

**श्री सभापति :** श्री मौर्य जी, आप जरा ठहरिये ।

**श्रीमती रोडा मिस्त्र :** मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से यह जानना चाहती हूँ कि क्या डिअबिलिटी या मौत इतने टाइम तक उठर सकेगी ? अगर इस तरह के मामलों में इतने महीने लग गये तो डिअबल आदमी तो इस बीच में मर ही जाएगा और उसके घर में फाँका पड़ जाएगा । मैं पूछना चाहती हूँ कि क्या डिअबल आदमी इनकी देर तक इन्जोर कर सकता है ?

**SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL:** Sir, the hon. Members are confusing. So far as the question of paying compensation to the victims is concerned, it is governed by the Motor Vehicles Act and under section 110 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939, Motor Accident Claims Tribunals are constituted and the victims or the family members of the victims can go and claim compensation, but the question that is under consideration by the DTC is to pay in addition to that. They have got a proposal for insurance of commuters. They are contacting the insurance companies and trying to finalise the proposal. This has nothing to do with the compensation that is to be paid under the Motor Vehicles Act. Members of the victims or the victims themselves can claim compensation under this Act. The proposal under consideration is to give over and above what they are entitled to the compensation under the Motor Vehicles Act. So, that is taking some time. They are under correspondence with the insurance companies and as my hon. colleague has said just now, it will take another two or three months to finalise the proposal.

**श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य :** माननीय मंत्री महोदय यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि इस तरह के विक्टिम को कम्पेंसेशन देने में ऐसी कौन-सी रुकावटें हैं जिनके

कारण उनको कम्पेंसेशन देने में देर होती है । जैसा कि अभी राज्य मंत्री जी ने कहा कि तीन महीने समाप्त होने पर वे कम्पेंसेशन दे देंगे मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा कौन-सा प्रोसेस या नियमावली आगे के लिए रखी जाएगी जिससे छः महीने में या तीन महीने समाप्त होने के तुरन्त धाद इसका भुगतान हो जाया करेगा ?

**श्री सीता राम केसरी :** सभापति महोदय, जैसा कि मैंने निवेदन किया है और जैसा कि हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी ने कहा कि जो एक्सीडेंट्स में घायल होते हैं उनके केसेज ट्राइब्यूनल में जाते हैं और वहीं समय लगता है । ट्राइब्यूनल और विक्टिम के बीच में समय लगता है । जहाँ तक हमारी तरफ से कम्पेंसेशन देने का प्रश्न है, हम मुआवजा फौरन देते हैं । जहाँ तक डी०टी०सी० को देने का सवाल है, हम फौरन मुआवजा देते हैं । जो भी व्यक्ति दुर्घटनाग्रस्त होता है उसको मानवीय आधार पर हम मुआवजा देते हैं । एक हजार रुपये भी देते हैं, तीन हजार रुपये भी देते हैं । अब हम उम्मीद करते हैं कि इसको बढ़ाकर 10 हजार करने की व्यवस्था कर रहे हैं ।

U.S. Visa to Sikh Secessionist Dr. Jagjit Singh

\*2. **SHRIMATI AMARJIT KAUR:**  
**SHRI G. C. BHATTA-**  
**CHARYA:**

Will the Minister of **EXTERNAL AFFAIRS** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government of India have lodged a strong protest to the U.S. Government on the question of issuing visa to the self-styled Khalistan leader Dr. Jagjit Singh;

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shrimati Amarjit Kaur

(b) whether Government of India have received any reply from the U.S. Government on this issue;

(c) if so, what are the details in this regard; and

(d) whether it is a fact that many countries have accepted India's view on this issue and Canada has agreed to India's proposal to check the activities of the Khalistan leaders?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): (a) The Government of India conveyed its unhappiness to the U.S. Government on their decision to allow Dr. Jagjit Singh Chauhan to enter the USA.

(b) and (c) Yes Sir. The US Secretary of State has addressed a message to the Foreign Minister saying, *inter alia*, that in the light of Government of India's concern they (the US Govt.) intend to contact Dr. Chauhan and stress upon him the US interest in the integrity and unity of India and ask him to take this into account during his stay there. Subsequently, we were informed that these views of the U.S. Government were conveyed to Dr. Chauhan.

(d) Yes, Sir. There are a number of countries which have shown understanding of Government of India's views regarding the nature of the so-called Khalistan Movement. The attention of the Canadian authorities has been drawn to this Movement. It is learnt that during his visit to Canada, Dr. Jagjit Singh Chauhan had undertaken not to engage in political activity in Canada.

SHRIMATI AMARJIT KAUR: Sir, does the Government of India have an extradition agreement with the Government of the United States? If so, is it the intention of the Government of India to take recourse of this treaty to bring Mr. Jagjit Singh Chauhan back to India and prosecute him for treason, for his secessionist activities abroad and in this country? If not, why not?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I am not aware of the existence of any extradition arrangement. I would like to have some notice on this. I will inform the House.

SHRIMATI AMARJIT KAUR: Is it true that the passport of Mr. Jagjit Singh Chauhan was first revoked in 1976 for his anti-national activities and that he lived as a stateless person abroad, especially in Pakistan, until he was ceremoniously invited back to the then Akali-Janata Government in Punjab in 1978? Doesn't this second revocation of his passport since 24th April, 1981, put the Government of India in a position to proceed against Mr. Chauhan under our criminal laws for his deliberate, illegal stay abroad without any valid sanction or documents of the Government of India?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: This is a very complicated matter, in the first instance, his passport was impounded in January, 1972, by the Government of India. Later on, he came here and for the second time, as the hon. Member just pointed out, in view of his continued activities against the Government of India and the integrity of India, his passport was again impounded. Now we are bringing his activities to the notice of several governments. As I have started, certain governments have responded. I have also described the kind of response that we have got from certain governments, and in particular from the United States. I have read out what has transpired between them and us.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: About this extradition I would like to ask the Minister whether we have not got diplomatic relations with the U.S.A. I do not know what notice he requires to answer the question of Mrs. Amarjit Kaur as to whether you want to have his extradition and have him prosecuted here. Do you propose to have him extradited and have

you taken any steps with the Government of U.S.A. asking for his extradition so that he may be brought here and suitably prosecuted and punished?

Secondly, in your protest you have said that it is an "unfriendly act". Under the international law, when you call some action of a government, with whom you are having diplomatic relations, as an "unfriendly act" certain other steps have to follow. You have only protested. You have not only protested but you have also called it an "unfriendly act". I would like to know what more steps you are going to take so that the Government which has committed an "unfriendly act" desists from doing it. We know what has happened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your question is over.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Just a minute, Sir. Because here he mentioned he has not gone to the hospital; he is there in Washington. He is preaching all these things possibly to do damage to India.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This thing is known to the Minister and known to all of us.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: I am only saying that it is connected with this because he is continuing. Your protest is nothing. After you have called it an "unfriendly act", your protest is nothing. Your protest is not being listened to. Whatever they are doing is just an eye-wash. Mr. Chauhan is continuing his activities with the active connivance of the American Government and the CIA. Therefore, I want to know what steps you are going to take in view of your assertion that this is an "unfriendly act" and whether you want to have any negotiations with the American Government

for the extradition of Mr. Jagjit Singh Chauhan. These are the two specific questions which I want you to answer specifically.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: As I said, I would like to have notice on the question of extradition. It is not that factually the extradition arrangements are there or not there. Those arrangements are there. But the point is under the Extradition Act, what is possible, what is feasible, what could be done—this is a matter which has to be gone into. That is why I wanted notice.

So far as the other part of the supplementary is concerned, I have a verbatim account of what I told the Ambassador of the United States.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you give me a little moment, Mr. Minister? Some guests are in the House whom I have to welcome. This will be resumed after I have welcomed them.

#### Welcome to Bulgarian Parliamentary Delegation

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have an announcement to make. We have with us this morning, Members of the Bulgarian Parliamentary Delegation which is on a visit to India from the 15th to 23rd February, 1982, under the distinguished leadership of His Excellency Mr. Stanko Todorov, Chairman of the National Assembly of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. The other Members of the delegation are Mr. Alexi Ivanov, M.P., Mr. Stoyan Karadjov, M.P., Mr. Boris Manov, M.P., Colonel Geogi Inanov, M.P., Mr. Stanislav Siviriev, M.P. and Mrs. Grozdna Yankova, M.P. The Members of the Delegation are now seated in the Special Box.

On behalf of the Members of the House and on my behalf, I take pleasure in extending a very warm welcome to the Leader and other Members of the Delegation and wish our distinguished guests a very enjoyable and fruitful stay in our country. They have already seen a little of our country and I hope by the time they leave us, they will have learnt more about our country and our people. Through them, we convey our greetings and best wishes to the National Assembly and the friendly people of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

### ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS— contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Minister.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, as I was saying . . .

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Sir, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. He is reading out something; he is halfway.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have a verbatim account of what exactly I told the United States' Ambassador. The hon. Member's remark that I called the U.S. action an unfriendly act is not borne out by that.

(Interruptions)

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to ask the Minister of External Affairs whether he is aware that the hard core of the so-called Khalistan movement consists of no more than 50 or 100 people basically located in four countries, Canada, the United States, England and, perhaps, a couple in Japan and that all these people are people with foreign nationalities and foreign passports and they have absolutely nothing at stake in this country. Is he aware that there are several in-

stitutions bearing innocuous names like the Guru Nanak Foundation led by Ganga Singh Dhillon who are flooding this country with propaganda material in Gurumukhi and English and creating an extremely bad name for this community? I would like to know if he has taken any action in warning our Missions in those countries to compile a list of these mischief-makers so that this mischief is nipped in the bud and the fair name of this community does not continue to be tarnished.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I am largely in agreement with what the hon. Member has said. These individuals are operating in a few countries. They do not have any organisational support worth the name. What we are doing is to draw the attention of the Governments of those countries to the activities of these persons and we are trying to see that they get no encouragement from those Governments.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shahabuddin. One by one. (Interruptions) There are quite a number. I am going to give more chances. So, please hold yourself in peace.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Sir, we do not seem to have full information about the case history of Mr. Chauhan. For example, we were told his passport was impounded in 1972 and again in 1976. In between these two years he was issued with a fresh passport. Again he came to India. On what passport did he travel? So, what I would like to know is that from, say, 1976 onward, what had been the various passports that he had held, whether he had held only Indian passports or he has held any foreign passports as well. Therefore, I would like to know, particularly when this time he travelled to the United States, whether he travelled on an Indian passport or on a foreign passport. My question is: Do we object only to the activities of an

Indian national on a matter of concern to us—which are adverse to our interests—or do we also take into account the possibility that the nationals of third countries may launch a propaganda on a foreign soil against our country?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, as I said, for the first time his passport was impounded in 1972. The second time it was impounded was not in 1976, as the hon. Member pointed out, but in 1981. Meanwhile, as I said, he came to India and since his activities continued, again in 1981 it was... (Interruptions) Then, Sir, about the other question... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I would like to avoid going into the details of his activities which led to the second impoundment. It is obvious that his activities continued, he went from place to place. Therefore, we thought that it was time to put an end to this and so it was impounded a second time.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: How was it validated? After 1972, when was it validated?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It was validated after the change of Government in 1977. I wanted to avoid it, but since he is asking for it, I am telling him. About the other question, I would say that it is not only in the case of the Indian nationals abroad but also foreign nationals, if they are carrying on propaganda and activities against the integrity of our country, we do bring it to their notice, and in this particular case we have been told that the U.S. authorities have not only told Dr. Chauhan but have also told the other American citizens of Indian origin that they stand for the unity of India, they do not want to tolerate any activities which go against the unity of India, any secessionist activities. I am placing the facts as I find them before

the House without any comment. I am quite prepared to say that the fact remains that Dr. Jagjit Singh Chauhan is now in Washington, the fact remains that he was admitted into the United States, whereupon I called the Ambassador and told him what we think about this act, to which a reply has come and I have placed it before the House. (Interruptions)

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Sir, he has not answered my question. On which passport did he travel to the United States? We want to know whether it is an Indian passport or a foreign passport.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The passport was impounded. He has been without any valid travel document. That is the position.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: For the United States to admit someone who does not hold a travel document at all, is something fantastic, is something totally against international law. Will the Minister make it clear?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I have nothing to say on his comment that it is fantastic. But the fact is that a waiver has been granted to him by the Government. In spite of the fact that he has travelled without any valid document, the Government has waived the necessity to have a document in his case and, therefore, he is in Washington. (Interruptions)

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: Sir, I would like to know from the Minister whether he is aware that he continued his activities for a year or so in Canada and it is only when the Canadian Government asked him to quit before February 3 that the US Government stepped in, though the first reaction if the US Government was that they could not provide him an entry. Is the Minister aware that it has come in all the papers? Whether he gets reports from newspapers or otherwise, I do

not know. It has appeared in the press that after reconsideration the US Government admitted him into America without any valid document from the Indian Government (because he had no passport). And then I would like to ask the Minister whether he has read the official statement of the US Government. It is not what he has stated in the House. The official stand by the American Government—I do not know whether he is aware of it—is that he will not indulge in organising any violent activities. It has appeared in the American Press. It has appeared in the Canadian Press. Then I would like to know from the Minister why he is shy in saying that America is indulging in organising activities, separatist movements and encouraging them. Sir, I am pointing out that this is not the first case. During the last ten years or more than ten years he has been carrying on these activities. Is the Minister not aware that earlier he was using Pakistan to raise this slogan and that on the Pakistan Radio he had made speeches advocating separatist slogans? Why is he now feeling shy to state that America is directly intervening to encourage the separatist movement? Why is he taking cover under technicality and legality? (*Interruptions*)

श्री जी० सी० मट्टाचार्य : चेरमंत  
साहब, ये कर्जा खा रहे हैं इसलिए वाईट-  
वाश कर रहे हैं।

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** There is no need for me to fight shy or feel shy. A question has been tabled, and I have given a pointed answer to the question. The question wanted certain information, and I have provided that information. In the supplementaries whatever additional information is wanted, I am prepared to furnish it. Now the point is that the American Government has given to us a certain explanation in regard to their action. The question pertained to that explanation, and I have placed it before the House. It

is for the Members to make any comments they like. I would certainly take note of the comments. And, as I have stated, the fact remains that he is there without travel documents; the fact remains that he has been given a waiver; the fact remains that this has certain political implications, and the fact remains that these implications have been forcefully brought to the notice of the other Government.

**SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET:** What implications? I have asked a specific question. He has not answered any of my questions. In the American Press a statement of the Government has come that he will not indulge in organising violent activities. That is the stand which the Government has taken. Has it come to his notice? I have seen the American Press reports. That is number one. Then, the second one, Sir, why can he not conclude that America is indulging in encouraging the separatist movement in our country? Otherwise what is the reason for protection?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That is what is called an unfriendly act.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** The answer to the first part of the supplementary is in the affirmative. But that does not help the argument of the hon. Member because if it is only a question of violent acts, there are no violent acts as such.

**SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET:** That is what I say.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** Therefore, what we have told the American Government is that the violent act is not individual but that it is organisational. If some persons belonging to that movement or to that body are seen to have indulged in violent acts, naturally the responsibility would also rest on the head of that organisation. Therefore, we should not take a very technical, narrow view of violence. All these things we have told them, Sir.

श्री रामानन्द यादव : श्रीमन्...

श्री सशरति : आपने बाद में हाथ  
उठाया था ।

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PAN-  
DEY: Sir, may I know from the  
Minister whether the Minister is  
aware that one Senator, Mr. Jesse  
Helmes, has shown keen interest and  
had put pressure to secure a waiver  
from the Deputy Secretary, Mr. James  
Buckley, to get entry into the USA  
for Dr. Chauhan? Is it in the know-  
ledge of the Government? And if it  
is in the knowledge of the Govern-  
ment, what did the Government do  
and what protest has the Govern-  
ment launched against all these  
things? The Government of America  
is involved. That is number one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That has been  
answered. Now the particular infor-  
mation...

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PAN-  
DEY: Let me complete the ques-  
tion. That is part one of my ques-  
tion. Number two, is the Govern-  
ment also aware that in 1977 the  
same man was organising "India for  
Democracy" and he was propagating  
it at that time also? Is it also a fact  
that the same person is in collusion  
with some of the enemical countries?  
Now he is propagating the separatist  
movement against India and against  
the unity and integrity of India.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:  
Sir, we are aware of certain persons,  
certain influential persons in the  
United States who are reported to  
have helped him in coming into the  
United States, but that is not relevant  
from our point of view. What is  
relevant is the action of the Govern-  
ment of the United States, and that  
is what we have concentrated upon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hanspal.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KUL-  
KARNI: Sir,...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute.  
Selection is made from all sides.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KUL-  
KARNI: From this side also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, every-  
where.

SHRI HARVENDAR SINGH HANS-  
PAL: Sir, as the hon. Minister has  
said, the waiver provision has been  
used in giving a visa to Dr. Jagjit  
Singh. I understand, U.S. Govern-  
ment has given the explanation that  
Dr. Jagjit Singh is suffering from  
some heart ailment and he wants to  
get a check-up from his doctors in  
Houston, and the waiver provision  
has been used in his case ostensibly  
on health grounds or humanitarian  
considerations. I learn—and the hon.  
Minister has also confirmed it—that  
he is staying in Washington and  
meeting some Senators who are  
chronically against India instead of  
going to his cardiologist in Houston.  
I want to know from the hon. Minis-  
ter whether they have taken note of  
it and, if so, what action the Govern-  
ment of India proposes to take in this  
regard.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:  
Sir, we have taken note of all that is  
happening now. We have taken note  
of the explanation which they have  
given us. Everything has been taken  
note of. And whatever further steps  
are warranted will be taken.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ramanand  
Yadav and then Mr. Dinesh Singh.  
Then I will come this way.

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO  
DHABE: Sir, why not allow a half-  
an-hour discussion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If everybody  
wants to put a question.... (Inter-  
ruptions).

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO  
DHABE: The question is important  
from our national point of view. Why  
not have a half-an-hour discussion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the use of asking me for a half-an-hour discussion after half-an-hour is spent?

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: To avoid another half-an-hour.

श्री रामानन्द यादव : मैं सरकार से चार प्वाइंट्स जानना चाहूंगा ।

श्री सभापति : नहीं, नहीं, चार प्वाइंट्स नहीं ।

श्री रामानन्द यादव : मेरा क्वेश्चन है....

श्री सभापति : अब एक सवाल से ज्यादा नहीं । ... (व्यवधान)

श्री रामानन्द यादव : वह क्वेश्चन के रूप में है, सुनिये । वह क्वेश्चन यह है कि क्या भारत सरकार ने अमरीकन सरकार को यह लिख भेजा है कि सेसेशनिज्म का प्रचार करना दृष्टिजन्य है और अमरीकन सरकार का इस पर क्या मत है ?

दूसरा, क्या सरकार को मालूम है कि भारतीय जेनेवा आफिस ने जगजीत सिंह को 12 सितम्बर, 1980 में पासपोर्ट दिया था लंदन के लिए जिसका नम्बर बी 65742 है । क्या अमरीका सरकार ने भारत सरकार को यह बताया है कि किन कारणों से जगजीत सिंह को अमरीका में आश्रय दिया गया है और यह बीजा कितने दिन के लिए अमरीका सरकार ने दिया है ? और यह भी कि क्या अमरीका सरकार का जो एक्स-प्लेनशन है, उससे भारत सरकार सैटिसफाईड है ?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : श्रीमन्, मैंने....

श्री सभापति : सिवाए नम्बर के तो मुझे कोई नई बात दिखाई नहीं देती ।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : मैंने अमरीका के राजदूत को यहां तक कहा कि आपके देश में इस अलग होने की भावना को लेकर सिविल वार हुई है, तो सेसेशन का क्या महत्व होता है और किसी देश के लिए वह कितनी खतरनाक चीज होती है, यह तो आप जानते ही हैं । इसीलिए हमें बड़ी मायूसी हुई है जबकि आपने इस आदमी को अपने मुल्क में आने दिया ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि वह जो पासपोर्ट नम्बर वगैरह बता रहे थे, अब वह नम्बर मेरे पास नहीं है ? हो सकता है कि उन्हीं का नम्बर सही हो, लेकिन मैंने यह कहा कि जब वह अमरीका गये, तो उनके पास कोई वैलिड डाक्यूमेंट नहीं था क्योंकि उनको पासपोर्ट जो भी दिया गया था, उसको रद्द कर दिया गया था ।... (व्यवधान)

श्री रामानन्द यादव : अमरीका सरकार ने उनको आने दिया उसका कारण क्या है ?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : वह तो मैं कह चुका हूँ । सदस्यों ने यह पूछा था कि क्या यह सही है कि अमरीका की सरकार ने उनको इलाज के लिए आने दिया, और यह कहा आपसे कि इलाज के लिए उन को आने दिया गया है ?—मैंने कहा, हाँ । ये सब बातें हमसे कही जा चुकी हैं और यह भी कहा गया है कि यह कोई उनको सदा के लिए स्थायी तौर पर वहां रहने नहीं दिया गया ; अस्थायी तौर पर उन को आने दिया गया है ।

श्री रामानन्द यादव : क्या भारत सरकार अमरीकन सरकार के स्टेटमेंट से सैटिसफाईड है या नहीं—लास्ट मेरा सवाल था ।



श्री समापति : बताया तो उन्होंने कि भई, हमें सैटिस्फेक्शन नहीं है। पहले इतने सवालालात हो चुके हैं। जवाब आपने सुने कि नहीं सुने ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: The honourable Minister has mentioned that this matter has been brought to the notice of other Governments also. I would like to know whether the U.K. Government is one of them to which this matter has been addressed and whether what has appeared in the press is true that the U.K. Government have informed the Indian Government that they will permit Mr. Chauhan to go to England and also to stay there.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: All these Governments have been contacted by us. U.K. Government is one of them. It is also a fact that the U.K. Government has given us a hint to the effect that if Dr. Chauhan wishes to come back and settle in the U.K., it may not be easy for them to deny him that opportunity under their laws. This will need a sort of negotiation. But finally nothing has emerged.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: It is an extraordinary circumstances in which a major world power, which also professes to work out a pattern of normal relationship with us, has indulged in what can only be called diplomatic belligerence; diplomatic belligerence because, without any travel document, much less a valid passport from the Republic of India, visa has been issued to a gentleman who is not an ordinary citizen of India but who is indulging in an activity which runs counter to the basic national interest. There is nothing more basic than the national territorial integrity of the country. Therefore, I would like to ask the honourable Minister whether the response from the Indian side was equal to the diplomatic belligerence, as I am trying to call it, from the American side; if so, whether he has also

responded to the letter of Mr. Alexander Haig, in which Mr. Haig, in his well-known style of avoiding the essentials, has mentioned that if violent measures are advocated action will be taken—whether the Minister of External Affairs has also informed them, whether violent or non-violent, any propaganda against the territorial integrity of India jeopardises our relations with the United States of America, and it will be construed as a very major act of unfriendliness in the last thirtyfive years during our very precarious relationship with the United States of America.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: What all has been suggested by the honourable Member has been conveyed except calling it an unfriendly act which has its own implications. All other things have been conveyed. In fact, the response that we got is to the manner in which we took up the matter and the seriousness which we attach to it.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : मान्यवर, अभी-अभी विदेश मंत्री जी ने हमको बतलाया कि अमरीकी सरकार ने "वेबर" "कर" दिया। यह बहुत ही असाधारण चीज है। आखिर-कार, अमरीकी सरकार को यह स्वयंभू खालिस्तानी नेता के प्रति कैसे इतनी मोहब्बत आ गई कि उन्होंने वेबर कर दिया अखबारों से पता चलता है कि ऐसा उन्होंने ह्यूमेनिटेरियन ग्राउन्ड पर किया। लेकिन अखबारों से यह भी पता चलता है कि यह सिर्फ बहाना था। डा० जगजीत सिंह न बीमार थे, बल्कि यह बहुत ही सुनियोजित चाल थी जिसके माहृत उन को अमरीका में बैठकर भारत के विभाजन के लिए प्रचार करने की सुविधा दी गयी। क्या विदेश मंत्री जी ने अपने अमरीका स्थित राजदूतावास से इस बात की खबर ली है वहाँ पहुंचने पर ये जनाब क्या-क्या हरकतें हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ कर रहे हैं और जो भी हरकतें कर रहे

हैं उनको रोकने के लिए हमारी सरकार क्या कदम उठा रही है ?

**श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव :** पहली बात तो मैं यह निवेदन कर दूँ कि जिस को माननीय सदस्य ने अधिधारण कार्यवाही कहा है, अमरीकन सरकार ने यह कहा है कि यह जो वेबर दिया जाता है यह स्टोन चीज है, इस में अधिधारण बात नहीं है। मैं उन की बात दोहरा रहा हूँ। दूसरे यह कि यह महाशय वहाँ वाशिंगटन में क्या-क्या कर रहे हैं, उन की गतिविधियाँ क्या हैं, जैसा मैं कह चुका हूँ, हमें मालूम है।

**श्री सदाशिव बागाईतकर :** श्रीमन्, और बातें जो विदेश मंत्री जी ने बताईं अपनी जगह हैं। लेकिन बुनियादी बात जिस का वह जवाब नहीं दे रहे हैं वह यह है कि जब उन का पासपोर्ट इम्पाउंड किया था तो क्या यह सही नहीं है कि जिनेवा में उन्होंने पासपोर्ट हासिल करने की कुछ तरकीब निकाली और उनको वहाँ पासपोर्ट हासिल हो गया। अगर वैसा नहीं है तो एयर टिकट वहाँ से उन को कैसे हासिल हो सका बिना पासपोर्ट के, बीसा कैसे मिला, यह हम लोगों की समझ में नहीं आ रहा है। अबबारों के जरिए तो यहीं जानकारी है कि जिनेवा में उन्होंने दुबारा पासपोर्ट हासिल किया। अगर यह सही है तो यह कैसे हुआ, इस का खुलासा आप करिए।

**श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव :** जिनेवा में जो पासपोर्ट उन्होंने हासिल किया उसी को हम ने इम्पाउंड किया। आप को मालूम है कि उन को बीच में पासपोर्ट मिला था।

**श्री सदाशिव बागाईतकर :** इम्पाउंड कब किया और दुबारा कब मिला ?

**श्री रामानन्द यादव :** दिल्ली में जब जनता गवर्नमेंट सत्ता में थी तब उन को पासपोर्ट मिला।

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** In 1977, Dr. Chauhan declared his support to the Janata Government...

**श्री सदाशिव बागाईतकर :** इस में क्या मतलब हुआ ?

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** The passport was revoked not impounded, I stand corrected...

**SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE:** Revoked or renewed?

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** Revoked. The difference is that when you revoke the passport, the document is not physically captured but a circular is issued to all concerned not to honour it. Here, there was a revocation of the passport given to him and, after that, legally he was not in possession of any valid travel documents.

**SHRI SADASHIV BAGAITKAR:** I specifically asked when and on what date it was revoked and when he got it back. I want the dates on which it was revoked and on which he got it back.

**श्री सभापति :** आप के पास है तो बताइये ? आप के पास नहीं है ? यादव जी के पास तो उस का नम्बर भी है।

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** First in 1972.... I have the date here, but I am not able to locate it. I shall give the date later on because I do not want to take any more time of the House.... (Interruptions).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Already so much time has been taken by this one question.

**SHRI SADASHIV BAGAITKAR:** If the date is not available with the hon. Minister, I can understand that.

Please postpone this question, because this is a vital piece of information in the whole context. So, unless we get the date, no meaningful supplementary can be put. Please postpone this question.

श्री जे० के० जैन : श्रीमन्, 50 मिनट इस क्वेश्चन पर हो गये।... (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I know. इसकी अहमियत बहुत ज्यादा है।

श्री जे० के० जैन : फिर इस पर डिबेट कर दीजिए।... (व्यवधान)

DR. SARUP SINGH: Sir, one very important question raised by Mr. Khushwant Singh has apparently not been properly noticed. His question was that there are organisations, some named after Guru Nanak like Guru Nanak Foundation—or there may be many such foundations and there are many foundations of this kind—and they may send their representatives to India and now, outwardly, it is a very innocuous kind of a thing if a Sikh member would claim that he has arrived here to go to Amritsar to the Golden Temple there and so on and so forth. But some of these organisations are apparently indulging in this kind of propaganda. Is it not, therefore, very necessary that the Government of India should be very watchful not only about the activities of individuals like Dr. Chauhan, but also about innocuous-looking individuals who claim, in the name of cultural or religious fraternity or whatever it is, friendship and cause grave embarrassment to the Sikh community? It is not merely a question of territorial integrity of India, but it is also a question of causing grave embarrassment to the Sikh community. So, Sir, this is my question to the honourable Minister.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I think I have answered that question. If it is a question of individuals coming and causing embar-

assment, we will not be able to take any action in advance. If such an act is actually committed by them, only then action can be taken. Otherwise, it will result in a fruitless action.

DR. SARUP SINGH: Sir, if there are organisations, we must know what those organisations are and what they are doing and what kind of propaganda material they have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have had enough on this. Enough is enough. We have got everything except Dr. Chauhan here. Yes, Mr. Mathur.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : श्रीमन्, मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि दो दफे पासपोर्ट इंपाउंड किया गया पहले 1972 में। 1977 में रिन्यू किया गया। उन्होंने कहा कि डेट्स उनके पास नहीं है। मैं डेट्स नहीं पूछ रहा हूँ। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि 1972 से 1977 तक, इन पांच सालों में सरकार ने क्या किया। आज जो मुस्तीदी आप दिखा रहे हैं इन पांच सालों में अमरीका सरकार के साथ या दूसरे देशों की सरकारों के साथ आपने क्या किया? डा० जगजीत सिंह हरकतें करते रहे, इस बीच में आपने अमरीका और इंग्लैंड की सरकारों के साथ क्या किया, यह बतायें।

श्रीमती सरोज खापड़ : उस दरमियान आपकी सरकार थी... (व्यवधान)

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : यह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है। सवाल ऐसा है जिसका जबाब मेरे पास इस समय नहीं है। अगर आप चाहें कि इन पांच सालों में हमने किस-किस के साथ क्या-क्या किया, वह मैं बताने के लिए तैयार हूँ।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : आपने कहा था कि वह ऐक्टीविटीज न करें।

इसका मतलब मैं यह समझूँ कि 1972 से 1977 तक आपने कुछ नहीं किया...

(व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Next question. Yes, Mr. Jain.

Motor Buses in the Fleet of D.T.C.

\*3. SHRI J. K. JAIN: Will the Minister of SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) what is the number of motor buses at present, in the fleet of the Delhi Transport Corporation and the number (i) plying on the roads, (ii) under repairs at various workshops and (iii) found unserviceable;

(b) whether there is any proposal to acquire more buses for the Delhi Transport Corporation in the current and ensuing financial years; and

(c) if so, what are the details thereof?

नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सीताराम केसरी) : (क)

1-2-1982 को दिल्ली परिवहन निगम की बसों की कुल संख्या 3081 थी जिसमें से 2793 बसें चालू हालत में थी, 44 बसों की मरम्मत हो रही थी और 9 बसें चलाये जाने के योग्य नहीं थी। शेष 235 बसें विभिन्न डिपुओं में थीं जो अन्य मोटर वाहनों के मरम्मत के समय प्रयोग में लाई जाती थीं।

(ख) और (ग) चालू वर्ष में दिल्ली परिवहन निगम अपनी बसों में 291 नयी बसों की और वृद्धि करेगा? आगामी वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए 290 नयी बसें खरीदने का प्रावधान किया गया है।

श्री जे० के० जैन : सभापति महोदय, मैं पहले तो डी०टी०सी० के उन लायल कर्मचारियों को बढ़ाई देना चाहता हूँ और डी० टी० सी० के अध्यक्ष श्री श्रीवास्तव को भी, जिन्होंने 19 दिसम्बर को दिये गये राष्ट्रविरोधी बंद

का मुह-तोड़ जवाब दिया (व्यवधान) और दिल्ली की जनता को होने वाली कठिनाई से बचाया। इसके लिए वे बढ़ाई के पात्र हैं। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या मंत्री जी ने भी और उनके मंत्रालय ने भी उनको बढ़ाई भेजी है? दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जितनी बसें इस वर्ष डी० टी० सी० के फ्लैट में शामिल करने जा रहे हैं क्या वे बात कम नहीं हैं और एशियाड गेम्स नवम्बर में होने जा रहे हैं उसको ध्यान में रखते हुए क्या वह और अधिक बसें डी० टी० सी० को प्रदान करेंगे? ... (व्यवधान)

श्री सीताराम केसरी : मान्यवर, एशियाड की तरफ से जो पत्र आया है उसमें आठ सौ बसें मांगी गई हैं। विभिन्न प्रदेशों से भी संकेत मिला है कि वे बसें देने को तैयार हैं। इस पत्र के अनुसार हम इस को कार्यान्वित करने जा रहे हैं। और विभिन्न प्रदेशों से बसों को मंगाने की योजना भी हम जल्दी बना रहे हैं। आशा है निकट भविष्य में हम इसको पूरा कर कर देंगे।

श्री जे० के० जैन : सभापति महोदय, मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि छठी पंचवर्षीय योजना में दिल्ली की डी० टी० सी० के लिये जो रुपये का प्राविजन किया गया है क्या वह उससे संतुष्ट हैं? हमारी ऐसी जानकारी है कि जितना रुपया प्लानिंग कमिशन ने डी० टी० सी० के लिए रखा है, बसें खरीदने के लिए रखा है, वह कम है। क्या मंत्री जी यह बतायेंगे कि उनके मंत्रालय ने डी० टी० सी० को और अधिक रुपया दिलवाने के लिये प्लानिंग कमिशन के पास कोई प्रोजेक्ट भेजी है? यदि भेजी है तो कितना रुपया उसमें मांगा है?

श्री सीताराम केसरी : इनका कहना यह ठीक है कि जितने यात्री चलते हैं