could mean a weapon system bought by India to bolster defence; say, for instance, against China or if India wants to use it against Pakistan, they will not be able to use it against Pakistan. EUMA restricts what purchasing country like India can do with US-origin defence equipment, even within its own border; you will not be able to do anything with the equipment which we purchase from the USA.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, please conclude. There are 13 more hon. Members waiting to speak; please allow others to make their speeches. The hon. Minister may reply at 3 o'clock.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: Please give me 2-3 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Already you have taken 15 minutes; yesterday also you spoke; so, you have taken 22 minutes; please wind up now.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Under the terms of EUMA, India cannot modify the purchased defence article or system in any form.

And, it also cannot prevent the buyer country from freeing itself from dependency on United States for maintenance. India would not be able to undertake maintenance of any of the equipment purchased from America. This is not so with the other countries. We have purchased a number of Defence equipment from Russia, erstwhile USSR but this end-use monitoring system was not there for the equipment purchased from other countries. This restricts India from getting ordinary US Defence equipment serviced by any other country without prior American permission. The Prime Minister has stated that the inspection will be fixed on mutually agreed date and the inspector from America will inspect the equipment supplied by America. Those inspectors will not be allowed to visit any sensitive establishment in our country. If any equipment is installed in a sensitive establishment in our country, then that equipment has to be brought to other place for inspection. This is nothing but infringement on our sovereignty, our independence. So, by signing the End-Use Monitoring Agreement with the United States of America, we have become different as with no other country this system is there. When there was an *ad hoc* arrangement, why did India sign the Agreement? Our C&AG and Air Chief has also criticised signing the Agreement with the United States of America in regard to the End-Use Monitoring. We think this is an infringement on our sovereignty. Our independence has been surrendered to the United States of America and we opposed this End-Use Monitoring Agreement which has been signed between the Government of India and the United States of America.

SHRI B. MAHTAB (CUTTACK): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I stand here to participate in the discussion, the second day, relating to the issues arising out of the Prime Minister's recent visit to foreign countries. The issues before us are manifold, no doubt, but I will confine myself to four issues;

- India Pakistan Joint Statement
- The End-Use Monitoring Agreement with the United States
- The G8 Resolution on Enrichment Technology
- The Agreement on Climate Change.

I would deduce the discussion today on two counts. One is the delinking of terrorism from composite dialogue process and the inclusion of a reference relating to Balochistan in the joint statement.

Second is, End-Use Monitoring Agreement about which the Government has fought shy of taking this House into confidence.

On July 9th the Foreign Affairs Minister Shri Krishna made a *suo motu* statement in this House on significant developments in our neighbourhood. In Para 4 of that statement the first indication of softening towards Pakistan was indicated and I would quote:

"When the Prime Minister met President Asif Ali Zardari, it was agreed that the Foreign Secretaries of India and Pakistan will discuss what Pakistan is doing and do to prevent terrorism from Pakistan against India and to bring to justice those responsible for those attacks including the horrendous crime of the attacks in Mumbai."

So, the decision to discuss was not a sudden one. After the Pakistan directed massive explosion in the Indian Embassy in Kabul last July, already a year has passed, which was followed not long after by the outrage in Mumbai, this country had suspended the composite bilateral dialogue process with Pakistan.

A condition was officially stipulated and reiterated at every opportunity that the composite dialogue could be resumed only if Pakistan gave concrete proof of moving against its nationals who attacked Mumbai and dismantling the infrastructure of terrorism on Pakistani soil. None of this thing has come to pass. We have received a dossier and the end result is only five persons.

A month ago when hon. Prime Minister, Dr. Singh met President Zardari in Yekaterinburg, he had bluntly told President Zardari that "My mandate is limited to telling you that the territory of Pakistan must not be allowed to be used for terrorism against India." But the developments show that the Prime Minister's warning went unheeded.

On 19th July this month, Indian security forces have captured two well armed Pakistani terrorists of Lashkar-e-Toiba, Mohammad Adnan and Mohammad Shafkat, who hail from Sahiwal district of Pakistani Punjab, and who infiltrated across the line of control. They have revealed that they belonged to a group of 15 militants who had been trained in Pak-occupied Kashmir to attack the Baglihar Dam in Jammu and Kashmir. They also revealed that a secret tunnel was being built near the border town of Sialkot for infiltration into India across the international border.

Three days later, Mr. Richard Barrett, Coordinator of the United Nations Security Council's Al-Qaeda and Taliban Sanctions Committee, has warned that there was a "real risk" that the Lashkar-e-Toiba would target India again. These are two instances which demonstrate that infrastructure of terrorism in Pakistan remains alive and kicking.

Let us not forget that on January 6, 2004, the Prime Minister Vajpayee and President Musharaf had jointly declared that India agreed to resume the composite dialogue process with Pakistan only after a categorical assurance from General Musharaf that the territory under Pakistan's control would not be used for terrorism against India.

There has thus been a clear link between Pakistan dismantling the infrastructure of terrorism on the one hand and India agreeing to continue the composite dialogue on the other.

Despite this, the Joint Declaration after Prime Minister, Dr. Singh and the Prime Minister, Mr. Gilani astonishingly notes – "Both Prime Ministers recognised that dialogue is the only way forward. Action on terrorism should not be linked to a composite dialogue process and these should not be bracketed".

Is this not an assurance that we will continue dialogue irrespective of whether or not the infrastructure of terrorism is dismantled? I raised this last week also when this was being discussed in this House and I reiterate it again. Who is fooling whom? Is this not a dramatic reversal of the Indian position obtaining till now?

I am of the opinion that there is nothing static in the world. I am not a *status quoist* nor our country should be. We should strive for change and change in foreign policy is required keeping in mind the change that the world is undergoing today. Once we accept this, as a policy, say it. Also say that the discontinuance of composite dialogue paid us no result. Scant attention was given by the powers that be, to pressurize Pakistan to apprehend the culprits of Pakistani nationals who were behind the Mumbai attack. Say it that Jamaat-ud-Dawa Chief Hafiz Saeed is walking free in Pakistan because you were unable to provide evidence and that is why you had to make a course correction and started the dialogue, at least, at the Secretary level. Say it that Islamabad has withstood Washington's pressure because both are fighting a different war together on a different front, so India's case can be ignored.

We are asked to believe on the trial process of Pakistan to convict the perpetrators of terrorist activities in India.

But are we not aware that Pakistan is yet to complete the trial process of Omar Syed Sheikh who was involved in brutally murdering American Journalist Daniel Pearl in 2001? It is an open secret that people like Omar Sheikh, A Q Khan, Hafiz Mohammed Saeed or Zakia Rahman Lakhri cannot be punished because they will spill the beans.

We should understand the attitude of Pakistan. Sentimentalism has no place in international relations. We are neither equal victims of terrorism, nor we share a common destiny. A democratic, secular India cannot share a "Common Destiny" with a theocratic, feudal and military dominated Pakistan. Why should we be forced to believe that a rising India cannot assert its rightful place in the comity of nations without good neighbourly relations with Pakistan? This attitude undermines our diplomacy.

Pakistan for the last three decades had created, harboured and trained terrorists backed by ISI to make India bleed and seek strategic depth in Afghanistan. India has been a victim of terrorism sponsored by Pakistan for the past three decades. Now what do we have? The Government has equated the two countries in Sharm-el Sheikh.

Sir, now I would talk about the reference to Balochistan in the India Pakistan Joint Statement. That is worrisome. If Prime Minister Gilani mentioned that Pakistan has some information on threats in Balochistan and other areas, why does it have to be mentioned in the Joint Statement? What is the relevance of such a formulation? It is a Pakistani perspective. It is for the first time that an India-Pakistan Joint Statement hints at Indian involvement in Balochistan and "other areas".

Sir, I need not delve into other matters as the time is very short. But till now there has been no credible report of any Indian sponsored activity in that province of Pakistan. But I would also like to take the opportunity of speaking in this House that with over one lakh Americans and NATO forces in Afghanistan, any action by India that complicates the NATO mission would have invited America's attention. I have a direct question. Have Americans, by implication, rejected Pakistan's baseless claims of Indian interference? I would like to know this from the hon. Minister. All those who care for this nation, all those who have lost their near and dear ones in the serial terrorist strikes across India till November 26 in Mumbai treats this as a betrayal. I believe in the words of the hon. Prime Minister of India for the interpretation he has given. Many people do in this country. The reference to Balochistan and other areas in the Joint Statement has to be excluded from any bilateral discussion in future as it is totally inapplicable and unacceptable to India.

Sir, let me conclude. I am not dealing with end-use. But I would like to make a short point on climate change. There is pressure from the rich nations on the developing nations and it is going in WTO way. When we are meeting in Copenhagen, I have information in my command that we are taking a different stand which is a consistent one, but my question here is, what is the quantity of Greenhouse emission that our country does? Are we conscious of that? We may have a point of view in different forums but what is the Greenhouse emission that our country does and what steps is the Government taking to minimise it?

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

Sir, yes, the hon. Prime Minister has struck the right note in this House by clarifying what India expects of Pakistan and has relied heavily on France and wants itself to be engaged with United States. We could not agree with him more and expect him to hold firm on the course he has worked out for the country.

श्री अनंत गंगाराम गीते (रायगढ़): उपाध्यक्ष जी, प्रधानमंत्री मनमोहन सिंह जी की विदेश यात्रा को लेकर और इस विदेश यात्रा में उन्होंने जो अलग-अलग बयान दिये, पाकिस्तान के साथ में जो एक जोइंट स्टेटमेंट पर उन्होंने हस्ताक्षर किये और एंड यूज मोनेटरिंग के बारे में जो एग्रीमेंट किया गया, इस पर देश भर में कई दिनों से काफी चर्चा है। इलेक्ट्रॉनिक मीडिया में, प्रिंट मीडिया में चर्चा है और कई आशंकाएं प्रधानमंत्री जी के अलग-अलग बयानों को लेकर सारे देश भर में हैं। इन्हीं बातों को कल यशवन्त सिन्हा जी ने नियम 193 के अन्तर्गत इस बहस के माध्यम से सदन के सामने यहां पर रखा। काफी विस्तार से उन्होंने अपनी बात यहां पर रखी है।

इस चर्चा में भाग लेते हुए प्रधानमंत्री जी ने यहां पर उस विदेश यात्रा के बारे में निश्चित रूप में अपनी बात भी सदन के सामने

रखी, लेकिन जब प्रधानमंत्री जी यहां पर बोलने के लिए खड़े हो गये, तब उन्होंने सदन को इस बात का एहसास दिलाया कि हमें इस बात को भूलना नहीं चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान हमारा पड़ोसी है और पाकिस्तान के साथ, पड़ोसी के साथ अच्छे सम्बन्ध होने चाहिए। मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी की इस बात से तो निश्चित सहमत हूँ कि पाकिस्तान हमारा पड़ोसी है और पाकिस्तान से हमारे अच्छे सम्बन्ध होने चाहिए, इससे भी मैं सहमत हूँ। लेकिन सवाल आज यह है कि क्या पाकिस्तान हमें अपना पड़ोसी मानता है? पाकिस्तान क्या इस बात से सहमत है, इस बात को स्वीकार करता है कि भारत हमारा पड़ोसी है? पाकिस्तान इस बात को स्वीकार करता है कि क्या भारत के साथ अच्छे सम्बन्ध होने चाहिए?

पिछले 20 साल से पाकिस्तान ने भारत के साथ मैं जो रवैया अपनाया है, जो व्यवहार हमारे साथ पाकिस्तान पिछले 20 साल से कर रहा है। आज मुझे यहां पर कहना पड़ रहा है कि पाकिस्तान हमें पड़ोसी नहीं मानता, पाकिस्तान हमें अपना शत्रु मानता है कि भारत हमारा दुश्मन है। दुश्मन के नजरिये से भारत की ओर देखा जाता है, न कि पड़ोसी की नजर से। प्रधानमंत्री जी ने यह बयान दिया कि पाकिस्तान हमारा पड़ोसी है, लेकिन पाकिस्तान इस बात से सहमत नहीं है। पाकिस्तान भारत को दुश्मन की नजर से देखता है और जो भी व्यवहार भारत के साथ पाकिस्तान की ओर से किया जाता है, वह एक दुश्मन के खिलाफ सारे जो व्यवहार होने चाहिए, वह पिछले 20 साल से पाकिस्तान के द्वारा भारत के साथ किये जा रहे हैं। इस देश भारत में जितने भी आतंकी हमले हुए, वह चाहे लालकिले पर का आतंकी हमला हो, संसद पर का आतंकी हमला हो, मुम्बई में जो रेलवे स्टेशन पर आतंकी हमला हुआ था, गेटवे ऑफ इंडिया पर बम विस्फोट हुआ, वह हो या पिछले 26 नवम्बर को जो आतंकी हमला मुम्बई पर हुआ, वह हमला हो, इस सदन में हर बार सरकार की ओर से, चाहे वह किसी भी दल की सरकार हो, चाहे वह सरकार यू.पी.ए. की हो या एन.डी.ए. की हो, वह सरकार देवेगौड़ा जी की हो या गुजराल जी की हो, हर सरकार के गृह मंत्री ने यह बयान दिया है कि जो भी आतंकी हमले इस देश पर हो रहे हैं, इन सारे आतंकी हमलों में पाकिस्तान का हाथ है। यह हर गृह मंत्री ने इस सदन में कहा है और पिछले 20 साल से पाकिस्तान भारत के खिलाफ एक तौर पर छिपा हुआ युद्ध चला रहा है, प्रॉक्सी वार चला रहा है। आज पाकिस्तान इस बात को जानता है, पाकिस्तान को इस बात का एहसास है कि सीधे युद्ध में हम भारत के साथ लड़ नहीं सकते हैं। पिछले बीस साल से प्राक्सिवार हमारे देश के खिलाफ चल रहा है।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, जो चार युद्ध हमने लड़े और पांचवां कारगिल का युद्ध हुआ, इन पांचों युद्धों में जितने जवान मारे गये, उससे ज्यादा जवान हमारे देश में आतंकी हमलों में मारे गये। उससे भी ज्यादा आम-आदमी, नागरिक, सिविलियन मारे गये हैं, उनकी संख्या 70 हजार से भी ज्यादा है। ... (व्यवधान) मुलायम सिंह जी मुझे जानकारी दे रहे हैं कि यह संख्या एक लाख के आसपास पहुंच गयी है। मैंने 70 हजार की जानकारी दी थी, लेकिन मुलायम सिंह जी ने इसमें सुधार किया है कि यह संख्या एक लाख के आसपास पहुंच गयी है। एक लाख के आसपास हमारे देश के सिविलियन मारे गये, जिनमें बच्चे, बूढ़े, महिलाएं, विद्यार्थी आदि सभी मारे गये। जितने पांच युद्धों में जवान मारे गये थे, उससे ज्यादा जवान आतंकी हमलों में मारे गये।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, पाकिस्तान हमें अपना पड़ोसी नहीं मानता है। पाकिस्तान भारत को अपना दुश्मन मानता है। पाकिस्तान की राजनीति इसी पर चलती है। जो सबसे ज्यादा भारत से दुश्मनी मोल लेगा, जो सबसे ज्यादा भारत के खिलाफ बोलेगा, वही ज्यादा दिन वहां राज करेगा। चाहे प्रेसीडेंट मुशर्रफ हों, चाहे प्रेसीडेंट जरदारी हों, चाहे नवाज शरीफ जी वहां के पूर्व प्रधानमंत्री हों या आज के प्रधानमंत्री गिलानी जी हों, सरकार में या प्रेसीडेंट वहां जो भी होगा, वह भारत के खिलाफ ही कार्रवाई करेगा। वह हमारे देश को दुश्मन मानते हैं और हमारे साथ उनका रवैया दुश्मन की तरह का ही है। प्रधानमंत्री जी की इस बात को स्वीकार करते हुए, मैं सदन की ओर से और अपनी पार्टी की ओर से मांग करता हूँ कि जब तक पाकिस्तान के द्वारा चलाया गया आतंकवाद पूरी तरह खत्म नहीं होता है, कोई भी वार्ता पाकिस्तान के साथ नहीं होनी चाहिए, हमारी सरकार को कोई वार्ता पाकिस्तान के साथ नहीं करनी चाहिए।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, 26/11 को मुंबई पर जो आतंकी हमला हुआ तब पूरे देश में क्या हालत थी, पूरे देश की क्या स्थिति थी? पहली बार 26/11 के मुंबई आतंकी हमले के बाद सारा देश एकजुट हो गया था। जाति, धर्म सबको छोड़कर, भाषा, प्रांत सबको छोड़कर, सारा देश एक हो गया था। कई मुसलिम संगठनों ने मुंबई में रैली निकाली थी और पाकिस्तान का विरोध किया था। मुसलिम संगठनों ने पाकिस्तान को चेतावनी दी थी और उन्होंने कहा था कि यह आतंक पाकिस्तान की ओर से चलाया जा रहा है। उस समय सारी दुनिया पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ थी।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, जब यह आतंकी हमला हुआ, तब कई पत्रों की चर्चा सदन में हुयी थी, तब इस देश की महिलाओं ने जो चिट्ठियां लिखी थीं, उनका जिक्र मैंने किया था। आज मैं एक चिट्ठी का जिक्र यहां फिर करने जा रहा हूँ। हमारे देश में क्या स्थिति थी, क्या मानसिकता थी? महिलाओं ने लाखों चिट्ठियां सांसदों को भेजी थीं, उनमें से चिट्ठी का जिक्र मैं यहां पर करूंगा। वह आज मेरे हाथ में नहीं है, यदि आप कहेंगे, तो निश्चित रूप से मैं सदन के सामने पेश कर सकता हूँ। मेरे घर पर वह चिट्ठी है, लेकिन यहां अभी मेरे पास वह नहीं है। उस महिला की क्या भावना थी? वह चिट्ठी हिंदी में थी। उन्होंने लिखा था, " एक बार गलती करे, वह इन्सान, दो बार गलती करे, वह नादान, बार-बार गलती करे, वह पाकिस्तान और हर गलती को माफ करे, वह हिन्दुस्तान। " उसमें आगे उस महिला ने अपने क्रोध को जताया था और आखिरी सेंटेंस था - अटैक पाकिस्तान। एक महिला ने, हमारे देश की एक माता ने यह चिट्ठी लिखी थी। इस प्रकार की लाखों चिट्ठियां उस समय आयी थीं। सारा देश क्रोधित था। कई वर्षों से आतंकी कार्रवाइयां पाकिस्तान की ओर से चलायी जा रही हैं। जब तक आतंकवाद को रोकने के लिए पाकिस्तान सहयोग नहीं करता या आतंकियों को जो प्रशिक्षण उसकी धरती पर दिया जा रहा है, वह उसे पूरी तरह से खत्म नहीं करता, तब तक पाकिस्तान से कोई वार्ता भारत सरकार को नहीं करनी चाहिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप कृपया समाप्त कीजिए।

â€(व्यवधान)

श्री अनंत गंगाराम गीते (रायगढ़): मैं समाप्त करने जा रहा हूं। दूसरे मुद्दों को मैं एक-एक वाक्य में समाप्त करूंगा।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, आज ग्लोबल वार्मिंग को लेकर यहां जो चिन्ता जताई गई, उस संदर्भ में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया था, उस बारे में, मैं सिर्फ एक वाक्य में बताऊंगा, ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा। ... (व्यवधान) मुलायम सिंह जी मुझे याद दिला रहे हैं कि हमने दो समय गंवाये -- पहला समय तब था, जब हमारी संसद पर हमला किया गया था। उस समय हमारी सरकार को पाकिस्तान पर हमला करना चाहिए था। दूसरा, जब मुम्बई पर अटैक हुआ, तो सरकार ने यह बयान दिया था कि यह हमला मुम्बई पर नहीं, पूरे देश पर है। उसके बावजूद भी हमने पाकिस्तान पर अटैक नहीं किया। मैं युद्ध का समर्थक नहीं हूँ, लेकिन पाकिस्तान यही भाषा समझता है, उसके अलावा कोई दूसरी भाषा नहीं समझता। हम युद्ध करें या न करें, वह बात अलग है, लेकिन हम एक फैसला कर सकते हैं कि जब तक पाकिस्तान इस मामले में हमें सुधार के सबूत नहीं देता, तब तक हम पाकिस्तान से किसी भी विषय पर चर्चा नहीं करेंगे। मुम्बई में 1993 में बम विस्फोट हुए। वह मामला सुप्रीम कोर्ट गया और उसमें यह तय हुआ कि दाउद इब्राहिम सहित कई मुजरिम हैं, जो फरार घोषित किये गये। वे सब पाकिस्तान में हैं, लेकिन आज तक पाकिस्तान ने उन्हें हमारे सुपुर्द नहीं किया। ... (व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : गीते जी, अब आप अपनी बात समाप्त कीजिए।

â€(व्यवधान)

श्री अनंत गंगाराम गीते : सरकार बार-बार मांग कर रही है। इसलिए पाकिस्तान के साथ कोई चर्चा भारत सरकार को नहीं करनी चाहिए।

ग्लोबल वार्मिंग के बारे में मैं इतना ही कहूंगा। मुझे डर इस बात का है कि आज हमारा देश विकासशील देश है। हमसे भी कई पिछड़े देश हैं, अविकसित देश हैं। ग्लोबल वार्मिंग पर बोलते हुए यशवंत सिन्हा जी ने कुछ आंकड़े यहां दिये हैं कि इसके लिए विकसित राष्ट्र जिम्मेदार हैं। आपको अचरज होगा कि आज सीबीएसई के सलेबस में बच्चों को ग्लोबल वार्मिंग का पाठ पढ़ाया जा रहा है। ... (व्यवधान)

मैं इस बात को सदन के सामने इसलिए रख रहा हूँ, क्योंकि आज इस पर गंभीरता से सोचने की आवश्यकता है। जिन्होंने ग्लोबल वार्मिंग की है, जो देश जिम्मेदार हैं, उन देशों में ग्लोबल वार्मिंग का पाठ नहीं पढ़ाया जाता। वह पाठ भारत में पढ़ाया जा रहा है, जिसके लिए हम बिल्कुल जिम्मेदार नहीं हैं। हमारी कोई गलती नहीं है। यदि हम उनकी बातों को स्वीकार करें, तो हमें इस बात को स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा कि हम सन् 2020 में डेवलपड कंट्रीज की पंक्ति में जाने का जो सपना देख रहे हैं, वह सपना कभी भी पूरा नहीं हो सकता। यदि हम इस बात को स्वीकार करते हैं, तो हम सन् 2020 में विकसित राष्ट्रों की पंक्ति में नहीं बैठ सकते।

एग्रीमेंट और एंड यूज, मॉनीटरिंग की बात भी आयी है। मुलायम सिंह जी ने कल सही कहा कि यदि आपने एग्रीमेंट किया है, तो उसे कचरे की टोकरी में फेंक दो। मैं उसे दोहराता हूँ, क्योंकि यह हमारी आजादी और स्वतंत्रता पर अमेरिका का आक्रमण है। यदि सरकार इस आक्रमण को स्वीकार करती है, तो उसके नतीजे इस देश को भुगतने पड़ेंगे।

DR. M. THAMBIDURAI (KARUR): Respected Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to participate in the discussion on the Statement made by the Prime Minister in this House on 17th July after his visit to Italy, France and Egypt.

Sir, I have carefully gone through that Statement and also his intervention in the House yesterday.

I would like to very briefly remind the House of the contrary positions that the Prime Minister took. To begin with, before leaving for the three-country-visits, the stated position of the Government of India was that Pakistan must act on terror before any meaningful discussion could be started.

India also refused to hold any talks with Pakistan until the perpetrators of 26/11 attacks were brought to book. India had been consistently saying that there has to be transparent action against the culprits, the masterminds of the Mumbai terrorist attacks.

Secondly, after making the Joint Statement, he dropped our demand of action against the attackers and said that dialogue is the only way forward. It is apparent.

Thirdly, while intervening in the debate yesterday, he tried to only justify his action. He mentioned that we should trust and verify Pakistan's actions. He stated that the former Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee also followed the same path of dialogue despite several setbacks. He further mentioned that a peaceful and a friendly neighbour is in India's interest. But where has this wisdom gone so far? Since the 26/11 Mumbai attacks and till he signed the Joint Statement, India was all along

saying that Pakistan must bring the culprits to book before we start the process of dialogue. Why should he take a contrary stand without taking Parliament into confidence and why should he unilaterally change the position? Of course, we are for friendly relations with all neighbouring countries, but that should not be taken for a ride by any neighbour.

The Prime Minister said yesterday that we should trust Pakistan. I will make only three sentences to show how we cannot trust Pakistan. On July 8th, the Intelligence Bureau made an alert that there is going to be another attack on Mumbai. The Home Minister Shri P. Chidambaram warned that Pakistan based terrorists would launch another sea-borne attack on Mumbai at seven places.

The second is, Beijing issued a White Paper claiming that a large number of Xingjian terrorists have been getting training in camps in Pakistan. The third is that Ms. Hillary Clinton, on her visit to India, said that Pakistan is the home to syndicate of terror.

So, how can we trust Pakistan? Pakistan had not kept up any promise it made on taking action against terrorists. Even the mastermind behind the Mumbai attack is set free in Pakistan. There is also a growing concern since Pakistan is inducting a large amount of sophisticated defence equipment on our Western borders. Will this create mutual trust and confidence?

In the Joint Statement, he allowed Pakistan to make a mention of Balochistan. India has nothing to do with what is happening there. But just two days after this Joint Statement, Pakistan started linking India with the troubles in Balochistan. The Pakistani Army Chief also stated that Pakistan would tackle Lashkar-e-Toiba, if India stops messing around in Balochistan. This cannot be tolerated. So I want to say that they were never serious and trusting Pakistan again might end up in further troubles for India.

Yesterday, NDA Members accused the UPA for the steps taken relating to Pakistan. In the same way, the UPA Members also accused NDA for whatever action taken during their tenure. But I want to accuse both sides on this issue. What happened during the Kargil War? When the Kargil War took place, the NDA members were very much hostile towards Pakistan. After the Kargil War, they got into power and did nothing. In the same way, after the 26/11 attack in Mumbai, the UPA Members said that they were going to be very serious in taking action against Pakistan for promoting terrorism. They said so many things, but now after the election is over, after assuming power, they also changed their attitude towards Pakistan. But the common people of India and Pakistan are suffering due to terrorism. So, this kind of politics must be avoided on this issue. We have to protect the sovereignty of our country and we must not succumb to any pressure from Pakistan.

Secondly, yesterday when the hon. Prime Minister made a statement, he said that he met the President of Sri Lanka. I would like to know what transpired between the President of Sri Lanka and our Prime Minister. We are very much worried about the pathetic conditions of Sri Lankan Tamil people in Sri Lanka. I would like to know whether any discussion took place between the President of Sri Lanka and our hon. Prime Minister.

Our hon. Amma, Ms. Jayalalitha has requested that a sum of Rs.10,000 crore must be allotted for the rehabilitation of Sri Lankan Tamils in Sri Lanka. But the Budget provided for only Rs.500 crore for them. I am saying this because when we are committed for the rehabilitation of Sri Lankan Tamils and when our Prime Minister gave a statement, why he has not mentioned about this meeting between the Sri Lankan President and the Prime Minister of India.

I have already stated that we must not succumb to the pressure of United States of America also because we are importing transfer of technology. When we are having such defence equipments, we must see that they must not come and visit our places to supervise wherever we are using the defence equipments. That is also very important as our hon. Members said that our sovereignty must be protected and we must have every right to protect whatever we want. Therefore, when we are importing defence technology, we must not allow the foreign countries to visit and supervise them.

Some hon. Members have also touched upon the issue of climatic conditions. Foreign countries must not exploit the Indian condition and we must see that they must not take advantage of the situation. We must have our own foreign policy. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru enunciated a policy of non-alignment. That kind of policy is suitable for us and that has to be adhered to by our country.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA (GHATAL): Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that the statement made by hon. Prime Minister is a matter of welcome to us. I have no hesitation in saying that. There is no reason why I should not feel that I agree with many of his formulations with regard to our policy on Pakistan.

There is a change in the situation. We cannot just only remember Kargil, we cannot just only remember attack on Parliament. There is, of course, a grim reality. We have also to feel that there is a change in Pakistan and the change for the better. There has to be a voice of sanity in India and not a voice of serenity. The handing over of a dossier by Government of Pakistan

confirming the involvement of Pak nationals in the violent attack on Mumbai is a significant development which need not be ignored by us.

The five persons, or maybe more, who have masterminded the attack are on trial and second challan is likely to be submitted by the prosecution. This is the wind of change in Pakistan even in the ruling clique.

We must be aware, Sir, that there is growing awareness among the people of Pakistan. People of India like friendship with Pakistan and people of Pakistan like friendship with India.

We are the two great neighbours in South Asia. Not only we have to live in peace – we cannot indulge in the luxury of fighting each other – but we have to fight against poverty, unemployment, and economic evils. Therefore, the whole intention of Indian political establishment, including India, would be to ensure the consolidation of the forces of peace and friendship in Pakistan. Our voice must reach to the people of Pakistan. Our warning should reach to the terrorist group. There has to be a voice of sanity; there has to be a voice of perseverance. There should not be a voice of senility.

I feel that a fractured Pakistan is more dangerous to India than the terrorist groups that seek to work on the soil of that country to mount attack. I am in agreement with the Prime Minister while he is saying that we want a peaceful, a prosperous, a democratic Pakistan and also growing friendship between us. Our own intention is to strengthen not the forces of militancy but the forces of democracy, the forces of peace, the forces of friendship in Pakistan. They are equally poor like India. They are equally unemployed. There has been lack of development. Therefore, there is a common ground to fight against the common enemies, that is poverty and unemployment

I have a word of caution to my friends in the Opposition also, we should not overplay suspicion to build up Parliamentary offensive in the House. We cannot be led by suspicion. But I must say that Prime Minister's foreign visit was not all in glory. His observation on G-8 countries' Resolution is absolutely ambiguous and it raises suspicion about the success of India's diplomacy.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA : I am just concluding, Sir.

The comment of the Prime Minister on the end-use of military hardware is unacceptable. The inspection of India's defence establishment by foreign personnel is definitely an infringement of the sovereignty of this nation. This is unfortunate. But I must say that the hon. Prime Minister has forgotten something to tell us. How has he forgotten his participation in the Non-Aligned Conference? India is one of the architects of the Non-Alignment Movement. There has been a Conference; there has been a declaration; and there has been a call for united action on vital, fundamental, global issues. There has been a call for a war-free world; there has been a call for the establishment of an independent State of Palestine. There has been a protest vigorously against the attack of Israel. How has he forgotten it? Does it mean to say that the Non-Alignment Movement is a low priority of the foreign policy of the Government of India? It is for him to clarify. But again I say, we would like to live in peace with Pakistan not of course giving up our fight against terrorism. Terrorism we must fight but friendship we must also have.

We want peace in the sub-continent. We do not want war. I am surprised the way in which one of my previous speakers had even quoted a letter by a person - maybe that person is a lunatic - that why India did not attack Pakistan. This is not the voice of India. The voice of India is the voice of peace and friendship in the sub-continent.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, since yesterday the hon. Members are participating in the discussion arising out of the Statement issued by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has already clarified in detail the three major issues which were raised in the course of the discussion – firstly, whether we have diluted our position in respect of our resolve to fight against terrorism and our concept of zero tolerance for terrorism; secondly, whether in any way by using a particular phrase we have indirectly or implicitly involved ourselves in a matter which was not earlier the part of the bilateral discussions; and thirdly, certain other issues raised in connection with the visit which have been amply clarified by the Prime Minister in his observations while responding to the debate yesterday.

My observation is limited to certain basic fundamental issues in respect of our foreign policy.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I do not mind at all whether I encourage more and more discussions on foreign policy because that is an arena where the Members of Parliament should have interests. It is exclusively within the domain of the Union

Government but I am little pained when a visit is being used by the principal Opposition Party even to march to the Rashtrapathi Bhavan and submit a Memorandum where they say: "The Government has altered the fundamental foundations of India's foreign policy and strategic interest." That is the Memorandum which they submitted; it is a part of the concluding paragraph. At the beginning of the Memorandum they suggested that within weeks of returning to power, the UPA Government headed by Dr. Manmohan Singh will completely reverse India's strategic and foreign policy positions much to the detriment of the nation. I have serious objections to these formulations and postulations.

India's foreign policy is not the whims and caprices of individuals or that of even a single Party. India's foreign policy is embedded in the basic fundamentals of our 5,000 years old civilization where we have stated *Vasudeva Kutumbakam* – 'whole universe is my friend' long before Independence; the actual formulation of the foreign policy by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru through the principles of *Panchsheel*; and the principles of non-violence and truth enunciated by the Father of the nation.

That is the very basic fundamental of India's Foreign Policy and that basic fundamental has been endorsed by the people of this great country. That can never be altered. That is as simple as that.

Now, what has happened with the visit of the Prime Minister? Serious allegations have been raised that we have altered our position in respect of terrorism. Where? How? I have the list; I would not like to reel out the list because many Members have spoken. From 1999 onwards, how many times we have started talks? Talks were disrupted. Dialogue process was disrupted because of events, because of terrorist attacks from 1999 onwards. It has been going on for more than last quarter a century. Who does not know?

Surely, the initiator of the discussion, the former Foreign Minister and the former Finance Minister, Yashwant Sinha was well aware of that. It was a part of the Pakistan Policy, after getting successive defeats to inflict 1000 scars so that India dies bleeding. That was propagated by one of the Military Rulers of Pakistan. It is well-known. It has been practised through the cross-border terrorism. But neither we have succumbed to that terrorism, neither we have succumbed to that policy nor did we stop talking. This is the bare fact.

You did it; India did it; UPA did it; and this is the process through which the world diplomacy moves. Everybody knew that -- before the Second World War when Chamberlain entered into the Munich Pact -- it is not going to succeed, it is not going to keep Adolph Hitler happy, but at the same time, it was considered necessary to have that, because they thought that the last effort should be made to save the world from the impending Second World War. As a humble student of history, this is the lesson of diplomacy, which we should not forget.

We cannot erase Pakistan. Pakistan is going to exist; and it is not new that our relationship with Pakistan has not been cordial from the very beginning.

14.39 hrs (Madam Speaker *in the Chair*)

Many of you may remember that after signing the Nehru-Liaquat Pact in 1950, in 1951 while participating in a debate on the floor of this very House, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru reminded through a story that sometimes the condition of Pakistan is like this, that it is like an errand boy, who killed both his parents – father and mother – and thereafter, when he was prosecuted, he was pleading mercy saying: "My Lord, pardon me because I am an orphan." He himself killed his father and he himself killed his mother, but he pleaded that he was an orphan.

Therefore, that has happened. But that is a reality. That does not mean that we should stop talking. Nowhere. Talking does not mean a full-fledged meaningful dialogue.

Keeping the communication channel open does not mean it is conceding or surrendering on any particular point. Therefore, this aspect is to be kept in view. We shall have to keep that in view.

What is foreign policy? Foreign policy is the extension of the national interest in the context of the external situation and atmosphere. Therefore, I shall have to enhance my national interest. I shall have to advance my national interest in the context of the external atmosphere. The world is changing, and simply we cannot keep our positions straitjacketed, a perception which refuses to acknowledge or admit the elements of change. War-mongerism is no way. Even when I was making the statement as the then Minister of External Affairs, I had expressed my strong resentment. Somebody suggested from the other side, why do you not attack Pakistan? My instant response, standing from here itself, was that that is not the solution to the problem. War is no solution.

Therefore, we shall have to pursue our policies of zero tolerance. I would not like to repeat. Events have clearly established

that we are not succumbing to the pressure of anybody. Madam Speaker, more often than not, myself and Advaniji are two old Members of that House and this House. Of course, he has spent more time in this House compared to me but I have spent more time in that House. Umpteen number of times, I have heard that our sovereignty is compromised. While entering into a broadcasting agreement in the early 60s, known as VoAA, Voice of America Agreement, I heard them saying that our sovereignty had been compromised. While borrowing some money from International Monetary Fund, it was said that our economic sovereignty had been mortgaged. While signing the WTO Agreement in the early mid 90s, they said, "Oh, our sovereignty has collapsed." While entering into Civil Nuclear Cooperation Agreement, they have said we have compromised our national sovereignty.

Questions have been raised. G-8 countries are saying that they are not in favour of supplying ENR technology to those countries which are not signatories to the NPT. Is it for the first time G-8 countries are saying so? Is it not a fact that since the days of formulation of NPT in the 70s, G-8 countries continued to pressurise the entire world? They have their own logic. We have our own logic. We have made it quite clear that we consider that it is a discriminatory treaty. We consider that it creates nuclear haves and have-nots. That is why, we did not sign and we have no intention of signing it.

Yashwant Sinhaji reflected on my observations. What did I say? In the other House, I said, yes, I have noted the observations of the G-8. But G-8 is not the appropriate forum to decide about the Civil Nuclear Technology Agreement. The two appropriate fora are IAEA and NSG. In NSG, we got clean waiver. As many as eight times, this issue has been debated in this House and in that House. It is not once or twice.

I do not remember any foreign policy issue has been so extensively and so exhaustively debated in this House or in that House. ...*(Interruptions)* But, despite that â€¦*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Madam, just one minute. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Please, I am not yielding. â€¦*(Interruptions)*

MADAM SPEAKER : Please do not interrupt.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : You have your own perceptions. I know your nuclear doctrine which you reflected in the last Elections. ...*(Interruptions)*

MADAM SPEAKER : Please keep quiet.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : You only remember what you did say that South Asia should be nuclear weapon-free. What is South Asia? It is India and Pakistan. China will have nuclear weapon; USA will have nuclear weapon; France will have nuclear weapon and England will have nuclear weapon. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : I did not say. ...*(Interruptions)*

MADAM SPEAKER : Please keep quiet.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : China will have nuclear weapon, but not India. ...*(Interruptions)*

MADAM SPEAKER : Please keep quiet. Please sit down.

...*(Interruptions)*

MADAM SPEAKER : Please do not disturb.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : That is your nuclear doctrine and the people of India have rejected your nuclear doctrine. ...*(Interruptions)* Please remember that.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : I did not take that stand. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Please remember that. The people of India have rejected that doctrine. Therefore, most respectfully I would like to submit that do not treat the sovereignty of 112 to 115 crore people as so cheap that it can be mortgaged, that it can be bartered in any way. I would not have minded if some casual remarks would have been made. Where is the fundamental change of the foreign policy? I would like to know. Have we deviated from the principles of building up brotherly relationship, close friendship with our neighbours? Is it not our stated policy that we will come to the aid of each and every neighbour? Is it not our stated policy we do not believe in exporting our ideology, we do not believe in exporting our sphere of influence and we do not believe in the interference of the internal matters of any other country? Therefore, this aspect is to be kept in view. Yes, there will be divergence of opinion. But if we point out that basic fundamentals are changed, I am afraid, the basic fundamentals are not changed in that simple manner.

Everybody agrees with me. The hon. Prime Minister has made it quite clear. We have nothing to hide in Baloochistan. Who does not know the problems of Baloochistan? Particularly the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows it very well. It was created from May, 1947 itself when the understanding between Quaid-E-Azam Jinnah and Khan of Kalat of Baloochistan a few days before the creation of Pakistan, perhaps, 11th August, 1947 and subsequently the accession of Baloochistan to Pakistan in 1948.

From 1950s onwards there are problems. Problems are continuing. It is their internal matter. We have nothing to hide. We have not done anything there. We have no intention of doing anything there. We are the victims of the terrorism. We have no intention of exporting terrorism to any country. It is against our principles.

I am grateful to the NDA Government which has established four Consulates there. It is because we want to help our friends in Afghanistan. They are good people. We have historic and traditional relations. Because of certain developments since the late 1940s, our traditional and historic ties have been snapped. Land route is not available. But that does not mean the centuries old cultural and historical relationship with that country can be snapped. Therefore, we wanted to help them. In order to help them, these Consulates were established there. It was a good decision of yours. We welcome it. But it is not meant for carrying on any subversive activity. If we made this position quite clear to them, I do not think heaven is going to fall on you.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA (HAZARIBAGH): Will you please yield for a minute? My simple question is this. We know their position and we know our position. Why was this sentiment not reflected in the Joint Statement when the Pakistani Prime Minister raised it? We included this sentence, why did we not include one more sentence to state our position? This is our point.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Shri Yashwant Sinha, you yourself have replied to that question in the National Democratic Alliance's memorandum, which you have submitted to the President, saying that 'this is unilateral'. Your point is that we could have put our viewpoint also, but when you describe the statement as unilateral, you admit that we are not a party to it. You yourself are admitting by using the epithet 'unilateral mentioning' that we are not a party to it. But you could have stated that our position should have been mentioned. That is not the intention. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : Shri Pranab Mukherjee, you said 'because it is unilateral and he said'.

Our objection is why Balochistan is mentioned here which is a Joint India-Pakistan Statement and for the first time in all these years. They have been making this allegation earlier also, and I am sure that when the Prime Minister talked to Shri Gilani, he must have told him that we have nothing to do with it, which has been said by you today and also by the Prime Minister. But why, when this was mentioned in the India-Pakistan Statement, could we not have added our viewpoint also?

I am not quoting exactly, but I have with me what he mentioned about Balochistan. But this is true that for the first time, Balochistan has been mentioned in a Joint India-Pakistan Statement agreed by the Prime Ministers. Therefore, my colleague was right when he said yesterday that 'I caution you that this Balochistan will be coming again and again whenever we talk about terrorism and this will be their proof against us that we are also indulging in terrorism, which is absurd, which is bunkum and therefore, never before has Balochistan ever occurred in talks with them.' That is our objection.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: You may have your objection. You are entitled to have your objection, but what I am trying to point out is that this is a unilateral reference. The perception of Pakistan is not shared by us. You know it very well that umpteen number of times ...(*Interruptions*) I have not disturbed anybody. Please allow me to make my observations.

You are entitled to have your own view. You are not going to change your views by listening to me. So, why are you worried? Let me speak my point of view because after all, everybody is listening to what this sovereign Parliament, their chosen representatives are debating and deliberating upon and I welcome this. As I mentioned that if more and more Foreign Policy,

more and more fiscal and financial policy is debated and discussed here, it is better than the local issues or extra-local issues being debated and discussed and taking the time of the sovereign Parliament. It would be much better if we concentrate on the macro issues like this. Therefore it is a good idea that you have your own views, but let me express my view and share it with you. It does not mean that you shall have to accept it. You are free to reject it, but let me speak. I will not take much of your time. My colleague, Shri Krishna will be replying to the debate.

Madam, the fourth point which I am trying to say is that the intention is quite clear. We are not going to succumb to the pressure and compromise our position in this. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ANANTH KUMAR (BANGALORE SOUTH): What is your viewpoint about Balochistan? ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Shri Ananth Kumar, please do not intervene. Time is running out. ...(*Interruptions*)

MADAM SPEAKER: Please sit down.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: No, Shri Munde. By 3.30 p.m., we shall have to complete because Private Members' Business will start at that time. Today, we have allocated time after 3.30 p.m. to Private Members' Business. Hon. Minister will reply. I will complete in a minute. Please do not disturb me.

The short point which I am trying to point out is that there is no question of compromising our position in respect of terrorism. Our Prime Minister has used it more than often that Pakistan must act credibly, verifiably to dismantle the terror mechanisms which are operating from there. That is their primary responsibility.

It is better for them, and it is better for us. I am saying this because if they dismantle the terror mechanism, then they will be safe from the terrorist attacks and we will be safe from the terrorist attacks. Therefore, it is better for them; it is better for us; it is better for the humanity; and for the people of this country. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The next speaker is Shri Digvijay Singh.

...(*Interruptions*)

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (विदिशा): अध्यक्ष महोदया, प्रणब दौं ने अपनी बात को बहुत प्रभावशाली ढंग से रखा है। मैं केवल एक प्रश्न...(*व्यवधान*)

14.56 hrs

At this stage, Shri Sudip Bandyopadhyay and some other hon. Members came and stood on the floor near the Table.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would suggest that you go back to your seats.

...(*Interruptions*)

MADAM SPEAKER: You please go back to your seat, and say whatever you have to say from there.

...(*Interruptions*)

MADAM SPEAKER: Anything that you say from here will not go on record. Anything said in the well of the House will not go on record. Therefore, please go back to your seats.

...(*Interruptions*)

14.57 hrs

At this stage, Shri Sudip Bandyopadhyay and some other hon. Members went back to their seats

SHRI SUDIP BANDYOPADHYAY (KOLKATA UTTAR): Madam, four persons belonging to the minority community and supporters belonging to our political party, namely, Shri Sheikh Jalan, Shri Maltoor Sheikh, Shri Daulat Gazi and Shri Sharafat Hussain and belonging to South 24 Parganas have been brutally killed in the district of South 24 Parganas under the Bhangore and canning Police Station and 35 have been brutally injured. The list is with us. We have drawn the attention of the hon. Shri Pranab Mukherjee; we are drawing the attention of the hon. Prime Minister; and we have drawn the attention of the Home Minister. We would request you to see that the interest, and life and properties of the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and the Minorities are protected properly. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Madam, it is a State matter. â€¦ (*Interruptions*) It has happened in the State. ...(*Interruptions*) How can he bring it in this House? ...(*Interruptions*)

MADAM SPEAKER: Hon. Members, there are four speakers left. I would give two minutes to each speaker.

...(*Interruptions*)

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes, please take very little time.

...(*Interruptions*)

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : अध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं प्रणब दाँ से एक मिनट में प्रश्न पूछना चाहती हूँ। उन्होंने एक बात कही है "foreign policy is an extension of our national interest" आपने बहुत अच्छा कोट दिया कि " foreign policy is an extension of our national interest " । मैं केवल एक बात पूछना चाहती हूँ कि जाइंट स्टेटमेंट में ब्लूचिस्तान के उल्लेख से कौन सा नेशनल इंटरैस्ट सर्व होगा? टैरर को कम्पोजिट डॉयलाग से डिलिंक करके, डिब्रैकट करके कौन सा नेशनल इंटरैस्ट सर्व होगा? सिर्फ इतना ही बता दें तो हम मान जायेंगे कि foreign policy is an extension of our national interest. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : I have nothing to add to whatever I have spoken on this issue. ...(*Interruptions*)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : श्री दिग्विजय सिंह जी।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : हम जानना चाहते हैं कि इससे कौन सा नेशनल इंटरैस्ट सर्व होगा?

MADAM SPEAKER: He has already given his reply. Now, Shri Digvijay Singh.

...(*Interruptions*)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : वह अपना जवाब दे चुके हैं।

...(*व्यवधान*)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : उन्होंने जो कहना था, वह कह दिया है।

â€¦(*व्यवधान*)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : सुनिये, वह कुछ कह रहे हैं।

â€¦(*व्यवधान*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : India's foreign policy is ...(*Interruptions*)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : श्री दिग्विजय सिंह। कृपया माननीय सदस्य को बोलने दीजिये।

â€¦(*व्यवधान*)

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : अध्यक्ष महोदया, विदेश मंत्री को जवाब देने दीजिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदया : विदेश मंत्री जी का जवाब होगा। जब समय होगा, वह जवाब देंगे।

â€¦(*व्यवधान*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : It has been stated, and I am repeating it, namely, that the action against terrorism is independent of any dialogue. A country may have a composite dialogue mechanism and a country may not have a composite

dialogue mechanism.

15.00 hrs.

But every country is obliged to take action against terrorism irrespective of the presence of mechanism or not. That is the main simple reading of the English language. So far as Balochistan is concerned, mere mentioning, unilaterally does not mean that we have any subordinate role to play in Balochistan, absolutely not.

SHRI ANANTH KUMAR (BANGALORE SOUTH) : Then, why have you mentioned 'Balochistan' in the Joint Statement? (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया: अब आप बैठ जाइए। माननीय सदस्य को बोलने दीजिए।

.....(व्यवधान)

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (बांका): महोदया, मैं आपका शुक्रगुजार हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया। मैं माननीय प्रणव मुखर्जी जी की बातों को बहुत ही गंभीरता से सुन रहा था। प्रणव मुखर्जी जी ने अपनी बात की शुरुआत बहुत अच्छे तरीके से की थी। जहाँ से, पंचशील से आपने पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी को कोट किया, मैं उससे और पीछे जाता हूँ। मैं भारत की विदेश नीति के बारे में इतना कह सकता हूँ कि जब वर्ष 1927 में पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी कांग्रेस पार्टी की तरफ से लीग अगेंस्ट इंपीरियलिज्म में बोलने के लिए गये थे, तब कांग्रेस पार्टी इस देश की मुख्य पार्टी थी और वे गांधी जी की तरफ से उसमें बोलने गये थे। आज वर्ष 2009 में लीग अगेंस्ट इंपीरियलिज्म के दिये हुए भाषण से भारत की विदेश नीति में कभी कोई परिवर्तन, सरकारें आयीं और चली गयीं, लेकिन उसमें कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ। हम हमेशा इस बात को मानते हैं कि हमारी विदेश नीति कंटीविटी में चलती है, कभी-कभी उसमें मामूली परिवर्तन हुए हैं। आज हम जिस परिस्थिति में अपनी बातों को आपके सामने रखने के लिए खड़े हुए हैं, उसमें पिछले साल जो घटना घटी, उसके चलते देश में पहली बार विदेश नीति के ऊपर लोगों के मन में संशय और बंटवारे का भाव देखा गया। इस देश में कभी भी विदेश नीति पर इस तरह की बात नहीं हुई थी, जो हमने इस संसद में पिछले साल देखा था या उसके बाद जो मन में संशय हुआ। भारत का प्रधानमंत्री कोई बात कहे, उसके बारे में कोई शक हो, यह कभी संभव नहीं हो सकता है। भारत की सीमा के बाहर देश में दो ही प्रतीक हैं। एक भारत का तिरंगा लहराता है, या भारत का प्रधानमंत्री जो जुबान बोलता है, वह देश के 100 करोड़ लोगों की भाषा को परिभाषित करती है। इसलिए भारत के प्रधानमंत्री पर कोई शक-सुबहा हो, यह बात न तो मैं कभी सोच सकता हूँ और न ही कभी बोल सकता हूँ।

महोदया, प्रधानमंत्री जी यहाँ बैठे हुए हैं, मैं आपके सामने इतना कहना चाहूँगा कि आखिर कौन सी ऐसी बात हुई, जिसके चलते देश के लोगों के मन में संशय हुआ। वह शंका नहीं है, संशय है और संशय इसलिए है कि 15-20 दिन पहले तक आपकी भाषा अलग थी और 15-20 दिन के बाद वह भाषा बदल गयी। जाहिर है कि भाषा बदलेगी तो लोगों को ऐसा लगता होगा कि प्रधानमंत्री जी को या तो कोई नया हथियार मिला है, कोई नयी जानकारी मिली है, उनके मन में कोई नया विश्वास पैदा हुआ है। हम यह नहीं कहते हैं कि बातचीत नहीं होनी चाहिए। बातचीत तो इस सदन में, देखिए भाषा बोलने में तो आदमी कुछ भी बोलता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदया : कृपया, अब आप समाप्त कीजिए।

.....(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : आप इसे अन्यथा न लें। साढ़े तीन बजे प्राइवेट मेंबर बिजनेस शुरू करना है। अभी मंत्री महोदय को भी उत्तर देना है इसलिए हम यह प्रतिबंध लगा रहे हैं। साढ़े तीन बजे प्राइवेट मेंबर बिजनेस शुरू नहीं हो पाएगा, जो होना अनिवार्य है।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : महोदया, जैसी आपकी इजाजत होगी। अगर आप इजाजत देंगी तो मैं बोलूँगा वरना मैं नहीं बोलूँगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदया : आप संक्षेप में बोलिए।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : महोदया, मैं संक्षेप में ही बोलूँगा। इसमें बोलने के लिए ज्यादा कुछ बचा ही नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदया : तब तो बहुत अच्छी बात है। आप संक्षेप में बोलिए।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: महोदया, प्रधानमंत्री जी जवाब दे चुके हैं, प्रणव मुखर्जी जी जवाब दे चुके हैं। मैं सिर्फ दो-तीन बातों की तरफ माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी का, आपका और सरकार के विदेश मंत्री जी का ध्यान खींचना चाहूँगा। यहाँ पर इस तरह के बहुत से लोग बैठे हुए हैं, सलमान खुर्रिद साहब बैठे हुए हैं। देश में कई बार ऐसा मौका आया जब विदेश नीति पर सलमान खुर्रिद जी और अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी मिलकर भारत की वकालत जिनेवा में कर रहे थे। प्रणव मुखर्जी जी स्वयं विदेश मंत्री रहे हैं, हम लोगों का इस्तेमाल कई बार हुआ है, उन्होंने स्वयं अपने हाथों से किया है। विदेश नीति के ऊपर तो यह बहस कभी होती ही नहीं थी कि देश से हटकर कोई विदेश नीति बनाएगा। आपने बिल्कुल सही कहा कि यह सेल्फ इंटरैस्ट में हुई है। मैं आपके सामने दो-तीन प्रमुख बातें रखना चाहता हूँ। यह सवाल विदेश नीति का नहीं है, देश में संशय पैदा हो गया। बलूचिस्तान के बारे में सब लोगों ने अपनी-अपनी बात रखी, आपने भी अपने तरीके से सफाई दी।

पहली बार देश के लोगों को ऐसा लगता है कि क्या हम भी बलूचिस्तान में गड़बड़ करते हैं? यह देश के मानस पटल पर छ रहा है कि आखिर बलूचिस्तान का जिक्र क्यों हुआ? इस मामले में आपसे ज्यादा अनुभवी कौन है? आप तो अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि बलूचिस्तान के मामले में हर बार और हमेशा इस तरह की आवाज उठाई जाती रही है। लेकिन हम लोगों ने कभी उस पर तवज्जो नहीं दी है। आप जब कहते हैं कि राष्ट्र हित की बात है, लेकिन राष्ट्र के लोगों को यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है कि चिस्तान का जिक्र क्यों हुआ? यदि हुआ, तो हमने उसमें क्या कहा, क्योंकि एकपक्षीय बात आयी है। सब लोगों के मन में यही शक है कि आखिर यह एकपक्षीय बात क्यों और किसलिए आयी? किसके दबाव में आयी? क्यों ऐसा कहा गया? क्या ऐसी कोई जानकारी हमें मिली है, जिसे कहना चाहिए था? इस संशय को दूर करना हमारा राष्ट्रीय कर्तव्य है। यह केवल प्रधानमंत्री जी का और आडवाणी जी का ही काम नहीं है, यह हम सब लोगों का काम है कि हम इसे मानसिक रूप से लोगों के मन से निकालें, क्योंकि दुनिया में भारत की एक ही ताकत है। विदेश नीति का हमारा रिकार्ड है।...(व्यवधान) जब हम लोग ज्यादा गरीब थे, तब भी स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति को चलाया। आज तो सब कुछ आपके पास है, आपने दुनिया से वायदा किया था...(व्यवधान) हम दुनिया की प्रजातंत्र की लड़ाई के साथ-साथ दुनिया में आजादी की लड़ाई में बराबर हिस्सेदार हैं।...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : महोदया, मैं दो मिनट में समाप्त कर दूंगा।...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : समय नहीं है। श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी।

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी (हैदराबाद): मोहतरमा स्पीकर साहिबा, मैं आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया।...(व्यवधान)

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: महोदया, मैं दो मिनट में समाप्त कर दूंगा।...(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: You have made your point. Please take your seat.

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : महोदया, मैं दो मिनट में समाप्त कर दूंगा। यदि आप नहीं बोलने देंगी तो हम नहीं बोलेंगे।...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : ठीक है।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : महोदया, जब कृष्णा साहब जवाब दें तो लोगों को सफाई से बताने की कोशिश करें कि ऐसा क्यों हुआ? क्योंकि यह बोलने और बहस करने से नहीं होगा। यह सदन हिन्दुस्तान के 116 करोड़ लोगों की आकांक्षाओं का प्रतीक है और जब यहां आप अपनी बात कहें तो यह बात वहां तक भी जानी चाहिए कि ऐसा क्यों हुआ?

दूसरी बात, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक बहुत ही गलत परम्परा आपके मंत्रालय में शुरू हुई है कि आपके विभागीय लोग, अफसरान, सांसदों से लेकर मीडिया तक को ब्रीफ कर रहे हैं, जबकि संसद का सत्र चल रहा है और प्रधानमंत्री और विदेश मंत्री स्वयं इसमें इन्वाल्व हैं। ज्वॉइंट स्टेटमेंट वह किसी विदेश सचिव अथवा किसी पदाधिकारी की जुबान नहीं है, वह भारत के प्रधानमंत्री की जुबान है। वही वक्त आ गया है जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि यह लीगल बाइंडिंग हमारे ऊपर नहीं है। मैं उनसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ।...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : आप बैठ जाइए, आपका हो गया है। श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : महोदया, मैं एक लाइन में अपनी बात समाप्त कर दूंगा।...(व्यवधान)

महोदया, मैं इस बात को सदन के माध्यम से सरकार के ध्यान में लाना चाहता हूँ कि वह कम्यूनिक्के भारत के प्रधानमंत्री का है। आने वाले इतिहास में वह हमेशा मौजूद रहेगा।...(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: You have made your point. Do not go on repeating.

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : हम लोग अभी तक यही समझते रहे कि बिहारियों का इंग्लिश कमजोर होता है, लेकिन यह कौन सी इंग्लिश है, जिसके बारे में कहा जा रहा है कि बैड ड्राफ्टिंग है। यह क्यों जा रहा है? यह शब्दावली क्यों कही जा रही है?

अध्यक्ष महोदया : आप बैठ जाइए। अपना स्थान ग्रहण कीजिए।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : महोदया, मैं माननीय कृष्णा साहब से जानना चाहूंगा कि इन दो बातों को साफ करें।

BANSAL): At that time, he was only putting his argument that you cannot find fault with content, intent and the policy. You can, as an argument, find fault with the draft. That was a point he was putting across....(Interruptions)

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी : मोहतरमा स्पीकर साहिबा, इस बहस का आगाज़ बीजेपी के एक मोआज्जि रुक्न ने किया। उन तमाम की तरफ से उस स्टेटमेंट में बलूचिस्तान का जिक्र क्यों आया? बहुत सी बातें हुईं। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि ... *

अध्यक्ष महोदया, दूसरी बात यह है कि वज़ीरेआजम हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : आप ओवेसी जी की बात सुन लीजिए।

â€(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : आप बैठ जाइए।

â€(व्यवधान)

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी : अभी तो शुरुआत हुई है।...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : कृपया शांत हो जाइए।

â€(व्यवधान)

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी : मोहतरमा स्पीकर साहिबा, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वज़ीरेआज़म ने जो बात की।...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : आप बैठ जाइए।

â€(व्यवधान)

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी : डॉ. मनमोहन सिंह जी ने यह नहीं कहा,...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : आप बैठ जाइए।

â€(व्यवधान)

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी : आपके डराने से मैं डरने वाला नहीं हूँ। ...(व्यवधान) आप वहां पर बोलिए, मुझे मत बोलिए।...(व्यवधान) मैं आपसे डरने वाला नहीं हूँ।...(व्यवधान)

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : अध्यक्ष महोदया, मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर है।

अध्यक्ष महोदया : सुषमा जी, आपका प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर क्या है?

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Madam, I am on a point of order. My point of order is under Rule 354 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok

* Not recorded as ordered by the Chair.

Sabha. Rule 354 says, "No speech made in the Council (that means Council of States, Rajya Sabha) shall be quoted in the House (that means this Lok Sabha) unless it is a definite statement of policy by a Minister". रूल 354 के अंदर बकायदा यह पाबंदी है कि राज्य सभा में कही गई कोई बात लोक सभा में कोट नहीं की जा सकती और माननीय सदस्य ने शुरु करते ही कहा कि दूसरे ऐवान में यह बात कही गई है।...(व्यवधान)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He was not quoting anything. He was only referring to it. ...(Interruptions)

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (विदिशा): आप इस पर रूलिंग दीजिए।...(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: Please take your seat. I have heard you.

On this point of order, under this Rule whatever reference has been made to the other House will not go on record. Shri Owaisi, please continue.

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी : मैडम, इन्होंने मुझे बोलने ही नहीं दिया, मेरी एक ही बात पर इतनी गड़बड़ कर दी। चराग पा हो गए। बीजेपी की तरफ से लफ्जे इस्लामिक का इस्तेमाल क्यों किया गया, पाकिस्तान तालुक से, इस बात का जिक्र बीजेपी के मोआज्जिज़ रुक्न ने किया। पाकिस्तान कोई इस्लाम का टेकेदार नहीं है, हिन्दुस्तान में 15 करोड़ गयुर हिन्दुस्तानी मुसलमान रहते हैं। इसमें कौन सी आपत्ति है? हां, आपकी आइडियोलोजी, सोच और फिकर इस्लाम के खिलाफ है, मैं इस बात को मानता हूं, मगर आप इस्लाम के ऊपर इस तरह की बात नहीं कर सकते। ...(व्यवधान)

मोहतरिमा स्पीकर साहिबा, मैं तीसरी बात कहना चाहता हूं कि ...(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: Please now listen to him.

...(Interruptions)

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी : मैडम, हमें बोलने नहीं दे रहे हैं। ...(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: Please conclude.

...(Interruptions)

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी : मैडम हमें खत्म करने दीजिए। ...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : आप बैठ जाइए।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: There is no time left. Hon. Member, I have to tell you to conclude.

...(Interruptions)

MADAM SPEAKER: There is very little time left. Please sit down.

...(Interruptions)

MADAM SPEAKER: Hon. Minister may please start now.

...(Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : आप बैठिए। मंत्री महोदय को उत्तर देने दीजिए।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: Only what the hon. Minister says will go on record.

(Interruptions) â€¦ *

MADAM SPEAKER: Please allow the hon. Minister to speak. Please sit down.

...(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI S.M. KRISHNA): Madam Speaker, I am grateful to all the hon. Members who have actively participated in the discussion on the recent visit of the Prime Minister to the foreign countries.

Certain perceptions have been put forward; certain doubts have been expressed; much of those doubts have been cleared by the effective intervention of the hon. Prime Minister yesterday.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: It was further strengthened by another effective intervention by the former Foreign Minister, Shri Pranab Mukherjee just now.

In the NAM Summit at Sharm El Sheikh 118 countries participated, which was a unique event by itself. References were made

which were lost in the heat that was generated in the House with reference to Pakistan; but I would like to take the House back to those days of glory, when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who truly could be said as the Father of India's Foreign Policy Evolution. He enunciated India's foreign policy. He was the chief architect of the NAM, along with President Tito and Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt. It was in that very land

* Not recorded.

where the non-aligned thoughts, the seeds of non-alignment were sown. In that land again, 118 sovereign nations met. They were not subservient to any other nation; they were independent and they were sovereign. All of them reiterated it in one voice that non-alignment is as relevant as it was during the days of Pandit Nehru.

They also said that they would like to pursue the policy of Non-alignment. Some acquisitions, some insinuations were made that the autonomy of decision making and independence of thought and action had been bartered away. I think the hon. Finance Minister referred to some of the previous incidents. I remember, when the Government of India sought a 5 billion dollars loan from the World Bank it was freely accused that India's sovereignty was being sold and India was becoming subservient to the World Bank which is controlled by the United States of America. What is the situation after 20 years? Have we become subservient to the United States? Is not India pursuing an independent Foreign Policy of its own? That is the question.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: We have....(*Interruptions*)

References have been made in the joint statement to a number of issues. In the Presidential Statement, which was accepted by all the 118 nations, a number of issues which are of common concern to countries have been raised and we are subscribers to that document. So, India even today pursues an independent Foreign Policy which is tailored to sub serve our national interest. In fact, our Foreign Policy is an extension of the domestic policy subject to the changes that have come about in our neighbourhood and in the world at large. So, we will have to factor that in, in an emphasis here or an emphasis there, in tailoring our Foreign Policy. That has been done very effectively over a period of time....(*Interruptions*)

...(व्यवधान)

श्री शत्रुघ्न सिन्हा (पटना साहिब): मंत्री जी, पानी पी लीजिए।

...(व्यवधान)

श्री संजय निरुपम (मुम्बई उत्तर): आप लोग पानी नहीं पीते हैं क्या?

...(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: Let the Minister reply.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: All of us need water at some point of time. It may be me today and it will be you tomorrow.

Madam, any Foreign Policy will be strong and effective as the domestic consensus behind it. That is the reason why the Government keeps this hon. House repeatedly involved through the Statements as to the direction in which our Foreign Policy is being directed. When the debate takes place any constructive suggestion that comes from there or here, we own it as our own. We have no hesitation. We do not stand on false prestige. Whenever this august House feels our Foreign Policy needs a course correction, we have never hesitated to go in for that course correction.

Well that is what democracy is all about. We stand very firmly on certain very basic concepts of our policy. But the emphasis might keep shifting here and there.

So, I will not dwell on Pakistan because there have been two very effective and decisive interventions. I would only touch one or two other points which the hon. Members have raised. One hon. Member talked about Sri Lanka...(*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : What about Balochistan?

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: It has been answered...(*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ: It has not been answered. You are going to Sri Lanka but you first answer about Balochistan.

Mr. Pranab Mukherjee said that you will answer that. He did not answer about Balochistan....(Interruptions). The question is very specific...(Interruptions) मेरा क्वेश्चन बिल्कुल स्पेसिफिक है, बलूचिस्तान के उल्लेख से कौन सा नेशनल इंटेस्ट सर्व होगा? ...(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: Please allow the Minister to complete his reply.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: I have understood the question. I thought the question had been answered. But if you would like to have an answer, I will give an answer...(Interruptions)

MADAM SPEAKER: Hon. Minister, please address the Chair.

...(Interruptions)

MADAM SPEAKER: Hon. Member, please address the Chair.

...(Interruptions)

MADAM SPEAKER: What is this going on?

...(Interruptions)

MADAM SPEAKER: Hon. Minister, please address the Chair.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Madam, I need your protection...(Interruptions)

MADAM SPEAKER: Hon. Members, let him complete his reply.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: With reference to Balochistan, I think there was a clarification which was made. When the two Prime Ministers met, the question of Balochistan came and we readily agreed.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Why?

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: It is because we had nothing to hide...(Interruptions) We had nothing to hide....(Interruptions)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI : Madam Speaker, this is a strange answer. If we had nothing to hide then we should have objected to the inclusion of this word there. For the first time, this has been included. They may have tried earlier also. Furthermore, if it was to be included then we should have said there that India has nothing to do with what is happening in Balochistan. This should also have been said...(Interruptions). I am not surprised that even within the Congress Party, there are demands that the Prime Minister clarifies his position on Balochistan and why has he signed it...(Interruptions)

अगर कोई आज सुबह का अखबार पढ़ेगा, तो राजनीतिक लोगों को छोड़िए, लेकिन विदेश नीति के, रक्षा नीति के जितने विशेषज्ञ हैं, वे कहते हैं कि प्रधानमंत्री जी के भाषण से या प्रणव जी के भाषण से डीलिकिंग और बलूचिस्तान इन दोनों का कोई समाधानकारक उत्तर नहीं मिला या अभी के आपके भाषण से भी नहीं मिला। मुझे लगता है कि प्रधानमंत्री जी के भाषण के बाद आपको कुछ जोड़ने के लिए नहीं है, इसीलिए जब तक बलूचिस्तान मांगा नहीं गया, आप उस पर बोलने को भी तैयार नहीं थे। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके बाद इस बहस में भाग लेने का कोई अर्थ नहीं है। हम सभी वाक-आउट करते हैं। ...(व्यवधान)

15.30 hrs

(Shri Lal Krishna Advani and some other hon. Members then left the House)

â€¦(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: Hon. Members, it is 3.30 p.m. If the House agrees then we will take up the Private Members' Business immediately after the reply of the hon. Minister.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Madam Speaker, most of the issues raised have been answered by the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Finance Minister...(Interruptions)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (मैनपुरी): अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर मंत्री जी बलूचिस्तान के बारे में नहीं बता सकते तो प्रधान मंत्री जी बता दें।...(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: Shri Mulayam Singhji, you may please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : बलूचिस्तान के बारे में कुछ कहा ही नहीं है। यह क्या बात है?...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : आप कृपया उन्हें पूरा करने दीजिए। अभी उन्होंने पूरा नहीं किया है। Mr. Minister, please address the Chair and continue with your reply.

â€¦(व्यवधान)

MADAM SPEAKER: Hon. Member, please take your seat. Let the Minister reply.

...(Interruptions)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां बैठे हुए हैं।...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदया : मंत्री जी, आप बोलिए।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री पवन कुमार बंसल : इन्होंने सब कुछ कहा था, लेकिन आपने सुना नहीं।...(व्यवधान)

15.32 hrs.

(Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav and some other hon. Members then left the House)

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Madam, most of the points has been covered. Some hon. Members have mentioned about the situation in Sri Lanka at the condition of the internally displaced persons who are lodged in camps in Northern Sri Lanka. As you know, the hon. Prime Minister had a meeting with President Rajapakse on the sidelines of the ...(Interruptions) In the meeting that the hon. Prime Minister had with the President of Sri Lanka the question of settlement and rehabilitation of civilians who have become hapless victims of the conflict in Sri Lanka came up and the Prime Minister reiterated India's willingness to make possible early return to normal lives of the Tamil IDPs in Sri Lanka.

MADAM SPEAKER: Hon. Members, please be quiet.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: The President of Sri Lanka assured us that he shared these goals and his commitment to complete the resettlement process in next 180 days. We have impressed upon the President of Sri Lanka that this is of urgent importance from the Indian point of view and then it is a humanitarian effort which the Sri Lankan Government will have to go through. The Government of India have already announced a sum of Rs. 500 crore and then the hon. Prime Minister has been gracious enough to say that if need be he is willing to give more for the resettlement of the Sri Lankans.

We are also working with the Sri Lankan authorities and the international community to ensure that practical, meaningful devolution of power and other arrangements are taking place which will enable all communities to live at home and live in peace and dignity within the framework of a united Sri Lanka.

As regards climate change, some references have been made. The hon. Prime Minister, yesterday, has spelt out India's basic policy. We are going to pursue that line even when we will meet in Copenhagen where an International Conference is to take place.

With reference to the end use monitoring, some Members have asked about the arrangements. An impression is sought to be created by some quarters that our Defence installations are going to be open for American inspection and verification. I think nothing could be farther from truth than this statement. The stated position about the end use monitoring system is, when we buy some high end Defence equipment from United States America after arriving at a mutual consent, we decide by mutual consent about the venue where the inspection is going to take place. It is not as if the United State authorities can walk into any Defence installation and then keep a tab on us.

Let me make it very clear that all that we have agreed on the end use monitoring arrangements will be henceforth referred to in letters of acceptance, as the hon. Prime Minister clarified yesterday and there has never been a thought of our sovereignty

being compromised. The arrangements that we have agreed are fully in consonance with our sovereignty and dignity.

...(Interruptions)

MADAM SPEAKER: Shri Acharia, please sit down.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Let me finish, Shri Acharia, and then you may ask(Interruptions)

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, please address the Chair.

...(Interruptions)

MADAM SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record except the reply of the hon. Minister.

(Interruptions) â€¹*

* Not recorded.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Madam, with these words, I conclude my reply....(Interruptions)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Madam, as we are not convinced with the hon. Minister's reply, we are walking out....(Interruptions)

15.38 hrs

*At this stage, Shri Basu Deb Acharia and some other
hon. Members left the House*

...(Interruptions)

श्री लालू प्रसाद (सारण): अध्यक्ष महोदया, सब लोग चले गये हैं। मैं भी वाक-आउट करता हूँ।

15.38 hrs.

Shri Lalu Prasad then left the House
