

[Shri Ravindra Verma]

nothing more in it. Therefore, there is no attempt to force a strait-jacket of a two-party system in this Bill.

Sir, a suggestion was made about proportional representation. This is a matter which will be studied not in relation to this Bill. This Bill tries to deal with the situation as it exists. If, in the collective wisdom of this country, it is decided that we should take to proportional representation and alter our basis of polity and representation, then, of course, this might be irrelevant in that context or might have relevance in an amended fashion. But, at the moment, we are dealing with what exists, and not what might exist. Therefore, Sir, I would commend this Bill for the acceptance of the House, and I hope, Sir, that my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will not insist on opposing it and will also join in accepting the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am grateful to him at least for one thing. I have noted what he said. My friend should hear. As far as the other part is concerned, it is the usual anti-communist speech.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: Do not take it as anti-communist.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He said that it was open to the party whether it is the CPI, CPI(M) or the CPI(M-L) to utilise this democracy to destroy it. Will you, Shri Viswanatha Menon, kindly convey it to your Politburo? This is the direct assessment of you. As far as our party is concerned, we do not need it.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: Do you not know your friends?

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: I do not know whether they know each other.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): Now I will put the motion.

The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the salary and allowances of Leaders of Opposition in Parliament, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI) : We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

*Clauses 2 to 12 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA : I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

#### DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DR. V. P. DUTT (Nominated) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I should like to begin by offering my felicitations to the Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee. This is the first time that the House is discussing international relations under his stewardship. Therefore, we are happy that he is here with us and I convey my best wishes to him.

He has also said more than once in the last four months or so that foreign policy was not an issue in the elections and that India's foreign policy will continue broadly on the same lines. It was a reassuring statement. It told the world that India's foreign policy was not the whim or fancy of an individual. And we feel quite gratified by the fact that the publicly stated statements that have come from the ruling party have said that the foreign policy which we have followed all these years will be conformed to.

Sir, I should like to mention in this connection that Indian foreign policy has

had an extraordinary stability. When we look at the transformation that has taken place in the U.S. foreign policy, when we perceive the sea change that has taken place in China's foreign policy and in the foreign policies of many countries of the world, we find that the stability of Indian foreign policy is an amazing fact. And I should like to remind the House that this stability has been due to Jawaharlal Nehru's vision. Jawaharlal Nehru foresaw that the Cold War was less ideological and more geopolitical and strategic for influence and control in the world and that it would not last long. Jawaharlal Nehru pointed out a new path to the newly emerging and developing countries of the world that they should strengthen their freedom and independence by staying out of the conflicts of Europe. Along with other leaders of the developing countries, he invited them to come together for co-operation. And we have seen how this co-operation has flowered. Jawaharlal Nehru also preached the temper of peace and India has been associated with the quest for peace everywhere. But Jawaharlal Nehru was also quite convinced that in order to bring about peaceful conditions, it was necessary to resist imperialism and neo-colonialism in every form and in every shape and in every part of the world. Jawaharlal Nehru was also an architect of our extensive economic relationship with the socialist world. Jawaharlal Nehru also strove to develop good relations with all countries, with all big countries of the world, too. And above all, independence of approach and quest for self-reliance, these were the hallmarks of Jawaharlal Nehru's and India's foreign policy. I have mentioned these as, to my mind, and in a very broad outline, these are the elements of India's foreign policy of non-alignment. This is what I would call the sum total, the stuff and substance of which non-alignment is made. And I say, this is what genuine non-alignment is. When I hear some talk about India now trying to pursue "genuine non-alignment", "real non-alignment", I wonder what that means. Does it

mean that the policy that Jawaharlal Nehru had pursued, that this country had pursued, was not genuine non-alignment? Sir, we have our esteemed colleague, Mr. Dinesh Singh, here who promoted Jawaharlal Nehru's concept of non-alignment. I am sure he would endorse that India was following genuine non-alignment. Sir, if I may say so, there are women of virtue and there are women of easy virtue, and I am afraid the so-called "genuine" and "real" non-alignment falls in the second category. In fact, I will be failing in my duty to myself and to the House if I did not mention an annoying feeling, a nagging feeling at the back of the minds of many of us that slowly, gradually, perhaps imperceptibly, subtly but surely, there is a certain departure, a certain shift and tendency to please, to placate and to bend.

In many vital areas, I would say, there is a strange softness and passivity. Take the nuclear field. This country has all along kept its options open and its research and development in nuclear technology in top gear, firstly because the big powers have sought to impose a totally unequal regime and relationship in this field. But I shall not go into that. What is more important is the vital need of nuclear technology for a country like India. I am reminded of what Jawaharlal Nehru said, "A country like India which is short of energy, short of power, cannot afford to remain behind in the field of a technology which might be the technology of the future, the nuclear technology." But now assurances seem to have been given, maybe, not written, maybe oral, but assurances none-the-less, that India would not undertake to explode the atom even for peaceful purposes and certainly not without discussion with certain powers. This I cannot understand. And it has also been said that nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes may no longer be necessary. I was going through very carefully a document, a speech by Dr. Ramanna, who is at least one of the founder-fathers of this

[Dr. V. P. Dutt ]

nuclear explosion that took place, wherein he has mentioned a large number of important uses of the nuclear energy and for carefully monitoring calculated nuclear explosions. And he says, "Peaceful nuclear explosions, known as PNE, can help in the fields of underground engineering, excavation and scientific studies; their use is envisaged to dig sea-level canals between oceans, to change the course of rivers, to strip waste rock from deep mineral deposits, to release trapped underground supplies of natural gas and petroleum, to create railway passes through mountains or to create harbours and lakes where none existed before, and so on. I do not want to take the time of the House by reading more. I would only like to read his concluding sentence. He says, "whatever be the conclusions that come out from other studies, it is clear that India should not lag behind in advanced technology. We missed the first Industrial Revolution and we should under no circumstances miss the second one. India should keep herself abreast in all aspects of modern technology so that it is available to it whenever the need arises and not be forced to import the knowhow because we do not have it when we want it." In this context I cannot understand the new policy, and I hope that our esteemed Minister of External Affairs will assure the House that no such departure is taking place. Take the question of the Indian Ocean. We get the impression that somehow our voice has become muted. We seem to be satisfied with leaving the matter to the two big powers to sort out among themselves. To my mind the biggest danger of these bases is not to the big powers themselves but to the smaller powers and to other countries like India. In fact, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that an effort has been made to build up a ring of bases from the Cape of Horn to Diego Garcia through the Gulf to the South-East Asia and the Pacific. Not taking too much time I just like to mention some of the basis that these powers have in this part

of the world. I first take up the British. They have bases in Cape of Good-Hope, Seycheles, Mahe, Desroches, Aldabra, Farquhar, Mauritius, and the so-called BIO Territories, again Maldives, Chagos; then the United States: Mahe, Chagos (near Diego Garcia), Cocos Island, Lorenzo-Marques, Baharain, Woomera, North-West Cape, Pine Gap, Perth and Alice Springs, and until recently Basara. Now the French bases are Dijibouti, Comora Islands, Reunion Islands and Diego Suarez. I have read all the names of the British, French and United States of America bases. The Soviet Union claims that it has no base in the Indian Ocean. But the Americans have challenged it. Therefore, we cannot equate the two systems of powers because our approach has been that one base will invite another base and one warship will attract another warship and these are sources of tension. Not only that, these are base spring-boards for dominance over the littoral States of the Indian Ocean. Therefore, I hope that we will raise our voice—as we have been doing in the past—against this and call for a conference of all the littoral States of the big powers for the resolution of the problem which would be fair and equitable to all—not only to the big powers.

Sir, I may also mention—now that I am talking about the vague and uneasy feeling that we get about some shift in our policy—that if we tie this up with certain other developments of enough importance, especially in the two neighbouring countries—then this feeling of anxiety gets somewhat strengthened and deepened. I am referring to the question of Farakka barrage and the developments in Pakistan. The Government is tight-lipped with regard to the Farakka barrage. But the reports that are coming are disturbing. The newspapers have been reporting that India might have agreed to cut down during the lean months the upland flow from the Ganga to less than 20,000 cusecs and this has caused serious concern in Calcutta. Such curtailment to upland supplies to the Hooghly to 50 per cent of its minimum

requirements will, according to the experts, far from effecting a steady improvement of the river, sound the deathknell of the Calcutta port. And similar misgivings are being voiced by the people in Bihar. In fact, somebody has pointed out that if this kind of an agreement goes through, then the very purpose of having the Farakka barrage is frustrated and stultified. What is being said is that this is being done under certain pressures.

There are changes taking place in Pakistan. But I would not like to go into those developments as they are the internal matters of Pakistan. But certain powers may again become interested in the developments in Pakistan and may again try to entice Pakistan by offering military supplies and all kinds of aids which are inimical to Indian interests. But from the Government the only response that we got was the Prime Minister's statement made the other day in the other House that he would not be careless to what happens—whether the U.S. supplies arms to Pakistan or not. I submit with all respect—and I do respect him as well as the Prime Minister of this country—that this cannot be the attitude of India. We have to take note of what is happening. And, Sir, we have to be active and up on our feet about it. I am afraid, Sir—I may be wrong and I hope the honourable Minister will say that we are wrong—that we are being led by the garden path through tempting offers, tantalizingly tempting offers, of aid in order to soften our approach and our stance on the various issues.

Sir, I would also like to point out that I am not against the development of good relations with the United States. In fact, it is quite the contrary. When President Carter got elected, I wrote a letter to the then Prime Minister—and this letter must be on files—suggesting that that was the opportune time for promoting quiet diplomacy with the United States, to see if we could continue our ties and promote good relations. Therefore, I am not against the promotion of good relations. But these good relations have to be on certain

principles and cannot be at our national cost. Similarly, I would like to say that we all stand for the development of similar spirit, for the development of good relations on the basis of principles, that we arrived at mutually at Simla and we do want the promotion of good relations with both Bangladesh and Pakistan, but again, as I said, on certain principles and not at our national cost and certainly not at the pressure of certain powers who are at this moment dangling the carrot before us. (*Time bell rings*)... Since I am now on the question of the negative trends in the world, I should like to mention two or three other negative trends which we are facing today. One is the question of the progress towards the establishment of a new international economic order. Sir, we all know this is a matter of vital concern to all the developing countries of the world and we also know that there is hardly any progress. Some people have asked me as to what an international economic order is. My answer briefly is this: It is an order in which there is less inequality, an order which gives more opportunities to the developed world for trade, an order which lessens or reduces or minimises the hard terms of aid that are being offered at this time, but more than anything else, an order in which there is more equal economic and trading system and we also know that all the factors are in favour of the advanced industrialised countries of the world. Sir, the advanced industrialised countries of the world are going to gain. May I mention, Sir, that in 1972, the non-oil-exporting countries had only a 13.63 per cent share of the world trade and in 1976, only a 14.33 per cent share? There was hardly any rise at all. And then, Sir, the oil-exporting countries have jumped from 5.06 per cent to 10.89 per cent. That is all. Sir, I may mention one more figure which will show the gravity of the situation. Between 1966 and 1974, there has been a

[ Dr. V. P. Dutt ]

total net transfer of capital assets to the tune of 19,434 million dollars to the advanced countries of the world and that situation continues to exist even today. I do not have the figures for 1975 and 1976. But, basically, the position has not changed.

Similarly, Sir, the negotiations with regard to the Law of the Seas have led us nowhere. All I would like to say here is that there was a time when every Western draft was matched by an Indian draft and finally a compromise had to be reached by them with us on what would be or could be achieved... *(Time bell rings)* ... But, Sir, somehow that dynamism and that activity are missing now and I would like them to come back.

There are two other points which I would like to mention in passing and I would not like to spend much of my time on them. What is this arms race that is going on now in the world? As we know, today while we are being preached that we must not be engaged even in peaceful explosion of the atom, the arms race among the big powers is not only continuing, but continuing frantically. Already, I was told, that last year there was a total spending of 300 billion dollars worth of arms, and now there is a talk of new missiles, there is a talk of more hydrogen missiles and there is a talk of various kinds of new weapons. These pose a fresh danger to the world and we have to raise our voice against it. But what is worrying me more than the arms race is the arms sale—arms sales from the developed countries, from industrial countries, to the under-developed countries. Sir, I understand from sources which should know that last year, the world order for arms had shot up to 20 billion dollars. Of this, half was of the United States and perhaps more than that of the Soviet Union. Not only that. What is even more disquieting is that last year 4.3 billion dollars worth of arms

were supplied only to the gulf countries and, Sir, out of that, two-thirds went to two countries of the world—Iran and Saudi Arabia. So this is the kind of unbalanced situation that is being created. And my suggestion is that through such arms sales and aid, developing countries are being divided, whether it is West Asia, Libia or Egypt or whether it is Africa or Angola. The developed countries, the industrialised countries—some of them at least—are successful by dividing the developing countries. Therefore, we have to guard ourselves against that... *(Time bell rings)*.

I will take five minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): I am afraid you have to conclude quickly.

DR. V. P. DUTT: I am yet to begin the most important part of my speech.

I do not want to mention the situation in South Africa, because the time is short. But I would like to say that if I may put it in just one sentence, the time in South Africa is five minutes to twelve. There is an explosive situation, and unless something is done immediately, it will blow up.

These are the adverse trends of international relations that we have to contend with.

But I should also like to mention some positive trends which we can make use of. One is certainly the decreasing ability of any single nation or a combination of nations to control international system, resulting in what has often been called diffusion of power or fragmentation of centres of effective, co-ordinated power. This system can no longer be stabilised by some arrangement of two or three or four or five powers or balance between nations. I am not suggesting that the military force has become absolute. Military deterrents will remain as one of the essential elements of the foreign policies of the major countries. But what

I am saying is that through the policy of control, the outcome of the application of power has become more eroded or more limited. Their sources of power remain, but their effectiveness has gone down. And this is a situation that we can certainly use to our great advantage. And, therefore, for that we have to have a certain set of priorities and we have to have a certain vision—vision that was supplied by Jawaharlal Nehru... (*Time bell rings*).

Please do not look at me like that, otherwise I will not be able to finish.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): You have taken practically half-an-hour.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Practically to open a talk takes time. I am not taking more time that anybody else has taken. I am initiating the debate. I am making a *tour de horizon*, and that *tour de horizon* cannot be complete unless I give my last suggestion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): There are 14 or 15 speakers.

DR. V. P. DUTT: If you ask me to sit down, I will sit down. But I would like to have just a minute or two more to finish this conceptual framework. If I am taking a *tour de horizon*, it must begin from our neighbours, China, 3 P. M. U. S. S. R., Pakistan, Burma, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Afghanistan. With China, there is very slow progress. Please keep on prodding and pushing. It will be a very gradual thing. But then we fell out to the Gulf region and the Indian Ocean on the one hand and to South-East Asia on the other. I am afraid we have been passive in South-East Asia. There are ASEAN States and there are Indo-China States. We can certainly play a very large role in it and from there go on to African countries, East Asia, Japan and the big powers like the United States and so on. Sir, while concluding, I would like to suggest that our re-

sources are limited. We cannot naturally be active everywhere and we cannot help everywhere. But we can adopt a selective approach and a discriminating approach in order to make our relationship and our aid more effective. Sir, each country has its own natural sphere of action and India is the emerging countries of the world and the developing and the non-aligned countries. No amount of foreign policy—shall I say 'trickery'; I am not using it about India and I am talking about the general thing—for a country like India can work unless we recognise the truth that we are a part of the non-aligned developing countries of the world and that we can make use of these positive aspects of the international situation only if we increase our co-operation and employ all the elements of our foreign policy that have counted on so far. Unless we increase that co-operation, we will not be able to make use of these positive trends. This is what I would like to conclude on. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, almost immediately after the new Government took office, the Foreign Minister made a categorical statement saying that India's foreign policy would be governed by its continuity. It was not necessary for him to say so. He could have also very easily said in the words of the American President: "It is a new world that calls for a new foreign policy". Yet the Foreign Minister was at pains to emphasise that we shall continue the policy and also when he spoke in the other House while presenting the budget, he paid a tribute to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of India's foreign policy and those who preceded Mr. Vajpayee in office. I would say that in the humility that he has shown and the sincerity that he has demonstrated, he has won respect not only of the people of India, but also of his friends and colleagues abroad. It is this openness that he has

[ Shri Dinesh Singh ]

introduced in the foreign policy which was present when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was the Foreign Minister, which has given confidence both to our neighbours and our distant friends that India will speak with one voice. Therefore, I was somewhat surprised with my friend, hon. Dr. Dutt, who expressed some kind of doubt about the continuity of our foreign policy. He saw some kind of a sinister move that we were moving away from the continuity. Sir, I would say that no sinister move was necessary to move away from a policy followed by a previous Government. It would have been fully justifiable for the Government to say that they were departing from certain aspects of the policy of the previous Government. Dr. Dutt also paid me a compliment for having had something to do with the implementation of the policies of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. And I deem it an honour that I have played a small part in trying to realise the kind of co-operation that he had envisaged in the world.

SHRI KALI MUKHERJEE  
(West Bengal): You have forfeited that now.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Dr. Dutt has also placed me in great difficulty. He asked me to say whether we were following the same policies that were being followed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and I would not be honest to this House and to myself if I said that we were following the same policies in respect of the nuances that Dr. Dutt tried to introduce. The distortions came not when the Janata Government took over, but two years ago, and I would mention a small illustration, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

Sir, one of the basic aspects of the principle of non-alignment was non-interference in the internal affairs. Interference has two aspects : Interference in

the internal affairs of other countries, and not permitting other countries to interfere in the internal affairs of our country. As the hon. Member, Prof. Dutt, would recall, about two years ago we started seeking international support for our internal policies. We tried to advertise the gains of emergency and to seek support for that emergency. Would this not amount to interference in our internal affairs ? Was some State to say that our internal policy was right or wrong? And it is this distortion, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, which I hope the Janata Government will correct. The hon. Member, Dr. Dutt, also talked about the policy of non-alignment. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, non-alignment cannot be a policy. It is merely a set of principles that guide the policy. The foreign policy of India as enunciated by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was world peace and international co-operation. World peace and international co-operation are essential for us because we are a developing country. We have got a large number of people living on the margin of human existence. We have to promote their welfare. This cannot be done in an atmosphere of conflict. It cannot be done when there is a war in the world. It can only be done by international co-operation. Sir, if you look at India's traditional policy, India's traditional attitudes towards foreign affairs and India has an ancient civilization—these have not come to us overnight since our independence. They have a long history in our tradition, in our background. And if you look at these, you see that India has stood always for human understanding, for absorption of ideas that have come from different parts of the world, for their synthesis, for evolving a consensus, and for working with people of different races, different religious backgrounds and different beliefs. And this is the essence of India's foreign policy. That we want to develop not in conflict but in co-operation. The developing countries, having achieved their independence from the

economic colonialism, would not like to fall under economic colonialism. They would wish to give content to their independence and that content can come only when they acquire economic self-reliance. I am not even talking of any kind of economic self-sufficiency. I am merely talking of economic self-reliance. And, therefore, Sir, the policy that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru enunciated and the policy which my distinguished friend and the hon. Foreign Minister, Mr. Vajpayee is following is the policy to promote international understanding. In this respect, Sir, may I say that I am entirely in agreement with the analysis that my distinguished friend, Professor Dutt, has enunciated here. There are negative aspects which we have to safeguard against and the giving away of large quantities of arms unrelated to the self-defence of a country is one of the major factors that tends to disturb the balance that we would wish to see in international relations. But, I think, when the Prime Minister referred to it in relation to Pakistan in this House, I do not think he meant, as my friend hon. Dr. Dutt has pointed out, that he was unconcerned about what happened in Pakistan. We cannot be. We are vitally interested in our neighbouring countries. He merely wanted to say that we should not look at it disproportionately, that we are a large country capable of defending ourselves against Pakistan and, therefore, we should not look at anything that happens in Pakistan with the phobia of an aggression against us. Unfortunately, the giving of arms is a danger today. We have to be alive to what is happening not only in Pakistan but all over the world.

Professor Dutt also saw some kind of a distortion in our nuclear policy and I have taken some pains to study the statements that have been made recently. Of course, an authoritative statement can only come from the Foreign Minister. But I have not read anything in the statements made by the Prime Minister which

I would call a departure from our nuclear policy. It is the judgement of the Government to say whether there should be nuclear explosions or not. It is for them to decide taking into account the cost, taking into account the benefit that will accrue, taking into account the technological knowledge that will come and in the balance if a Government decides that we have the technological know-how, that we know how to explode a nuclear device and that we would not wish to explode a nuclear device; I would not say that this is a departure. In fact, the Government has reaffirmed its adherence to the earlier policies against the N.P.T. and I have not seen any statement to the effect that any action that we take will be conditioned by the advice that we may receive from outside as has been talked about and, therefore, once again, I would wish to assure my friends, particularly Dr. Dutt, for whom I have great respect that what he is saying is some kind of a hallucination borne out of some kind of a fear complex, than any realities that exist.

Now, Sir, he also talked of the positive aspects of international situation and I am entirely in agreement with him that we have to look at these positive trends now that we are free from the problem of explaining our internal situation to the world outside. Maybe, we shall have more time to think in terms of international co-operation. In this respect there are two or three things which, I think, are of utmost urgency. Professor Dutt talked of arms sale. There is arms sale to developing countries because there is a lack of stability in the general situation and we have to do away with this lack of stability. This can come only from co-operation. I would wish to remind the Foreign Minister that there was something called a Council of Asian Foreign Ministers; that it was established at the initiative of India and that it has been lying dormant.



[Shri Dinesh Singh]

If we could revive the Asian Council, of Ministers, it could encourage greater dialogue amongst the Asian countries. It could remove some of the fears that exist and it could initiate a more co-operative Asian society. Unfortunately, we have no Asian organisation, not even a cultural one. There are regional organisations but there is need for a general Asian organisation.

In the same trend, Sir, may I also remind the Foreign Minister that we had initiated a new arrangement amongst the non-aligned countries which are in a larger sense, the developing countries? The tripartite arrangement that we arrived at with Yugoslavia and the U.A.R. was an example of co-operation between the developing countries and the effort we were making to share surpluses for development in different countries is a concept which has tremendous possibilities. It is something that goes beyond the trade. It is the utilisation of the surplus of one country for the development processes of another country and we were envisaging such arrangements with Iran and with Sri Lanka, and I would commend to the House and to the hon. Minister that this positive trend could be utilised to remove some of the distortions that Prof. Dutt mentioned before and in doing so, we would be giving a new content to non-alignment as well as promoting our basic international policy, which is international co-operation. In this regard, Sir, may I say that the United Nations which was a body set up for conciliation and for consensus is gradually weakening in its basic objectives? Much of the problems of the world are being sorted out outside the orbit of the United Nations. I have no objection to the settlement of the disputes wherever they may be, and they need not always be brought to the United Nations; but I do feel that this international body created with great expectations and hope and financed by all the countries, including the ones not very prosperous, must be made

use of in a better way. This organisation is capable of promoting international peace and international co-operation and we must attempt to make a better use of this organisation. There are many things in which the United Nations Organisation is engaged at the moment and we should see that a more positive contribution is made by this world body for finding solutions to the problems of the world.

When we talk of the problems of the world, we cannot forget what is happening in Southern Rhodesia, whether it is in Zimbabwe, whether it is in Namibia or in Southern Africa. For us, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a matter of deep interest because it was here that the Father of the Nation began his struggle against injustice, against racialism and against colonialism and it is a matter which, I am sure, is occupying the mind of the Government. I have seen the statement made by the Foreign Minister which gives me a great encouragement to see that he is relentlessly pursuing this matter and we hope that some success will emerge in the foreseeable future.

We must also welcome the changes that are coming in the foreign policy stance of the United States. Although, the United States is far away from India, yet, the United States has exercised a great influence all over the world and a change in the policy of the United States based on the assertion of human rights is something which we must welcome. At the same time as Dr. Dutt mentioned, we cannot also forget our neighbours to whom the Foreign Minister is paying special attention. I was happy to see that his first visit was to our neighbouring country, Nepal—to China, which is an important neighbour. We may not always agree with it. But we have to learn to live together. The initiative that has been taken to begin a dialogue is something that we must welcome.

In this respect, may I mention Afghanistan? With Afghanistan, we have

had very old and traditional ties of friendship, and talking of the distortions which the hon. Member mentioned, a distortion has also taken place in the last two years in our relations with Afghanistan over the dry fruits question. It is my hope that the Foreign Minister will be able to visit Afghanistan in the near future and that he will be able to set right this one more distortion which has taken place in our traditional policy towards Afghanistan.

It is not my intention to take much time of the House because this is a subject with which hon. Members are fully familiar. My intention was merely to correct the distortions that my esteemed friend, Dr. Dutt was trying to introduce into the debate. I would only say that we are discussing the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs, not merely India's foreign policy, and I should like to take this opportunity to say that the work that has been done by the Ministry and by the officers of the Ministry is of the highest quality. Our officers have stood, with great success, comparison with those who have come from other countries, from developed countries, using extremely sophisticated methods and it would be unfair on our part not to think of the tremendous and good work, day-to-day work, they are doing in the promotion of our foreign policy. It is my hope that it would be possible to introduce a greater element of specialisation in our foreign service and also a more specific direction to India's ambassadors who go to different countries so that we are able to promote not merely the general international relations I have talked about, but also deeper bilateral relations between the countries with which we have friendly relations.

Thank you very much. Mr. Vice-Chairman.

SHRI D. P. SINGH (Bihar) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, before I invite your attention to the various problems that affect

us in the distant corners of the world, let me point out some of the problems that afflict us today, the problems with our neighbour Bangladesh. I am glad Shri Jagjivan Babu happens to be here who led the first delegation. Now, before I bring out the points and the subject-matter of our grievance, I must point out and place before the House the situation that obtains in Bangladesh at the moment. In the last few months, secularism has been deleted from the Constitution of Bangladesh. The Directive Principles of the Constitution of Bangladesh designed to protect the interests of the minorities have also been removed. Thirdly, in a joint communique issued just now, which we had occasion to see, the joint communique with Saudi Arabia, there is a categorical statement that Bangladesh intends to convert itself into an Islamic Republic and that, in that view of the matter, their foreign policy it is going to be fashioned. And, lastly, Sir, we have the Presidential order, the order passed by President Zia-ur-Rahman, to say that all the goods supplied by this country are sub-standard, not fit to be taken. Therefore, there is a directive that even in the matters of contracts and tenders, even where our tender happens to be the lowest, our tenders have got to be rejected. In this context, Sir, we are moving towards a situation where the people of this country, particularly of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh are going to be deprived of the possibility of any development in the next two decades.

Then, Sir, all the time we are told: You don't mind the little suffering that is going to be imposed you may not get enough water for the time being, but ultimately the hope is that there will be a general accord about linking of the Brahmaputra with the Ganga. Until recently, just about 15 days back,

[ Shr D. P. Singh ]

they were not even prepared to talk on the subject and four arguments were advanced by the Bangladeshis. They said that they will not agree to the proposal of linking the Ganga with the Brahmaputra because it will divide the country and in the process it will make them more vulnerable to attack from India. They said that this will mean removing the people from one place to another and this will cause human sufferings. In spite of all this, we are being told that there is a hope that the problem will be solved sooner or later in the larger interest of the country—a subjection which they are not even prepared to talk. Now what is the talk? What are we going to be asked to do? On the basis of a study in the last 25 years, it is assumed that the flow of the Ganga will be 55,000 cusecs. Now we were about to agree to a situation—thanks to the intervention of the people in the Cabinet that it has not come about—that out of the 55,000 cusecs 34,500 cusecs will go to Bangladesh and 20,500 cusecs will come to India. This is the first step. The second step is, if the flow of the Ganges water comes down to 20,500 cusecs or if it comes down to even 34,500 cusecs, the entire 34,500 cusecs will go to Bangladesh and not a drop of water would remain in India. This is the kind of situation. This is the kind of an agreement that is in contemplation, because they are pressing that the ratio that obtains in relation to, 55,000 cusecs will have to be maintained in relation even to a diminished flow, a flow to the lowest level. (Interruptions). When it comes to the INTUC matters you can certainly intervene.

Now the situation is this that with a view to providing Bangladesh with this amount of water the upper regions of the Gangetic valley shall not be allowed to

draw the water at all. This was our apprehension and I had an occasion to voice this in the meetings of the Consultative Committee of the Ministry of External Affairs and also in this House. The hon. Minister for External Affairs is here. He may contradict it or he may accept it. We are told that there is a decision of the Cabinet, a solemn decision of the Cabinet, that no proposals, no scheme with respect to the upper regions of the Ganges, that is in Uttar Pradesh or Bihar, shall at all be taken into consideration. This is the decision arrived at by the Cabinet. Happily, there has been no agreement. I do not know whether you have taken any steps—we expected that there would be some statement kept on the Table of the House—to try to investigate that if the flow of the water is diminished, what will be the effect on the Calcutta port. As it is, we are told that there is 112 million tonnes of silt in the Hooghly. The world experts had told us that if there was a flow of 40,000 cusecs at least, then there would be 8 per cent of desilting annually and in the course of 12 years, on that basis, it would be possible to clear the silt that had already deposited and ships of bigger draught would be able to come to Calcutta, as they did 15 or 20 years back. Now the situation is that if you reduce the flow of water to anything below 35,000 cusecs, there will be a deposit of 2·8 per cent silt annually, with the result that there can be no question of its clearance in about 10 years. Then the Calcutta port will be doomed, destroyed and ruined for ever. And you are going to enter into an agreement on the dangling of carrots—on mere hopes. Bihar and Uttar Pradesh are the States which gave the Janata Party hundred per cent seats in Parliament. This is how you are going to treat those people in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. Our people there stand cheated,

cheated, cheated. On this assurance, you are going to destroy the destiny of those people for ever! This is the basis of the whole agreement. We are fortunate and happy that the agreement has not taken place and I hope that in the days to come, Sir, good sense will prevail and you will go back on that position and see that the interests—not only of the Calcutta port but of the upper reaches of the Gangetic valley—will be protected and preserved.

Hon'ble Shri Dinesh Singh—we were hoping and we were thinking that he will be sworn in today; now I hope that it will be on the 15th—referred to hallucinations of Dr. V. P. Dutt. The hallucinations arise from the multi-voices that we hear from the Janata Party. We are gratified, satisfied, happy and delighted to hear our able Foreign Minister with his sweet tongue, suavity and able advocacy. All that is so pleasant. But there are other voices that we are apt to hear. And, Sir, the voice is not of an individual; the voice is a phenomenon—that is, Mr. Subramaniam Swamy who claims to be the real spokesman of the Janata Party. He says, "what I say is the foreign policy". In that context, we have been a little apprehensive. We confess that we felt very happy. But then we have been watching a little. We try to be a little cautious. What is going to happen about the so-called deviations that are now coming? Now he says—blow off Indo-Soviet Treaty, snap the links with the East, European countries because in trade we have been cheated all these years, have genuine non-alignment. Now genuine non-alignment means alignment with America and America alone where annually we are being cheated of the weightage in wheat and the cases are going on in the American courts. They say they are selling hundred tonnes and ultimately if you weight it, it transpires that it is only 72 tonnes. So he is fond of having a genuine alignment—a policy whereby we

stick to America and denounce everything else. Now this kind of statements are apt to raise eye-brows and we try to see things in the proper perspective. Departures, of course, should not have been there but there have been departures. Sometime back we heard of subtle deviations. They are no longer subtle. They are now broad, admitted deviations in the foreign policy. Now we are told that we are going to have amity and friendship with Israel. Of course, we stood for amity with everybody but in the matter of foreign policy if we are going to take that decision with Israel, what about all your Arab countries whom you cultivated at our cost with so much of sacrifice? You helped the Arab countries in their hour, of distress and many a time when here were moments of distress even the Americans had to face it; even the Germans had to face trouble. Well, I think we had to pay a high reprice for oil but the flow oil to this country did not stop. And there are many benefits that are likely to flow in the continued relationship. But there have been departures even in the matter of the Soviet Union and the East European countries. Sir, there are deviations, there are departures and there are such gross departures which are ultimately likely to jeopardize the interests of this country.

What we fear most is not a departure. A departure, of course, can be set right. But if there is a surrender of sovereignty, of our independence, if there is a surrender of our ability to take our own decisions in our own matters, then that is the most unfortunate thing that could happen to this country when the souls of Gandhiji and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru will turn in their graves.

Now what is happening in those matters, Sir? I have particularly in mind the nuclear policy on which it was all right for Mr. Dinesh Singh to say, "What does

[Shri D. P. Singh]

it matter? The Government can take a decision." Yes, I fully agree with him but if a Government, in taking its decisions has to take not only the consent but also orders of Washington, then that is an unfortunate day for this country. Thank you, Sir.

**PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN** (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, a discussion on the External Affairs Ministry indeed becomes a discussion on the broader framework of the national policy. The External Affairs Ministry is not a Ministry in the simple sense of the word.

[The Vice-Chairman, (Shri Shyam Lal Yadav) in the Chair]

It is a Ministry which reflects national policy at the international level in all its three aspects of bilateral relations, multilateral relations and global relations. This, Sir, is precisely the reasons why every Prime Minister, *ipso facto*, is also his country's Foreign Minister. A discussion, therefore, on India's foreign policy is a discussion of national perspective of the Janata Party. Happily, the Janata Party has put its better foot forward in foreign policy. Thanks to the eloquence and intellectual subtlety of Mr. Vajpayee and also because of the wisdom which prevailed in the Janata Party, foreign policy has been kept out of the partisan arena. It has been mentioned again and again by the Foreign Minister and further reiterated by the Prime Minister that foreign policy is a national policy of consensus, is a bi-partisan policy and is a policy of continuity from the past.

Continuity is an ambiguous term. Continuity might mean a mechanistic extension at the rhetoric level with the sweet, silver tongued oratory of the Foreign Minister. Sometimes I feel concerned that much of the shifts in substance might be hidden by the turn of the phrase.

Mr. Vajpayee is a good parliamentarian. And all of us must be somewhat wary of good parliamentarians. Good parliamentarians are difficult people, good politicians also, but they are also statesmen. Let us give them the benefit of doubt. I would say that it would be unrealistic on one side and unfair on the other if within four months the Opposition parties and others come to a very firm conclusion about the direction of the foreign policy under the Janata Party. My fear is that, while one would not like to appear foolish subsequently, and the path of wisdom normally should take a negative view—you people who have taken a negative view have been proved right on the balance the province of fairness and building up of consensus demands that you give them a reasonably longer period of time. One-year time would be an adequate framework within which to judge the foreign policy. Sir, it is a fact that, when the Janata Party—and, in particular. Mr. Vajpayee—speaks of continuity, he speaks of the involvement of India in the struggle for social change, building up of a self-reliance economic base and having world peace. Non-alignment has never been a substitute for foreign policy. Non-alignment has been a framework within which we attempt to perceive the correlation of forces. Non-alignment has been a rejection of dependence on colonial powers on one side, and military blocks on the other. But non-alignment also means assumption of certain values. Non-alignment involves a positive commitment to anti-imperialism. It means a positive commitment to anti-colonialism. It means a positive commitment to anti-racialism. It means a positive commitment to depolarisation of the world. While alignment was the politics of polarisation, non-alignment is the politics of de-polarisation. It was precisely because of this that Shri Baij Nath in his 'Parliament of India' mentioned about the innovative role which India has played. Therefore, a genuine

non-alignment and genuine commitment to non-alignment, are very essential components of non-alignment. Genuine non-alignment is not surreptitious alignment. Genuine non-alignment is not a back-door entry into those perilous areas and regions which in the last 30 years have neither supported authentic independence of India or authentic development of the whole third world. Intelligent people are here around and the path of subtlety of Indian wisdom demands not to mention the countries. But I would say that, while we speak of genuine non-alignment, we have to know who are our friends actually and potentially and which are the parties and groups which have intrinsic incapacity to become friends of all those who are struggling for a fair part in the development of a just international economic order.

Sir, the nuclear policy the problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, is an important test. Monopoly of nuclear arms was the declared policy of the United States of America until in 1953.

SHRI KALI MUKHERJEE : And also Soviet Russia.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN : Well, I beg your pardon. Let my good friend with his great voice not destroy the feeble voice of reason which I want to raise. I would say that monopoly of nuclear arms by the United States of America has been their subtle policy of 1950's until that monopoly was broken by the Soviet Union. And then comes the atom for peace. And then comes our agreement on the Tarapore Reactor. Then comes the attempt to twist our arms: You have been able to elect a good government, with decent people the gentlemen who are the articulators of human liberty and freedom. And those articulators of human liberty and freedom shall be the first to accommodate some compromise in the Indo-American agreement.

821 RS-4.

This I fear is there. Several articles have appeared on 1st of July in the American and the Indian newspapers emphasising the fact that Mr. Victor Ainsky has said that the standard conditions will be fulfilled, that they were releasing 12 tonnes of enriched uranium for the Tarapur Reprocessing Plant for a period of six months which would end by the end of this year and that they had the right to cancel further supply of enriched uranium if explosion was made in India even for peaceful purposes, even based on indigenous component. While I entirely agree with the Prime Minister here that India must play a positive role by declaring that India will never build atomic weapons, the options should not be unilaterally closed particularly under the pressure of a big power which on the one side advocates monopoly of nuclear power and on the other side still sticks to the nuclear club. Discrimination was the reason for our not signing the NPT. Shri Atal Bihari Vajapayee is here. He said in the Consultative Committee that Yugoslavia told us that we were wise in not signing the NPT, while some of them had succumbed to the pressure.

There have been attempts on the part of the IMF to weaken the policy of non-alignment and the manoeuvrability of India's independent foreign policy. Sir, it is a sad story. Governments are elected. Governments fall. One day leaders are recognised as the most sharp-minded politicians and great statesmen they are acclaimed in all parts of the world. And, suddenly, we find that great leaders collapse like nine pins. Then you read that not only the free vote is involved, which certainly it was, but that there were other aspects involved in it also. At least if one makes a clear analysis of the role of the IMF, World Bank, in the so-called process of stabilisation, one will find that it puts particular emphasis on sterilisation by saying that unless the population is stable and unless population control methods are adopted, it will not

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

be possible for the World Bank to advance loans. This problem is still there. The Government of the Janata Party is after all a democratic Government. If one democratic Government falls by the machination of the IMF, the World Bank, then other Governments may also fall. I am an independent Member of Parliament. I would like to say that the first concern of all citizens should be not which party is in power, but whether India has a stable polity where the rights of dissent and of building an independent economy are assured. Certainly, it will be an excellent pattern of parliamentary system when party changes. It may be a two-party system or a multiple party system. Every party is subject to international pressure and of the World Bank. Of all people, it was Mr. Willy Brandt, the former Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, who was identified by the IMF, the World Bank to be the chief spokesman at the North-South Dialogue. Therefore, when Mr. Gensia, the Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany and Mr. Hatoyama, the Foreign Minister of Japan came here, knowing the links of the IMF, the World Bank, to be intimate with the Federal Republic of Germany on the one hand and Japan on the other, and paid compliments to India, my heart sank. When Mr. McNamara complimented India for the development, I honestly tell you that my heart sank. It is true on the one side, but on the other side it became a part of the international economic machination. I am not for isolation. I am not saying that any country can develop in isolation. But I am saying that the manoeuvrability of India should never be comprised, and the only thing that powerless Members of Parliament like me can do is to utter a word of caution in proper time so that in future certain things do not happen.

Sir, I would like to say here that Diego Garcia is sought to be soft-pedalled.

It is wrong to emphasise that the Soviet Union and America are equally guilty in militarisation of the Indian Ocean. It is a fact that the Soviet Union has facilities in the Indian Ocean; it is a fact that the Soviet Union has got a larger strength of submarines in the Indian Ocean. It is a fact that it is so because it is also an Asian power interested in the Indian Ocean, particularly because in this nuclear and thermo-nuclear armament race, it is possible from a submarine to hit at any point in the Soviet Union. The United States is not a part of the Indian Ocean area. The United States is not a part of the world in which we live. Therefore, it is understandable for the Soviet Union to be concerned about the Indian Ocean. But there is a country with a nuclear base in the Indian Ocean. And despite what President Carter says—let us also recognise the fact that President Carter has made some shift, but despite what President Carter says about demilitarisation—the nuclear base at Diego Garcia remains and it is being strengthened. The only conclusion from the strengthening of Diego Garcia is, on the one hand, to keep a watchful eye on non-aligned countries like India and, on the other, to keep an eye on liberation movements and patriotic forces in Africa. Therefore, when proposals come, originating from the USA and the UK, for a peace force in Zimbabwe and when India responds through its Foreign Minister saying "We shall examine it", I have a shudder in my spine. I am happy that the Foreign Minister has come back. I want him to hear this personally. Involvement in a peace force under the auspices of the United States of America and the UK will land us in the same problem as it did in Congo or it might be an attempt to identify us with colonial powers, and the African resurgent, patriotic forces will never have confidence in us. Therefore, let us never ally ourselves with forces which were never helping the liberation struggles of Africa.

On West Asia, I should like to say that it was reported that Begin opened the Bible and he said he was happy to see Jimmy Carter also open the Bible. He quoted chapter and verse from the Bible as to what should be the destiny of the Israeli Jews from the waters of the Nile to the waters of the Euphrates. God Almighty in his wisdom or the lack of it is supposed to have said that the whole area should go to the successors of the original Israelites. Now what is happening might be another factor of our compromise. Sometimes compromise is explicit but most of the time, in international operations, compromise is in acquiescence and silence. Therefore, let us stick to the position of support to the rightful Arab cause, vacation of aggression by Israel and support to the idea of a Geneva Conference with the participation of the PLO. Let us not withdraw our support to all people struggling for a place under the sun. I was happy to hear Mr. Vajpayee rebutting his eloquent friend, Mr. Jethmalani in the External Affairs Consultative Committee. Mr. Jethmalani went hammer and tongs at Mr. Vajpayee saying "You should recognise Israel and withdraw all support to, and diplomatic contact with, the Arabs." That the Foreign Minister of India occupied the chair which was once occupied by the great visionary of Asia, Jawaharlal Nehru, might be one factor contributing to the enlightenment of Mr. Vajpayee, apart from his own indigenous enlightenment. Bureaucracy plays an important role. I would like to pay a straight—not a left-handed—compliment to the bureaucracy. Probably in the working of parliamentary system the term bureaucracy has become an inherent part. My feeling is much of the continuity in India's policies is today also contributed by the clarity of commitment as articulated and submitted by the bureaucracy in India. Having been associated with the External Affairs Ministry for quite some time and being a sentimental Indian

I would like to pay my straight compliment to the Ministry over which Mr. Vajpayee presides. It is an excellent Ministry. Every flock has black sheep and one would only emphasise one's point of view. There may be one or two black sheep. But rhetoric alone does not contribute to continuity. Mr. Vajpayee will grow in our estimation if he proves himself a Foreign Minister of national consensus. This at the moment is only a wish and a hope and a promise from him. Fulfilment will have to be observed over the months, probably early next year, when we get assembled again, when we get a more objective view of India's foreign policy. Let me nevertheless hope that Mr. Vajpayee shall prove a worthy successor to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

#### THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM) :

Sir, I had no intention to intervene in this debate and if I am intervening, I will not try to cover the entire field of foreign policy because that will be taken care of by my able colleague, Shri Vajpayee. I have intervened because the question of Farakka has been raised. My friend, Shri D. P. Singh, has the reputation of being a good advocate, but what sort of advocacy he has urged today, I leave it to the House to decide. This problem of Farakka arises because during lean months the flow at Farakka is not adequate to meet the requirements of the two countries. Before 1975 the entire flow has been available to Bangla Desh; not a single drop was diverted anywhere. Farakka barrage was conceived with a view to diverting some water according to the experts, 40,000 cusecs in order that the hump and sand formation at the Calcutta Port can be washed away and the channel for the ships may be maintained. Before the Farakka barrage was completed it was agreed between the then Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, and the President of Bangladesh, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman,



[Shri Jagjivan Ram]

that before the Farakka barrage is commissioned, the two countries will come to an agreement regarding the allocation of water during the lean period. I leave it to the House to decide or judge whether it was wise to keep the Farakka barrage over which we have spent nearly Rs. 154 crores, uncommissioned till we reached an amicable agreement between the two countries or whether it was beneficial to India to get it commissioned. In 1975 when I visited Bangladesh my 4 P.M. effort was to see that Farakka was commissioned. And I got it commissioned. Some water was supplied to Calcutta port and I hope my friend is aware of the quantity released during this period. If that quantity was proved beneficial to Calcutta port, certainly the figures assumed by my friend will do better than what was done in 1975.

My handicap is that in the case of all treaties with foreign countries, it is hardly possible to disclose the terms of the treaty or place them before the public before the treaty is finally signed. And I am sure, as an able Advocate, he will appreciate this point. I am sorry that he has not appreciated this. We are engaged in a delicate negotiation with a friendly country. I do not know how far it is correct to criticise the internal system of any other country so long as we have recognised and have diplomatic relations with that country. It is upto that country what system of Government it should have in that country. It is none of our business, let alone an examination in detail of the system of political administration they have in their country. The only guiding principle is what relations we are having with them. And from all accounts it had been assured by the present President of Bangladesh that he wants to establish friendly relations with India.

Now, this Farakka question is not only one of sharing of water. It is one of political relations with our neighbouring country as well. The foreign policy of the Government has also to see how far

we succeed in having friendly relations with our immediate neighbours. If we are not in a position to create situations or conditions in which we will have genuine friendly relations with our immediate neighbours I think renewed effort will be required to see that friendship is established between our immediate neighbours and ourselves. Bangladesh is our immediate neighbour. Another thing is, we are members of the non-aligned countries consisting also of small countries, and emerging nations who have suffered through ages from the oppression of colonial powers. We have been preaching to them the gospel of bilateralism and emphasizing the necessity of resolving differences between two countries, without the intervention of a third country, by negotiations and discussions among themselves. Is this gospel meant only for preaching to others? Or, is it expected that we should practise it ourselves? These are some of the basic principles of our foreign policy. Non alingment is not a negative approach. It is a positive approach. I will not go into the history of the Various stages of the negotiations so far as the sharing of the waters of the Farakka is concerned. But I presume that my friend is aware that a stage came when Bangladesh thought of discarding bilateralism and, as a matter of fact, there was a taunting remark from the side of Bangladesh that by bilateralism India meant only unilateralism.

AN HON. MEMBER : What ?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM : By bilateralism India means unilateralism, that India wanted to decide the question of the Farakka by herself. And, Sir, the question was taken by Bangladesh to the United Nations and there, our friend, mutual friends, friends of India and Bangladesh, all the non-aligned countries, made efforts and emphasised the necessity of India and Bangladesh resolving their differences by themselves. Was it not a challenge to India? Does it require much advocacy and argument to show that in

a dispute between two parties, the sympathies go always to the weaker party? Anybody who has dealt with that, will appreciate this aspect. Therefore, it has been our approach to resolve this Farakka question without the intervention of any third party. There are several parties which were very willing to offer their good offices to negotiate between us and resolve our differences. I put it to my friend: Will it be very creditable to India to say that we have failed and now we require the services of some third party to resolve out differences? We will resolve our differences ourselves, a few cusecs on this side and a few cusecs on that. But what I think is that friendship with the neighbouring countries is of much more value than that. Of course, we will have to see that we do not reach a stage where the Calcutta Port will be in jeopardy. But, Sir, shall I put it to my friend? What was the position before 1975? I think, even after that, he will try to consult some experts and I have no doubt that he will be enlightened on those aspects. My handicap, Sir, is that he has disclosed some figures. Well, Opposition does not always mean irresponsibility, especially in matters where the issues are national, where the issues do not even belong to one party or the other. I had the good fortune of negotiating on behalf of the Congress Government and I have the good fortune of negotiating on behalf of the Janata Party Government also and I have always held that the Farakka issue is not a party question, but it is a national question and it should be viewed in that light and not as a party question. One can, by his advocacy, gain certain debating points. I doubt very much whether the member has succeeded in that even. But it should be looked at as a national problem. I am not in a position to disclose the details of the discussions that are taking place, because the negotiations are continuing, and I presume that my friend is aware that the negotiations are continuing and they have not been finalised. But I may take the House into confidence and say

that the agreement will be a package agreement. It will cover both long-term and short-term solutions of the Farakka problem.

The Farakka problem can be resolved only by augmentation of water of the Ganga, and there have been several proposals made by India, by Pakistan or by others. It is for the information of the House as well as for the information of my friend that it has been agreed that the various proposals made for augmentation of the Ganga water at the Farakka will be studied by the experts of the two countries and whichever scheme is found as the most cost-effective, will be implemented. Perhaps he is aware that this includes Brahmaputra-Ganga link also, because that is one of the proposals made by India. But the whole thing will have to be considered as one composite whole where the question of augmenting the water at Farakka will be an integral part of the short-term solution of the allocation of water between India and Bangladesh.

The whole problem, Sir, is a question of six to eight weeks in the period when the flow at the Farakka is the lowest. The Ganga behaves in a very strange way. In the month of May we have shortage and on the 1st of June the water is so much that even if we take the full quota we require, much volume of water is allowed to flow to the sea. So it is a Question of a few weeks. These weeks are critical.

Then, again, he argued that if the water was below a certain level all the water will be taken by Bangladesh. I will ask my friend to refresh his arithmetic once more. Even if the same proportion as assumed by him is applied and even if the flow is 20,000 cusecs how is it that they will get all the 20,000 cusecs?

There should be some sense of arithmetic and the simple rule of three. One should not argue to such a point that obviously it will appear to be ridiculous. In no circumstances will that situation arise, even if we follow the assumed figure that he has given and the assumed percentages

[Shri Jagjivan Ram]

that he has advanced. On that basis also, the conclusions are not only erroneous but completely wrong.

Sir, I will again assure the House that we shall approach this problem of Farakka as a national problem. We believe that our foreign policy should be such that we establish friendly relations with all our immediate neighbours. A qualitative non-alignment concept will have to be actually translated into action. And this will be one step in that direction. I may again assure the House, Sir, that in our negotiations, we will keep the national interests upper-most, but certainly they will have to be judged in the context of the availability of water to be allocated to the two countries.

As it is obvious, the water is not adequate to meet the requirements of both the countries. Therefore, we will have to share shortages. When we are sharing shortages, certainly there will be discontentment on this side and there will be discontentment on that side as well. But we have to face our people and explain to them the circumstances under which we have accepted the quantity which is not adequate to meet our requirements and they in Bangladesh will have similarity to explain to their people why they have accepted a quantity which is not adequate to meet their requirements. Their difficulty will be more than ours because up till now, even at the time of the minimum flow, they were receiving 100 per cent water that flow below Farakka. Now they will be receiving only a percentage of that. We will have to explain to our people that in the interest of friendly relations between the two countries, we had to agree to share shortages in a manner which can be regarded as friendly. Again, Sir, I would not like to go into the internal situation in Bangladesh. We have recognised Bangladesh. We have diplomatic relations with them. It is a friendly country and let us hope that we will continue to be friendly. Let Farakka not stand in the way of our friendship.

SHRI D. P. SINGH : I would like to have a clarification, Sir. Would the hon. Minister assure the House that this short-term expedient sought to be used will not take place until they have agreed on the larger agreement of the linking of Brahmaputra with Ganga ? Would the hon. Minister assure that it will take place before this short-term agreement commences ?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM : Sir, I do admit probable defects in my spoken English. Perhaps I have not been able to express myself adequately to make myself intelligible to my friend. But what I said is that it will be a package deal and out of the alternatives that have been made out for augmenting the water of Ganga, out of various alternatives the scheme which is found to be the most effective will be implemented. It will be applied.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: (West Bengal) : Before the hon. Minister leaves, may I know whether in the course of discussions, the subject of Bangladesh nationalists who have taken shelter in this country and whom this country is pushing out, came up for discussion ?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHEI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE) : I will reply to that later on.

श्रीमती अम्बिका सोनी (पंजाब) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज सुबह जब विदेश मंत्री महोदय ने यह सुझाव दिया था कि आप विदेश मंत्रालय पर चर्चा करने की जगह कुछ और मसले पर चर्चा कर लें तो मुझे ताज्जुब हुआ था ....

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह मैंने नहीं दिया था ।

श्रीमती अम्बिका सोनी : बहरहाल, आपकी ही तरफ से हुआ था ....

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : औरों ने दिया था तो मैंने बहुत पानी-पानी होकर मांगा था ।

**श्रीमती अम्बिका सोनी :** यह तो और भी अच्छा है अगर विदेश मंत्री की तरफ से वह मुझाव नहीं आया था क्योंकि शायद वे जानते ही थे कि आज उनकी काफी प्रशंसा की जाएगी, उनको मुबारक दिए जाएंगे, उनकी तारीफ की जाएगी, क्योंकि उन्होंने बार-बार यही कहा कि जो भारत की विदेश नीति रही है उस से वह अलग नहीं होना चाहते हैं, उस में कोई तब्दीली नहीं लाना चाहते । और यह जायज भी है चूकि विदेश नीति राष्ट्र के हित के मुताबिक बनती है और एक राजनैतिक दल सत्ता में आए और दूसरा बाहर जाए उस से राष्ट्र के हित तो बदलते नहीं हैं, यह विदेश मंत्री ने खुद भी कहा है, और इससे यह स्वाभाविक है कि विदेश नीति में बहुत ज्यादा तब्दीलियां नहीं आई इसलिए भी कि खास तौर पर भारत की जो विदेश नीति है उस का जन्म भारत की आजादी की लड़ाई के समय में हुआ था और उन आकांक्षाओं और भावनाओं को ध्यान में रखते हुए पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने जब भारत की विदेश नीति तय की थी तो सिर्फ एक राजनैतिक दल की विदेश नीति के तौर पर नहीं की थी और सिर्फ भारत देश की विदेश नीति है इस को मन में रखते हुए वह नीति निर्धारित नहीं की थी बल्कि उन तमाम लोगों की तरफ से भी आवाज उठाने की कोशिश की थी जो अपनी गुलामी से छुटकारा पाना चाहते थे, जो पिछड़ेपन से लड़ना चाहते थे, जो अपना आर्थिक ढांचा मजबूत करना चाहते थे । हम भी सदियों की गुलामी से निकले हुए पिछड़े हुए देशों में थे और अपनी आवाज तमाम उन देशों के बराबर उठाना चाहते थे जो सालों पहले आजाद हो चुके थे । यही अंतर था । जब महात्मा गांधी के नेतृत्व में हम लोगों ने आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी तो वह लड़ाई सिर्फ भारत तक सीमित नहीं कही जा सकती थी । तमाम देशों की आजादी भारत की आजादी के बाद हासिल हुई और उन्होंने यह स्वीकार किया कि उस से उन्हें एक इम्पीटस मिला । लेकिन जब विदेश नीति तय की गयी थी

तो सामने यह बात जरूर आयी थी, और हम पढ़ते हैं, सुना है कि वह बड़े देश, वह विकसित देश अपना कब्जा छोड़ना नहीं चाहते थे और कोलोनियलिज्म को न्यू-कोलोनियलिज्म में बदलना चाहते थे । और तमाम देशों की यह भावना थी, यह आशा थी कि वे अपने देश के बारे में, अपनी आजादी के बारे में अपने आर्थिक सामाजिक और राजनीतिक ढांचे के बारे में, अंतर राष्ट्रीय मसलों के बारे में अपनी स्वयं आवाज उठावें उन मसलों की मेरिट्स पर आवाज उठावें । लेकिन किसी एक ब्लाक या पावर ब्लाक के साथ मिल कर न रहें । इस तरह से नान-एलाइनमेंट पालिसी के नीचे तमाम शान्ति को चाहने वाले देश इकट्ठा हुए और आज हम देखते हैं कि दुनिया के आधे से ज्यादा देश नान-एलाइन ग्रुप के नीचे आ गये हैं । लेकिन जैसा कि डाक्टर वी०पी० दत्त जी ने कहा और दिनेश सिंह जी ने भी उस का जिक्र किया कि जो जेनुइन नान-एलाइनमेंट है कांग्रेस की सरकार उस से दूर हो चुकी थी । उस का ज्यादा लगाव किसी पावर ब्लाक से हो चुका था । लेकिन क्यों ? क्यों ऐसा कहा जाता है ? कैसे कहा जाता है ? जरूरी बात है और पूछने की बात है । आज इस जेनुइन शब्द ने तमाम देशों के मन में एक शंका उत्पन्न कर दी है । जो हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ आज तक देखते आये हैं और जो नान-एलाइनमेंट में विश्वास रखते हैं उन के मन में शंका है कि जेनुइन शब्द क्यों इस्तेमाल किया जाता है । मैं समझती हूं कि वह पूछा जाना चाहिए कि यह लगाव क्यों किसी के साथ समझा जाता है । कहा जाता है कि जब भारत मोवियत मंत्री संधि पर हस्ताक्षर किये गये थे उस समय भारत सोवियत यूनियन की तरफ ज्यादा झुक गया था । मैं एक आम सवाल पूछना चाहती हूं कि जब हम अपने कार्यक्षेत्र में जाते हैं तो आम लोग हम से पूछते हैं कि आप रूस की मंत्री से पीछे क्यों हटते हैं ? जब 1971 में बंगला देश को आजादी की लड़ाई में हम ने उन का हाथ बटाने की कोशिश की,

[श्रीमती अम्बिका सोनी:]

हम ने उनकी आवाज प्रजातंत्र के लिये ऊंची करने की कोशिश की। हमने मदद की थी उन की, जितनी कर सकते थे उन की भावनाओं को ध्यान में रखते हुए तो यह सोचने की बात है कि उस संकट के मौके पर किन-किन देशों ने हमारे पक्ष की आवाज को ऊपर करने की कोशिश की थी, किन किन देशों ने हमारा साथ दिया था, बंगला देश का साथ दिया था और किन देशों ने हमारे इंडियन ओशन में अपने सैनिक पोत भेज कर हिन्दुस्तान को धमकी देने की कोशिश की थी। उनका यह काम क्या मित्रता के भाव पर आधारित था? विदेश मंत्री जी ने लोक सभा में जो बात कही है, जहां तक मैं समझ सकी हूं यह थी कि सोवियत यूनियन से मैत्री इस लिये बढ़ी क्योंकि हमारी जागरफिकल क्लोजनेस है। जागरफिकल प्राक्सिमिटी के कारण मैत्री नहीं बढ़ती। संकट के मौके पर, कठिनाई के मौके पर साथ कौन देता है; मित्र उसे ही कहा जाता है। गुट निरपेक्षता में उस से कोई फर्क नहीं आता है। यह बात भी मैं कहना चाहती हूं कि यह सुझाव भी रखा गया था उस वक्त भारत सरकार के सामने कि एशिया में एक कलेक्टिव सेक्योरिटी रख कर चलें। लेकिन उस वक्त की सरकार के सोचने का तरीका यह था कि नहीं, यह उसना अनिवार्य नहीं है, उतना आवश्यक नहीं है जितना कि हमारे लिये आर्थिक समझौता है, एकोनामिक एग्रीमेंट्स और अडरस्टैंडिंग्स ज्यादा होनी चाहिए विकासशील देशों के बीच। इस लिये उस पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं किये गये। किसी का दबाव नहीं था। भारत ने मित्रता के हाथ तमाम देशों की तरफ बढ़ाये थे कि आप भी आइये। आप भी भारत के साथ मित्रता की संधि में शामिल होइये। लेकिन यह मित्रता की सड़क एक तरफा नहीं हो सकती। अगर हाथ बढ़ाना है तो हाथ थामना भी पड़ता है। क्या इस सदन को याद दिलाने की जरूरत है कि निक्सन और किंसीजर के जमाने में हिन्दुस्तान की

तरफ नफरत की भावना किस प्रकार बढ़ाई गई थी? कितनी कोशिश की जाती थी पाकिस्तान को बढ़ावा देने की। पाकिस्तान को आर्मामेंट्स दिये जाय और वे आर्मामेंट्स दिये गये कि जो हिन्दुस्तान में सबवरसिव कामों के लिये इस्तेमाल किये गये क्लैंडस्टाइन तरीके से। कितनी बार बताया गया, कितनी बार मित्रता के नाम पर रोका गया, लेकिन क्या यह मित्रता का भाव कहा जा सकता था। लेकिन आज उन बातों को बुलाकर कहा जाता है कि नान-एलाइनमेंट को जेनरल बनाना है। किस चीज का प्रेशर है? सभी सदस्यों ने उसकी चर्चा की है। न्यूक्लियर ऐक्सप्लोजन पर रूकावट क्यों लगा रहे हैं? हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने क्यों कहा है कि ऐक्सप्लोजन नहीं होगा जब होने की आवश्यकता समझेंगे तो कुछ लोगों को पकड़कर किया जाएगा? कौन लोग होंगे? कौन सी शक्तियां होंगी, किसके दबाव के नीचे हमको फंसला लेना होगा? क्यों आज हम यह नहीं कह सकते कि हिन्दुस्तान को एक रखने के लिए, हिन्दुस्तान को मजबूत रखने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद रखने के लिए हमें किसी की राय लेने की जरूरत है, किसी की मदद लेने की जरूरत है? क्यों यह बात हमें विश्वास करने दी जाती है। आज डिगो-गार्शिया में कहा जाता है कि इन्वी डिस्टेंस पर यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स और सोवियत यूनियन को दो मिलिटरी बेसेज को मेन्टेन करना चाहिए।

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri H.M. Trivedi) in the Chair]

एक जगह nuclear equipped मिलिटरी बेस खड़ी की गई। जहां तक हम लोगों की जानकारी है और दूसरी तरफ लोग कहते हैं कि उनका कोई बेस नहीं। तो यह इक्वि डिस्टेंस क्या नान-अलाइनमेंट की पालिसी होती है? नान-अलाइनमेंट यह है कि हर एक देश को हर एक चीज का अधिकार होना चाहिए? बगैर किसी मिलिटरी या दूसरे गुट के प्रभाव के।

श्रीमन्, जो हमारे पड़ोसी देश हैं उनके साथ अधिक मित्रता की भावना होनी चाहिए,

बहुत अच्छी बात है। कभी मतभेद हो जायें तो उनको दूर करने की पूरी कोशिश होनी चाहिए। विदेश मंत्री साहब भी नैपाल गये, इनका काफी वहां स्वागत किया गया, इन्होंने उन लोगों से चर्चा की, राय मशविरा किया, बहुत खुशी की बात है। चीन के साथ भी आप मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ा रहे हैं। इससे पहले ही, जनता सरकार के आने से पहले, वहां राजदूत लेवल पर डिप्लोमैटिक रिलेशंस कायम किये गये थे। अगर आप इनको बढ़ा सकते हैं तो बड़ी खुशी की बात है। लेकिन एक सावधानी बरतनी आवश्यक हो जाती है कि जब आप मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ाएंगे तो साथ-साथ आपको उन लोगों को भी जवाब देना पड़ेगा, उन बातों को भी ध्यान में रखना पड़ेगा। तमाम उन लोगों का ध्यान रखना पड़ेगा जिन्होंने अपनी जान की कुरबानी की, हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा के लिए, उस जमीन का जब तक समझौता नहीं हो सकता, तो मित्रता की भावना कैसे बढ़ सकती है? बाबू जी ने बहुत ही साफ शब्दों में कहा और हम लोग भी जानते हैं कि कई बार जब संधियां की जाती हैं या कोई समझौते किये जाते हैं तो बहुत दफे उनके डिटेल चर्चा में नहीं लाये जा सकते, उसमें रुकावट पड़ जाती है। लेकिन कम से कम सदन को यह आश्वासन तो मिलना ही चाहिए कि मित्रता की भावना को बढ़ाने के लिए समझौतों को सफल बनाने के लिए हमारे देश के हितों का बटवारा तो नहीं किया जाएगा। इसका आश्वासन देना पड़ेगा चाहे इससे समझौते में कोई कमी आये या न आये।

मैं विदेश मंत्री को मुबारकबाद देना चाहती हूं, अभी वह लौटे हैं। African विजिट के बाद जो इन्होंने बयान दिये, अखबार में हमने जो पढ़ा उससे हमारा भी हौसला बढ़ता है कि अनेक राजनीतिक दलों ने और उसके इलावा आम लोगों ने एक सहारा सालिडैरिटी और सपोर्ट की भावना दिखाई है आज विदेश मंत्री ने उसे ज्यादा मजबूत

करने की कोशिश की है। मैंने जहां तक समझा है, शायद मैंने गलत समझा हो, लेकिन विदेश मंत्री ने उनको मिलिटरी एड देने का भी आश्वासन दिया है। हो सकता है कि पहले कांग्रेस की सरकार भी दिया करती थी, लेकिन उन्होंने इस बात की चर्चा नहीं की, लेकिन मैं खुश हूं कि आपने खुले तौर पर इस बात का एलान किया है। यह बात माननी चाहिए कि लिबरेशन मूवमेंट में भय की जरूरत नहीं होती है।

Peace and freedom are invisible and you have to fight for them without fear and with courage.

लेकिन साथ साथ जहां हम लोग इतना आगे बढ़े हैं उनको मदद, सहायता देने में तो क्या मैं यह उम्मीद कर सकती हूं कि विदेश मंत्री जी आज के बाद इस चीज का भी बढ़ावा देंगे, बेशक राजनीतिक मंच न हो, बेशक सरकारी मंच न हो लेकिन आम जनता की राय मोबीलाइज करने के लिए हम इन बातों पर भी विचार कर सकेंगे कि तमाम उन देशों के बारे में भी विचार किया जाए जो युनाइटेड नेशन्स के इकोनोमिक सैंक्शंस को वायलेट करते हैं, जो सदर्न अफ्रीका के साथ आज भी करोड़ों रुपये का व्यापार करते हैं। इस बात को एक्सपोज करना चाहिये, उन लोगों को, उन देशों को सामने लाना चाहिये ताकि लोग जान सकें कि शब्दों से सहारा देते हैं, सपोर्ट देते हैं और फ्रीडम, और डेमोक्रेसी की बात करते हैं लेकिन जब व्यापार की बात आती है तो व्यापार छोड़ नहीं सकते। मैं यह उम्मीद करती हूं कि विदेश मंत्री जी आप अपने भाषण में इस पर भी इशारा जरूर करेंगे।

मैं आपको बताना चाहती हूं कि एक तरफ तो हम आजादी लड़ने वाली शक्तियों को ताकत देने की बात करते हैं, फ्रीडम मूवमेंट को सोलिडरिटी देने की बात करते हैं और दूसरी तरफ आज जब सुबह हमारे संसद सदस्य श्री आर० के० मिश्र ने अपने एक स्पेशल मेशन के दौरान इस बात की चर्चा उठाई थी कि इस बीच के बावजूद हमारे

## [ श्रीमती अम्बिका सोनी ]

प्रधान मंत्री ने और हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने कई बार यह कहा है कि जो बंगलादेश के रिफ्यूजी भारत आए थे उनको वापस नहीं भेजा जाएगा, लेकिन आज सुबह यह आंकड़े दिये थे कि कितने लोगों को वापस भेजा गया। अगर खुद जाना चाहे तो स्वाभाविक है कोई नहीं रोक सकता लेकिन क्या उन लोगों को मौत के जाल में धकेला जाये उन पर वहां अत्याचार मारपीट की जाये ? क्या आज हम उनकी जिन्होंने 1971 में Bangladesh में आजादी और प्रजातंत्र को काम करने के लिये लड़ाई लड़ी थी इस तरह से ही मदद कर सकते हैं। क्या आज हम किसी दबाव में उन्हें मौत के मुह में भेजने की कोशिश नहीं कर रहे हैं ? मैं जानती हूं एक सरकार दूसरी सरकार के अंदरूनी मामलों में दखलअन्दाज नहीं करती है इससे संबंध बिगड़ते हैं लेकिन साथ-साथ क्या इस बात पर ध्यान दिया गया है कि आज जो बंगलादेश में 25 हजार लोगों को गिरफ्तार किया गया है वह सिर्फ राजनीतिक कारणों से किया गया है ? आज जनता पार्टी कहती है कि वह चम्पीयन है डेमोक्रेटिक राइट्स के लिए, फ्रीडम के लिये। यह डेमोक्रेसी या फ्रीडम किसी टैरेटरी या किसी एरिया में कन्फाइन नहीं की जा सकती जब कि आज इंसान में शक्ति है अपनी आवाज उठाने की, आजादी और अधिकारों के लिये लड़ाई लड़ने की। तो फिर जहां कहीं भी लड़ाई कमें न लड़नी पड़े वह लड़ाई लड़नी होगी।

अंत में, मैं यह कहना चाहूंगी कि मंत्रालय में एक छोटा सा विभाग है जिसे पालिसी एंड प्लानिंग विभाग कहते हैं, शायद अब भी है, मैं जानती नहीं, लेकिन इसमें मेरा एक सुझाव है, वैसे इस पालिसी प्लानिंग विभाग ने काफी अच्छा काम किया लेकिन कई अर्थों से यह सुझाव दिया जाता रहा है और आज मैं उसको दोहराना चाहती हूं कि इस विभाग को कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि सिर्फ एक व्यक्ति को ही नहीं लेकिन कुछ लोगों को बुद्धिजीवी

तबके के लोगों को, जिनकी अलग अलग विषय पर मास्टरी हो, इकट्ठा करके पोलिसी प्लानिंग विभाग में लिया जाए। उनकी मदद ली जाएगी, उनका कोआपरेशन लिया जाएगा तो मैं समझती हूं कि आज जो विदेश मंत्री के ऊपर कई दफा बहुत ज्यादा प्रेशर पड़ता है अपनी पार्टी का कि डायनामिज्म लाएं पालिसी में, तबदीली लाएं अपनी फोरेन पालिसी में तो इससे कई नये सुझाव आयेंगे कुछ नहीं होगा। जो मौजूदा पालिसी है उसको टाइम ने बता दिया है कि वह सफल हुई है और सफल होती रहेगी। इसमें एक नया जोश नई भावना डाल सकेंगे ऐसी मुझे उम्मीद है। जो लोग कहते हैं कि फोरेन पालिसी को बदल दिया जाए, खासकर हमारे विदेश मंत्री पर इस बात पर ज्यादा जोर डालने की कोशिश करते हैं तो मेरा कहना है कि फोरेन पालिसी को बदलने का मतलब यह नहीं है कि जो मैत्री संबंधियां हैं उनको तोड़ दिया जाए, जो देश भारत से मैत्री की भावना रखते हैं उनको धक्का दे दिया जाए और एक भिखारी का बाउल लेकर उन देशों की तरफ जायें जो आज तक आपका अनादर करते आए हैं। उनसे कहते हैं कि हमें एड चाहिये, मदद चाहिये। और वे आपको अपनी विदेश नीति में तबदीली लाने को वहाँ तभी एड देंगे, मदद देंगे। इस तरह की बातें, इस तरह की विदेश नीति हम बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकेंगे। यह मैं उम्मीद करती हूं कि कांग्रेस सदस्यों के भाषण सुनने के बाद विदेश मंत्री महोदय में ऐसी शक्ति आएगी कि इन तमाम प्रेशर और गलत प्रभाव पड़ने के बावजूद भी वह एक रिएक्शनरी और एन्टी नेशनल फोरेन पालिसी को कभी भी अडाप्ट करने की कोशिश नहीं करेंगे।

DR. Z.A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh):  
Mr. Vice-Chairman, before examining certain important developments in the international situation in the recent period and making my comments on the same, I would like to make a general mark

about the tenor and the temper or the direction of the foreign policy which Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee is pursuing. It is a fact that three months is too short a period to make any progress. It is too short a period. It requires at least six months to one year for the policy to blossom out, whether in the right direction or in the wrong direction.

**SHRI KALI MUKHERJEE :** Within that short period, he has gone to Soviet Russia.

**DR. Z.A. AHMAD :** I am not bothered about his going to Soviet Russia. I would not make a generalisation about the direction or the character of the foreign policy of the Government. I would say that Mr. Vajpayee himself have been following a very reasonable and sensible course of action.

**SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM (Andhra Pradesh):** Which he is by himself.

**DR. Z. A. AHMAD :** He is a liberal amongst liberals in the Janata Party and we expect that under his stewardship, the foreign policy, the national foreign policy—it was not a policy of this Government or that Government; it has been a national foreign policy, the framers of that policy being Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and, in fact, the whole nation including the ruling party as well as many in the opposition parties—will be pursued further. It was a national policy and we hope and expect that our friend, who has a national consciousness, not only a party consciousness, I know him for a long time, for many years will pursue that policy and plug the loopholes, that he will strengthen the strong points of that policy and eliminate the weak points. The foreign policy of the previous Government, I would submit, Sir, despite some of its vacillations and weaknesses, was essentially an anti-imperialist and peace-loving policy in character.

It was feared by many people that the Janata Government would reverse the foreign policy because there were many people, many components of the Janata Party, at least some components of the Janata Party, who were extremely critical of the foreign policy pursued by Nehru and later on by the Congress Government. In fact, they wanted a reversal of that foreign policy. They wanted that the foreign policy should be reoriented in a manner that will take us closer to what they call a free world, and what we call an imperialist world. Therefore, they said that the policy was a policy of submission to the socialist countries, a policy of ko-towing to the socialist countries, a policy that was not independent and a policy that was dependent on the whims and fancies of certain other countries. That was their criticism. Here in this House, there was a gentleman called Subramaniam Swamy, and you know in what forthright manner he used to criticise that policy. My friend, Mr. Advani, also shared many of the positions that he took. Therefore, many people, who were democratically-minded people, progressive people, in all parties, were afraid that there would be a reversal of this policy. I am glad that this has not been reversed. But the fears still persist because there are certain ominous statements, from time to time, made by certain leaders of the Janata Party. I am not just talking about Mr. Subramanian Swamy. I may mention the name of Mr. Jethamalani. We were present in that meeting, the Consultative Committee meeting of the External Affairs Ministry. He went hammer-and-tongs at Mr. Vajpayee. It was surprising how a senior member of the Janata Party was criticising his...

**SHRI KALI MUKHERJEE:** Democracy.

**DR. Z. A. AHMAD:** That may be democracy, but that shows that there are very important elements inside your party which do not agree with the policy



[Dr. Z. A. Ahmad]

that Mr. Vajpayee is pursuing and that frightens us. You may not agree with it, but we do not know whether there will be pressure on you—internal pressure or pressure from inside the Janata Party. We do not know whether there will be external pressures also. And they will mount and they will continue to mount. I keep my fingers cross. And I do not know what ultimately will happen.

Now the Prime Minister made a reference to the bomb explosion. It is very strange, it looks very strange, that sitting on the benches over that side Mr. Advani, Mr. Subramaniam Swamy and many of our socialist and Jan Sangh friends, used to say: Why not manufacture an atom bomb? We should manufacture the atom bomb. We should be in possession of an atom bomb to throw it anywhere we like. And here you say that even the explosion for peaceful purposes is not necessary and will not be necessary. Have the things changed so much after you have won the election? Has the national or international situation changed so much that even for peaceful purposes you will not do it? (*interruptions*). Getting wiser or not, I do not know, but at the same time you say that you will ask others. Who are the others?

SHRI NRIPATI RANJAN CHOU-  
DHURY (Assam): The masters will be annoyed.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: I do not know. But who are others? Whom will you consult? Well, you have to consult Parliament, but who are others? I can understand if the Prime Minister said: We shall consult Parliament if we have to do anything different. But you say that you will ask others. That frightens us. You are soft-peddalling the machinations, the intrigues and the interventions

of the imperialist powers in all parts of the world. Your voice against all is not very powerful. By 'your voice' I do not mean your voice, but the voice of your party is not powerful. On many things, as Mr. Rasheeduddin Khan said, you are quiet. Why are you quiet? (*interruptions*). I will answer those points. I am coming to those points where not only the Department of External Affairs, but your Party should take political positions. Then, we shall understand that you have a political backing which gives you strength. Now, take for example the question of Peace Corps. When the matter about the Peace Corps came up, Mr. Raj Narain said: We are considering the matter of calling the Peace Corps people back to India. You may not agree with it. But there is another very important member of your Cabinet who says that this is under the considerations of the Cabinet, that some sort of informal talk took place and that the informal talk will be reported to the Cabinet. I do not know how informal talks are being reported to the Cabinet. When President Carter sent a message that the Peace Corps will be prepared to come and take part in the development of health services in the country, he says, yes, it is being considered. Now, you know what the Peace Corps is. It is not only imperialist, but a shame-faced CIA agency which has been proved to the hilt. The CIA men themselves have made a confession that the Peace Corps is nothing but a CIA agency, which believes in subversion, which believes in all kinds of manoeuvres and interventions and everything which goes against our national sovereignty. So, these things frighten us.

Now, since the time at my disposal is not very much—I can say a lot of things—I will come to the international situation, that despite a considerable improvement in the international situation in recent years, due to the general strengthening and acceptance of the ideas

of detente, a certain amount of deterioration is visible. A certain amount of deterioration is visible today. It was expected that after Mr. Carter got elected, the arms race would subside. But the arms race has not subsided. The arms race has been stepped up. The military budget of the USA has increased by 10 to 12 billion dollars. Then the manner in which arms are being sold is very significant. The arms are being spread all over the world. Is it a joke—Iran getting huge consignment of arms, Saudi Arabia getting these arms? For what purpose? Are these arms necessary for their national security? Not at all. These are kept and stored there for aggressive purposes, for military intervention in other countries. We should beware of that. Then take another area—the Middle East or the West Asia. There, again, Israel is being armed. Arab countries are being divided. A policy of divide-and-rule; of keeping the Arabs divided and keeping them bottled up in unilateral or bilateral negotiations is going on. This is the mischief that the American imperialism and, generally speaking, the colonial powers are playing in order to keep the tensions mounting in the Arab world.

Then take South-East Asia. What is happening in South-East Asia? The whole Asean combination of nations is being equipped and prepared to become a bastion of the imperialist powers in South-East Asia. After the defeat of the Americans in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, now we see the Asean nations being prepared, Japan is stepping in with offers of giving them aid—not merely arms aid but economic aid also... (*Time Bell rings*)... Sir, I have not taken much time. I shall take another five to six minutes.

So Japan is stepping in with economic aid. Japan has a lot of money and we should beware of this. Japanese imperialists are very clever. They have

come to you. They must have indulged in very sweet talk with you. But Japan is an imperialist power. It has close connections with America. There is a treaty between Japan and America. All these facts stand out. So Asean is being equipped properly to become a bastion of the imperialist powers there. And who knows one day Asian may turn against Indo-Chinese countries, or against us.

Then what is happening in Diego Garcia? I have no time to give you all the relevant quotations etc. to show that the two powers—the Soviet Union and America—cannot be equated. But the fact is—and it is an unfortunate fact—that the Prime Minister made a statement in the other House that it was a race between two super powers, not recognising the fact that Soviet Union has no bases there. It is an unquestioned reality that they have no bases there. It is an unquestioned reality that the Soviet Union stands for converting the Indian Ocean into a peace zone. This is recognised by all. Even the Committee of the United Nations' experts were not able to prove that they had bases in the Indian Ocean. And yet the Prime Minister, the tallest amongst you, goes on saying that it is a sort of competition between the two super powers and we have to save ourselves from their rivalries. You must realise that it is America which has bases in Australia. It is America which has bases also in South Africa. It is the U.S.A. which has been able to get some concessions from the Bangladesh Government in the port of Chittagong. Now what does this whole chain of bases, with all the atomic weapons at their disposal, mean? Does it not constitute a serious threat to our national sovereignty and safety? It is a serious threat. I do not know how you, as the Foreign Minister, accept quietly the statement made by the Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai. It is necessary to pinpoint the main aggressive force, that is, U.S. imperialism, which, despite all the pressure

[Dr. Z. A. Ahmad]

that has been put on it by us and other littoral States has not dismantled that base. Mr. Vajpayee himself has said that Mr. Carter is not agreeable to dismantling the atomic base in Diego Garcia.

Now, Sir, I am not going to take up much of your time talking about the Indian Sub-continent. We always insist that there should be fraternal relations, good-neighbourly relations and all that but we should be careful about the fact that India will continue to be under pressure of the western powers, particularly by the United States to revise its foreign policy, to change the direction of its foreign policy. And there are all sorts of pressures. Political, economic and diplomatic pressures will be exercised, are being exercised on us today. What is this statement about nuclear explosion? It is an expression of the foreign pressure that is on us.

**SHRI NRIPATI RANJAN CHOU-  
DHURY :** Surrender to the master.

**DR. Z. A. AHMAD :** It is almost a surrender to the pressure that is being exercised. How much economic pressure is being exercised ! Well, this a very serious doubt in our mind and you have to prove that these pressures are not there. How much pressure is being exercised by the World Bank on us about the State sector and about keeping an open door for foreign investment and all that ! There are economic pressures, political pressures and diplomatic pressures to change the direction of our foreign policy.

Sir, I would conclude by saying that in the light of these developments, in the light of the fact that imperialist forces are again manoeuvring, intriguing and interfering in the affairs of Asian and African countries, we should be careful. You know what is happening in Africa. You know how they are combining against the people of Rhodesia and South Africa. In view of all this, our policy of non-align-

ment should be a strong policy of anti-imperialism. The content of anti-imperialism should not be watered down. That was the principle in the non-alignment policy of the earlier Government; it was a policy of anti-imperialism; its essential score was anti-imperialism. See what is happening in the non-aligned world. We have a big place in the non-aligned world today. Look at the Summit decision. Look at what happened in Sri Lanka and what happened earlier in Algeria. The major decisions were essentially of an anti-imperialist character and we, as one of the foremost non-aligned countries in the world, should see to it that the decisions of the non-aligned Summits in Sri Lanka and Algeria are carried out and implemented. We should see to it that a new international economic order—about which decisions were taken by the non-aligned countries at the UNCTAD conferences and which are being resisted and opposed by the United States and other imperialist western countries—is created so that we can build it up and contribute to it. There our initiative should be vital. Our people look to us. After all, we are the biggest country in the non-aligned world and if we have to pursue a positive policy of non-alignment with strong anti-imperialism in co-operation with the peace-loving forces all over the world, whether of the socialist camps or other camps, we have to pursue a policy of co-operation political, economic and cultural at all levels. If you pursue and build up this world of non-alignment as a powerful force among non-aligned nations, I think you will make your due contribution and you will also get the credit that India deserves. Now, India's foreign policy is not a party's concern. India's foreign policy is of national concern. We should sit together and, if there are differences, we should thrash them out. We have got to follow a policy of peace and a policy of international co-operation, a policy of international fraternity, a policy of anti-imperialism, and a policy which stands for the freedom of the people.

fighting for national emancipation. You made good declarations. I hope those declarations will be strengthened and you shall come forward and even materially help those countries which are fighting for their freedom. I hope and trust, as Mr. Khan has said, that following in the footsteps of great Jawaharlal Nehru and the great national traditions of non-alignment and freedom and peace and equality among the nations, you will rise to the occasion and you will prove that your party is also capable of taking the country forward in that respect. I also hope and trust that you will not succumb to the pressures—internal pressures or external pressures—whether they come from outside or whether they come from inside your party. I hope your party will not succumb to them and take a dignified national stand and pursue an anti-imperialist policy.

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): There is a Half-An-Hour Discussion scheduled for 6 P.M. and there are several speakers left. So we can at the most extend the debate up to 6.30 P.M. The Minister proposed to reply by 6 P.M. I would request the Members to be brief. Not more than 8 to 10 minutes can be allotted to each speaker.

Mr. B. N. Pande.

श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे (नाम-निर्देशित) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इस सदन के नेता श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी ने यह प्रस्ताव रखा था कि बजाए विदेश मंत्रालय पर बहस के, फ्लडस पर बहस कर ली जाए तो मुझे याद आया 1924 में सेन्ट्रल असेम्बली की बैठक में जब उस समय की गवर्नमेंट ने यह रुख लिया कि डिफेन्स और एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स पर कोई बहस नहीं होगी, तब मालवीय जी, मोतीलाल नेहरू जी और जिन्ना साहब ने सबने मिल कर के, उस वक्त के बजट को

गिरा दिया। जब कौंसिल आफ स्टेट्स में यह सवाल आया तो कौंसिल आफ स्टेट्स में जब उन्होंने यही रुख लिए एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस্ট्री पर बहस नहीं होगी तो पूरा नान आफिशियल ब्लाक था वह सदन से उठ कर बाहर चला गया। तो मुझे थोड़ा सा आश्चर्य हुआ क्योंकि इतनी बड़ी चीज को नज़रअंदाज़ कर देने वाली बात मुनासिब नहीं थी ....

डा० रामकृपाल सिंह (बिहार) : वह लोग कह रहे थे, उधर से ....

SHRI NRIPATI RANJAN CHOU-DHURY: We only suggested extension of time to discuss that.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : एक्शटेन्सन नहीं कहा। आगे पोस्टपोन करने के लिए।

श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे : माननीय मंत्री जी से मैं अर्ज करना चाहूंगा कि हमारे देश की जो विदेश नीति है वह हमारी आज़ादी के साथ-साथ पनपी और बढ़ी। 1921 में जब गांधी जी ने लोगों से यह सवाल किया कि हिन्दुस्तान की आज़ादी का मकसद क्या है, तो गांधी जी ने जवाब देते हुए कहा—उनके ये अल्फाज़ थे :—

“India's war of liberation will not end with her own freedom. Its frontiers of freedom extend to all corners of the world. Its pledge of freedom will be redeemed when the last country in the world attains freedom from the foreign yoke.”

ये गांधी जी के शब्द थे।

5 P.M.

हमारी फारेन पालिसी का बड़ा वसीह दायरा है। जब नेता जी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस त्रिपरी कांग्रेस के अध्यक्ष हुए तो उन्होंने

[श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे]

अपने अध्यक्षीय भाषण में वैदेशिक नीति को स्पष्ट करते हुए यह कहा था :

"Indian National Congress repudiated any civil designs of hostile intention on any of the neighbouring states and proclaimed in 1921, that the self-governing India had nothing to fear from its neighbours. Mahatma Gandhi's concept of foreign policy was not that of isolation but of international co-operation, that of peace and good-will to a groaning world. The Congress had extended its support to Abissinia, Spain, China, Palestine Arabs, Czechoslovakia in the hour of danger. The independence of Iraq, Jordan, Arab States was greeted. To China was extended support in her war with Japan. In 1938, the Congress proclaimed the desire of Indian people to live in peace and friendship with all nationals, particularly with their neighbours, and their allegiance to a world order based on international cooperation, goodwill and peace."

इस वजह से कांग्रेस की पालिसी जो वैदेशिक नीति की थी वह बराबर उसी रास्ते पर चलती रही। 23 मार्च, 1947 को एशियन रिलेशन्स कांफरेंस में जो नई दिल्ली में हुई, उसे सम्बोधित करते हुए जवाहर लाल जी ने कहा था :

"We seek no narrow Nationalism. Nationalism has a place in each country and should be fostered, but it must not be allowed to become aggressive and come in the way of international development. We have arrived at a stage in human affairs when the ideal of one world and some kind of world federation seems to be essential though there are many dangers and obstacles in the way. We should work for that ideal and not for any group which comes in the way of this larger world group. We, therefore, support

United Nations structure which is painfully emerging from its infancy. In order to have one world, we must also in Asia think of the countries of Asia co-operating together for that larger ideal."

नान-एलाइनमेंट के सम्बन्ध में जवाहर लाल जी ने अपनी राय स्पष्ट करते हुए कहा था :

"The pursuit of peace, not through alignment with another major power or groups of power but through an independent approach to each controversial or disputed issue, the liberation of subject people, the maintenance of national and international freedom, the abolishing of racial discrimination and elimination of want, disease and ignorance which afflict the greater part of the world population. Non-alignment is a positive instrument in the interest of humanity."

तो आप की मारफ़्त में मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूँ कि ग्राज जैसी स्थिति हैं उसको देखते हुए हमें यह समझना चाहिए कि हमें अपनी स्थिति नान एलाइनमेंट पालिसी को बड़े पैराये पर खड़ा करना है हमारी यह नान एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी पाजिटिव पालिसी हैं, डायनमिक पालिसी है। इस के साथ साथ गांधी जी ने, और बाद में दूसरे नेताओं ने जो चीज स्पष्ट कही थी वह यह हैं कि नान-एलाइनमेंट के साथ हिन्दुस्तान ही एक ऐसा देश है जो ऐसे कदम उठा सकता है कि जो दुनिया से यह कहे कि वह नाकाफी है जब तक हम उस के साथ ही निरस्त्रीकरण की आवाज नहीं उठाते। आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि जब तमाम दुनिया में हथियार बांटे जा रहे हैं, लोग हथियार खरीद रहे हैं ? लोगों के यहां हथियार जमा किए जा रहे हैं उस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान

इण्डिपेंडेंट तरीके से अपनी फारेन पालिसी डेवलप कर रहा है, हिन्दुस्तान सामने आया और उसने कहा कि यह शस्त्रीकरण गलत है, दुनिया गलत दिशा की तरफ जा रही है। हमें निरस्त्रीकरण की आवाज उठानी चाहिए। बगैर इसके वह काम पूरा नहीं होगा। फिर मैं आप से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यहां अम्बिका सोनी जी ने चीन का जिक्र करते हुए एक बात कही। मैं आप से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि चीन के बारे में आज नहीं, बहुत पहले गांधी जी ने यह कहा था।

"I long for the day when a free China and a free India will work together in co-operation and friendship for their own good, for the good of Asia and for the good of the world."

जब पिछले दिनों मुझे चीन जाने का मौका मिला तो वहां जो चीन के नम्बर दो के नेता समझे जाते थे, जो ताकत हैं वहां की सरकार के पीछे, मार्शल येह चिएन बिंग उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कहा था, हम लोगों का स्वागत करते हुए:

"The Indian people and the Chinese people have been friends. Their traditional friendship goes back to thousands of years. The party leadership of the people of China welcomes this great and everlasting friendship between the two people. India and China both suffered under imperialism. We are both developing countries. We both belong to the Third World. We both believe in self-reliance, in the strength of the people. China and India both represent ancient civilisations and both are traditional friends. May this friendship remain evergreen."

माननीय उपसभापति जी, मैं अर्ज करना चाहता था कि यह सवाल उठाया गया कि आखिर चीन ने हमारी बहुत सी जमीन दबा रखी है, जब तक उसका फैसला न हो तब तक कैसे हम दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ा सकते हैं। 35 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर जमीन को यह कहा जाता है कि हमारी चीन के कब्जे में है। लेकिन हमारी 50 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर जमीन पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है। अगर पाकिस्तान के साथ शिमला समझौता कर सकते हैं, पाकिस्तान के साथ अपने सम्बन्ध सुधार सकते हैं तो 35 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर जमीन हमारे रास्ते में खड़ी क्यों हो। सवाल यह है कि आप यह कहते कि 35 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर जमीन चीन के कब्जे में है, हम उससे बात नहीं करेंगे, उससे दोस्ती का हाथ नहीं बढ़ावेंगे तो इसका अर्थ यह है कि हमेशा नंगी तलवार लड़ाई की हमारे सिर के ऊपर लटकती रहे, हमारे लाखों जवान चीन की सीमा पर बैठे रहें। एक ही तरीका है उसका, वह यह है कि हम आपस में बैठकर बात करें। हमने डिप्लोमेटिक रिलेशंस उनके साथ कायम किया है। अगर उनके नेता यह चाहते हैं कि फैसला हो और वह दोस्ती का हाथ हमें बढ़ा रहे हैं, पक्का फैसला करना चाहते हैं, यह कोई मामूली फैसला नहीं होगा तो हम कहें कि जितनी दिक्कतें हैं हमारी उन पर हम उनसे बातें करें। मैंने वहां बात की फारेन मिनिस्टर से, वाइस-फारेन मिनिस्टर से। उन्होंने कहा कि हम अपने लोगों को भड़कायें नहीं। पहले जनता के भीतर हम एक आस्था पैदा करें दोस्ती की, उसके बाद जब हम बैठेंगे टेबुल पर तो उस पर फैसला करेंगे। उनका कहना यह था कि मेकमोहन लाइन के नक्शे न आपके बनाए हुए हैं, न हमारे नक्शे अंग्रेजों के बनाए हैं उनके नक्शे अमरीका के बनाए हुए हैं: मैंने उनसे कहा कि क्यों नहीं हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर और आपके फारेन मिनिस्टर बैठ कर एक ऐसी लाइन खींचें जिस में कभी फर्क न आए। एक पक्की दोस्ती की बुनियाद

कायम हो, फिर सरहद का अगड़ा पैदा न हो।

उपसभापति जी, यह चीज उस वक्त भी सामने आई थी और एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री के आर्काइव्स में वह पड़ी हुई है, वह प्रपोजल पड़ा हुआ है जिसमें कहा गया था कि अक्साइजिन जिसके रास्ते से उनकी लाइफ-लाइन है वहां से उनकी निवृत्त से आल वैदर रोड जाती है, उसके बदले मैकमोहन लाइन के ऊपर हमसे कहीं जमीन ले लीजिए। बर्ट्रैंड रसल का भी प्रपोजल था। बर्ट्रैंड रसल ने यह कहलाकर भेजा कि एक चीज हो सकती है कि जो डिस्प्यूटेड लैंड है उस पर ईवन नम्बर की चेक पोस्ट हों, लेकिन जब चाऊ-एन-लाई से बात करने गए तो उन्होंने कहा कि जीरो नम्बर की चेक पोस्ट्स हों। आपके आर्काइव्स में वह प्रपोजल पड़े हैं, 15-20 वर्ष पुरानी बात हो गई है, लेकिन फिर भी वह खोजेंगे तो वह निकाल लेंगे। इस तरह की चीजें जैसे यह प्रपोजल पड़ा हुआ है, हमारी तरफ से हुआ, उनकी तरफ से प्रपोजल हुआ लेकिन अन्त में कोई बात तय नहीं हो पाई। मैं यह मानता हूं कि हमें इस चीज को पढ़ाने की जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन जब चीन की जनता यह चाहती है कि हमारी दोस्ती पक्की हो और भारत में भी यह भावना इस वक्त है कि हमारी दोस्ती चीन के साथ पक्की हो ताकि खतरा मिटे और दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़े तब फिर ऐसी तूरत में यह कदम उठाना चाहिए बेशक यह कह कर कि पहले हमारी जमीन का फैसला हो जाए। यदि आप बैठेंगे नहीं टेबुल पर—तो कैसे फैसला होगा, कैसे संधि होगी कैसे मामला सुलझेगा? आप उधर खड़े हैं वह इधर खड़े हैं इस तरह से मामला सुधर नहीं सकता है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि इस मामले को छोड़ने की जरूरत नहीं है, आप को इस पर ध्यान देना चाहिए और सरकार को बैठ कर फैसला करना चाहिए। यहां से जनता के

प्रतिनिधि हों और वहां से भी जनता के प्रतिनिधि हों। एक वातावरण पैदा हो जिससे एक दूसरे से मिल बैठ कर हम आपस में बातचीत कर सकें, और कोई हल निकाल सकें। हमारा इतना बड़ा देश है और चीन भी बड़ा देश है। हमारे इतने बड़े देशों की हजारों वर्षों की मैत्री बीच में डगमगा रही है। इस तरह से उस मैत्री के काम को अधूरा नहीं छोड़ना चाहिए; उसे आगे बढ़ाना चाहिए। मैं अर्ज करंगा कि इस मामले को खूब अच्छी तरह से सोचें। (Time bell rings) और चीज मैं कहना चाहता था लेकिन समय हो गया है। अब मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस समय आज जो चीजें चल रही हैं और जिस तरह से अमेरिका की दोस्ती हमारे ऊपर हावी हो रही है, तारापुर प्लांट को लेकर और अटोमिक प्लांट को लेकर वे सारी चीजों का जायजा ले रहे हैं, उसको बराबर समझ रहे हैं, मैं समझता हूं हमें उसको रैजिस्ट करना चाहिए? हमारी इंडिपेंडेंट फोरेन पालिसी है। देश को किसी का दखल बर्दाश्त नहीं करना चाहिए। हम को अलग रहना चाहिए हमें अपने पैरों पर खड़े रहना है। अगर वह अपने मनोरथ में सफल हो गए, तो लोग यह कहेंगे कि हम उनके झांसे में आ गए, उनके दबाव में आ गए, उनके असर में आ गए। दुनिया हम से यही कहेगी कि

“बस एक कदम उठा था गलत राहेशीक में, मंजिल तमाम उमर हमें ढूंढती रही।”

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA  
(Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it has become a common practice these days to find fault with everything of what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru did and to say that most of the mistakes committed in this country were because of his wrong thinking. I hope that at least the

Foreign Minister who seems to be extremely reasonable, when he speaks and when he acts. . .

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: And sensible also.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: That all the Ministers are supposed to be.

I hope he at least will admit that the foreign policy that we have followed and which we today consider to be a national policy was thought of and was given its real shape under Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. And it is to his memory today that I wish to pay my first tribute when I participate in this evening's foreign affairs' debate. It was Pandit Nehru who really gave India its Asian identity after the Bandung Conference. It was he who realised and showed that we, the Asian people, recently freed from the yoke of imperialism and colonialism have to assert ourselves and stand together and show that we have something to offer and something to teach the so-called advanced countries around the world. And yet, we are being told today that what we have followed all these years was not really something genuine. Non-alignment which has been really the cornerstone of India's foreign policy, we are told today, has not been genuine non-alignment. What they mean by genuine non-alignment, we are going to see for ourselves in the months ahead. But from whatever little we have seen over the last few months, it can only mean that they are supposed to negative what we had tried to build over the last 30 years. Today, on the 9th of August, we do remember the Indo-Soviet Friendship Treaty, and we had great exponents of foreign policy—I do not want to name—in the Janata Party who have been demanding that this should be scrapped, that we have tilted too much to one side. In order to prove that we are genuine, we should now let the pendulum swing to the opposite side. This we have been seeing over the last few months. I would like to remind the honourable Minister and the Janata

Party that it was this country that had stood by us in times of distress, in times of need and in times of tribulation. I would repeat, we do not forget our friends who stood by us in times of tribulation. On the other hand we are being told today that a new administration has taken charges of the United States Government and therefore under the great Jimmy Carter everything that was bad and doubted up-till now has changed and that we have today a very big friend who is stretching out his hands of friendship, aid is being resumed, friendship visits and letters—I do not know what else—are being exchanged and the Ministers of Finance, Commerce and Trade are all paying visits both ways to and fro and in the middle of this we are expected to believe that a new era of friendship between the two countries has just started. The hon. Health Minister is here and he admitted that the first move for sending peace corps volunteers to rural areas. . .

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI RAJ NARAIN): I have never said that. I said that a proposal to send them had been made. . .

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I have said that there was a proposal from the side of America, but nothing has been decided.

SHRI RAJ NARAIN: There was only a proposal. You say only what I said.

श्रीमती मार्ग्रेट आल्वा : मैं हिन्दी में बोल देती हूँ। आपने कहा था कि उनका प्रपोजल आया है, परन्तु अभी तक उस पर विचार हो रहा है। ऐक्सेप्ट नहीं हुआ है। मैं यही रही हूँ, लेकिन अंग्रेजी में कह रही हूँ।

It has been said that proposals have already come. I did not say it had been accepted. What I say is that the first overtures have already started. This can



श्रीमती मार्गरेट अल्ट्रा]

only be because it is believed that a new atmosphere is already created in India and they have been saying that human rights have been restored, the black days in India are all gone and therefore India is now good enough for the U. S. Government and the U. S. people to have normal friendly relations with India. Yet, I would like to ask which are the countries and which are the regimes which the United State Government has been propping up around the world all these years? Have they shown any basic commitment to democratic principles? Have they not propped up military regimes and military governments in various countries which have totally denied human rights to their own people? Which are the regimes in South America or in Asia whom they have propped up so far? Today because democracy has been restored, they want to treat us as good friends. It has been said that Americans would like to be our big brother. We are good when we do what they want and when we follow our own independent policies, then we become bad and like a big brother they try to do arm-twisting. Let us not forget that today in Asia they are looking for new pastures. The old military treaties like SEATO and others are now almost dead. From Vietnam, Indo-China and other places they have been unceremoniously thrown out. Therefore, they are now looking for a new, respectable foothold in Asia so that they can come and try to influence the policies in this largest democracy in the world. Yet, by asking us to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, they are attacking our individual rights and we have been denied even the right to carry on with our peaceful nuclear programme. Our fuel for Tarapore project is being withheld and delayed and they are trying to impose conditions on us so that we are not able to go ahead with our programme. The Prime Minister has just come. We all did feel rather upset when he said that there will be no further explosions even for peaceful purposes in this country.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI): It is not necessary.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Many of the younger people feel that we missed the first industrial revolution because we were then under the foreign yoke.

We are left two hundred years behind. But let us not miss the scientific and technological revolution of the 20th century. Let us not, because of certain inhibitions, forget that in the twentieth century, the scientific and technological revolution is going to decide the fate of the nations for the future and we do need the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and we do not need to consult anybody or any country before we go ahead with this programme and I think we should have a firm stand as far as this is concerned. (*Time Bell rings*). Sir, I will just take two minutes more; I am just studying my papers.

Sir, much has been said about the need for us to treat our neighbours with a little more caution or care and here I shall not raise the question of the Farakka waters. But it has been raised by the speakers before and, with due respect to what Babu Jagjivan Ram has said earlier, I do not want to raise any new controversies. But I would like to quote—Babuji has gone away now—in order to prove what we have been saying so far, from a publication of the Government of India, which was produced last year and which was circulated in the UN also last year, about the needs of India of the waters of the Farakka barrage. Sir, I am quoting:

“The minimum requirement of 40,000 cuses of water from the Ganga to save Calcutta port has long been known to the Government of Bangladesh. All the experts, including Dr. Walter Hensen, an eminent German engineer of tidal hydraulics, and Dr. J. J. Dronkers, Chief of Hydraulic Research of the Government of the Netherlands and consultant to the Rand Corporation of the United States, examined the relevant

data and concluded that 40,000 cusecs of water was the minimum required to save the port and maintain the navigability of the Hooghly. Moreover, experiments with hydraulic models under varying conditions in the dry season..."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): Mrs. Alva, may I draw your attention to the fact that this has been more or less replied to by the Minister?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: But this has not been quoted before. Sir, what I am quoting is from a Government of India publication and let it be placed before the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: It can be taken as read!

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): It should be taken as read. The Minister has already replied to it.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: Sir, let her complete her submission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): The Minister has already replied to that point.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: He has said that the details cannot be disclosed and the problem cannot be discussed here. But we do feel that national self-interest is more important than what Babuji said. He has said that the big brother has always got to accommodate the small brother. The same thing can be applied to Pakistan and he can give away the portions occupied by Pakistan in Kashmir. Is that what he wants? So, it is not a question of big brother and small brother, but it is a question of national interest and the long-term interests of the countries that are involved and in the name of big neighbour and small neighbour, Sir I do not think we can sacrifice our national interests. Sir, I do not want to raise those issues which have already been raised and also the question of refugees from Bangla-

desh which has already been touched upon. But I think the External Affairs Minister will answer them. But I do welcome the idea made recently by the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka about more economic co-operation and common efforts for building up a common market in this region. I think it is a very important move and it is something which is going to benefit us and I think that we should really accept this initiative and see how far it can be worked out.

Sir, today, we are celebrating the South African Women's Day and we pay special tributes to the heroes of the struggle for freedom in Southern Africa and we also welcome the many statements made by the External Affairs Minister on our commitment to the cause of African liberation movements and we hope that our aid and our help to these countries will increase. I would say, not just military aid, but even economic assistance to the developing African countries, would have to be stopped up.

Sir, just one or two words about the Ministry itself. We welcome the new announcement made today about the certification by MPs for the issue of passports. Though it is going to impose more work on us MPs in signing the forms, I think it is a very good move, because to have a passport is a fundamental right of every citizen and now it is going to be easier to get it. But I would like to remind the Minister of his earlier commitment. The only place in the Southern region, the only State in that region, which does not have the Passport Office is the State of Karnataka and we have been hearing much about this... (*Time Bell rings*)... I hope that he will make a commitment and give us what we have been asking for.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): Please conclude.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Finally, Sir, I would like to come to the question of foreign students studying in India. Most of them come from the third

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

world countries and I think greater efforts to look after the foreign students, especially those coming from the African and Asian countries, should be made through the Minister of External Affairs and they should not be left just to the whims and fancies of the Ministry of Education or any other Ministry.

There are so many departments with which they deal that they normally feel completely neglected.

The final point that I wish to make, before I sit down, is that there has been so much said about the R. A. W. It may be a very controversial subject. But we do believe that intelligence is part of the External Affairs Ministry in the country's foreign policy. This is an organisation which has been built over thirty years. It has contributed something. Pt. Nehru had taken personal interest in building up this organisation, though it was re-named later. But it has to form part of the foreign policy. With these words, I conclude.

SHRI A. P. JANARDHANAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, when this Ministry was formed, the All-India Anna DMK expressed its opinion that it will support this Ministry on constructive attitudes. If there is one sphere where we whole-heartedly support this Ministry, or any other Ministry which upholds the foreign policy enunciated by the great Pt. Nehru, it is the sphere of foreign relations. Non-alignment has been our sheet anchor. It is gratifying to know that the Minister concerned has stated that he will stand by genuine non-alignment. Our party has been every time supporting the Central Government whenever aggression was threatened. When the enemy threatened our sanctity, when the enemy was on our soil, the A. D. M. K. rose as one man, rose to the occasion and we offered all out co-operation. Our late lamented leader, Dr. Anna, the 'Demosthenese' of the South, called upon us to give liberally—men and cash—to the war effort. Our Good

Samaritan, Mr. M. G. Ramachandran, the present Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, big-heartedly gave the gold sword that he was presented with, by his admirers. The A.D.M.K., will support the foreign policy of this Government. I am glad that this Minister, after assuming office, has admirably adapted himself to the new role. He has been winning laurels in a very, very short time.

But before that, I would request you to turn the searchlight inwards. We go on preaching morals to others. We go on telling about our Gandhi, Buddha, Periar Ramaswamy, Dr. Ambedkar, Anna and so on. But let us think of ourselves. We condemn apartheid in South Africa. We speak about Zimbabwe. We speak about Numibia. We speak about racialism in Britain. We speak about this and that. We give instances where our people are insulted. We should rise as one man to protest against all these indignities. But we should also examine our own past. How have we behaved towards our brothers? I sincerely feel that the South African apartheid is child's play compared to the apartheid committed in the name of Varnashrama here for the past three thousand years. Our great social reformers, our great social revolutionaries—Buddha, Periyar Ramaswamy, Dr. Ambedkar, Anna, Gandhiji and others—have been striving hard to remove that cancer, but they could not do so. Yesterday we heard of series and series of atrocities being committed by brother against brother. We should see that such evils are eradicated before we face the world.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

Sir, the lady Member referred to our markets and the importance of economic co-operation. Yes, commercial diplomacy is very much required.

But how do we protect our markets? I am sorry to say that some of our traders, not all of them, but a few of them, send very genuine samples. When it comes to send-

ing the real goods, they send spurious goods and we lose our markets in several developing countries. That is a thing which we all have to examine. We had a good pepper market, textile market, etc. Why did we loose them? So, I request the hon. Foreign Minister to look into all these things. Not only that, The AIMDK is concerned with the fate of Tamilians in Sri Lanka, and Malaysia and the fate of our brothers in Africa. Gandhiji was in Africa. He started his first *satyagraha* there. But when we see that our people there are suffering, we cannot sit idle. So far as our diplomatic personnel are concerned, only those people who know their language and who are well-versed with their customs should be sent. For example, in Sri Lanka we should have a Tamilian, to Africa we should send a Gujarati and to Canada we should send a Punjabi. That way, those people will get satisfied. I place these things for the consideration of the hon. Foreign Minister. This is my maiden speech. I promise that. I will give more speeches hereafter. With these words, I conclude. Thank you.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam): Sir, may I make a suggestion? At this stage, I request Shri Shyam Lal Yadav to agree that the subject which he has brought before the House for Half-an-Hour Discussion may be taken up in the next session so that we may continue this debate, because the debate is very interesting and useful and it will help the Government and the whole country. So, I would request Shri Shyam Lal Yadav to agree to this proposal that the Half-an-Hour Discussion may be taken up in the next session so that we may carry on with the debate. I hope he will agree to it.

SHRISUNDER SINGH BHANDARI: Is the suggestion only to postpone the discussion upto 6.00 O' clock or is there going to be some time-limit for this debate also? If we postpone this Half-an-Hour Discussion, how long do we intend to continue?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: When we discussed the Home Ministry and the Information Ministry, the reply was given between 7.00 and 7.30 P.M. To day also we may follow the same procedure.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We can continue as long as human endurance permits and our interest does not subside.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But the degree of human endurance differs.

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHAN-DARI: There is a statement on the flood situation also. You will have to fix up some time-limit.

श्री श्याम लाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): मान्यवर, मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। चूंकि यह विषय महत्वपूर्ण है और आप देख रहे हैं कि कितना व्यापक है सारे लोग इसमें इंटरेस्टेड हैं इसलिए अगर आपकी अनुमति इस बात की हो कि इसको अगले सेशन में इसी रूप में स्वीकार कर लिया जाए और इस पर बहस की जाए तो मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं होगी। अगले सेशन में इस पर बहस हो सकती है और जो विषय चल रहा है उसको आप चलायें। लेकिन इस पर बहस अगले सेशन में होनी चाहिए यह मेरा अनुरोध होगा। इसलिए आप कुछ व्यवस्था दें।

श्री राजनारायण : यह हो सकता है कि आप बिगिन करें और एक मिनट अपनी बात कह कर खत्म कर दें और फिर यह कन्टीन्यू करेगा।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : यह नहीं हो सकता है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think some new ideas will also come. This subject can be discussed in the next session. We can find some way of doing so. Is it the wish of the House that we

[Mr. Dehu y Chairman]

postpone the Half-an-Hour Discussion and carry on with the debate ?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRIMATI HAMIDA HABIBULLAH (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while it is gratifying to note that the Government has decided to adhere to non-alignment, in my opinion, there is a distinct under-current noticeable of the cooling off of the relations with the socialist World. The atmosphere of warmth and equality that once existed is distinctly now that of formality and correctness. I am very happy that the Prime Minister is also here. So, we may remind the Janta Party here and now that this great nation has promised its people a socialist future. Sir, this talk of genuine non-alignment is utterly confusing Sir, since foreign affairs is a national problem and not a party problem, I hope that any doubts and fears which I express will be taken in that spirit by the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. foreign Minister.

Sir, the Soviet Union is one country that has stood by India openly since 1955. It is one country that has during this long period of capitalist inflation gone on purchasing Indian goods in increasing volume. Indeed, the USSR has, as it were, led the 'fashion' of the socialist countries, not only to help the public sector of India to grow to a position of commanding the industrial magnitude of India but it has enabled us to reach a position where we are now helping our fellow Asians and Africans to help themselves— not to mention their great help in our self-reliance in producing defence hardware.

Sir, by its appreciation of and close affinity to the cultural image of India, the Soviet Union has done much to turn the attention of the world to the rich heritage of our country and to give meaning outside India to the long and agonising struggle of our people. Men

like the late lamented Prof. Gafoorov, a Central Asian academician and internationally recognised as a great historian, showed to us the true meaning of much of our past history on which we may base our future concept of socialism, secularism and unity. It was, therefore, right and fair that India being in geographical and historical, ethnic and cultural proximity to the Soviet Union should have continued a process of growing warmth towards that great country. Sir, I am grateful and pleased to hear that the Foreign Minister has said something about this the other day.

Sir, the last two decades have witnessed much development of history. The two outstanding features in India during this period are the establishment of the public sector, starting with the Bhilai Steel Plant, and the timely help given by the USSR by diverting two million tonnes of wheat from its own resources. But it is sad to see the powerless state of the public sector within a few months of the Janta Party's rule. It is even worse to know that the two million tonnes of wheat is to be shipped back to Odessa in kind. This is indeed a brilliant start, Sir, a magnificent beginning! This, accompanied by the announcement that no new public sector projects are visualized forebodes ill for the people of India. the real *Janata*. Sir, a Minister of the present Government, airing his views, recently stated that to day there are 320-million Indians dying slowly of undernourishment. Yet, Sir, their motherland is shipping two million tonnes of precious grains back because it has no place to store them. It makes one wonder, Sir, whether these calculating machines and the bureaucrats that produce the desired answers for them ever drank their mothers milk. Is there no milk of human kindness in their veins ? Sir, it is further noticed that a large development loan that had been accepted by a solemn agreement signed when Mr. Gromyko came here is now sought not to be utilised as far as possible. The danger exists in that the cooling may change into freeze.

Sir, with China too, we were going quietly on the road to mending fences. Now it once again seems that a wedge has been inserted at the thin end. But all this is not surprising considering the conservative, reactionary, even a fascist base that is being built up in order to revert the Indian mind to accept reaction.

Sir, the recent proscribing of some well-accepted and really well-written books by Dr. Romilla Thapar and others give us cause for alarm. It is also well-known how jingoistic and fascist is the philosophy of one group of people hiding behind the name of the 'Janata Party'. Sir, on the other hand, the warmth of certain important Americans when receiving an ailing Indian statesman can hardly fail to have been noticed. It is in contrast to the polite and diplomatically correct reception which our leaders had heretofore received. This is when the atomic screw is being tightened starting with the fuel for our Tarpaoe reac or, a tool of prosperity and peace. This is also when the role of the USA in South Asia and the Middle East is becoming obvious and when that country has escalated its arms budget to over 110-billion dollars. Unemployment in the U.S.A. is over 10 per cent. For young people it is over 40 per cent and among coloured folk nearly 50 per cent. The erstwhile imperialist camp has as its chief supporter the U.S.A. Therefore, what the people of India must know is how the Government wishes to equate the neo-colonial exploiters and Afro-Asian's erstwhile oppressors with those who have for half a century onwards gone on supporting one freedom movement after another and those of colonies striving for freedom.

Our Prime Minister has said that we wish to be equally friendly with the whole world alike. How is this possible? If it was only a matter of diplomatic relations, then we could have skeleton embassies everywhere. But security and economics enter into this field. So we must ask who covets power over India? The answer is

plain. Strategically and economically India has to be kept down. So that its cheap labour and its raw materials such as iron ore, manganese, chrome, tea and jute can be expropriated. Who can exploit it better than the multinationals? These same people have here ready markets for their goods which they can sell at prices out of all proportion to their costs.

We have already mentioned about \$ 2 billion arms programme. In order to sell arms one has to create a need for them. For this purpose the whole of the Indian Sub-Continent has been destabilized. Sri Lanka, our off-shore island, has been brought under neo-colonial sway. On the main land religion in the shape of Islamic States and the camp followers of the R.S.S. had been set up. To counter the progressives, the socialist path and the growing power of the masses, a deliberate attempt has been made in the name of Democracy to block our road to further progress.

We are not unfamiliar with the philosophy of "emphasis on agriculture", but agricultural efficiency cannot come without matching industrial growth. If that industry is in private hands, the cost of agricultural production will go up. Whence come this ridiculous philosophy? From the New World, of course.

As the Western machine age grows older it needs more and more to devour. It must have a bigger share of profits to continue a state of unlimited growth. It has also to placate its masses queuing up at soup-kitchens to avoid the storm of the have-nots breaking upon the haves. At the rate of present inflation, the West is at point of a no return. The present arms production is at the point of combustion. Therefore, selected areas of crisis have had to be created after the withdrawal from Vietnam.

While American dominance over South America is at present complete, the U.S.A. has selected the area of Indian Ocean and the Middle-East for its diplomatic offensives. In such circumstances the Ex-

[Shrimati Hamida Habibullah]

ternal Affairs Ministry should naturally have followed a cautious policy with circumspection. The indications are that this is not so.

One of the partners of our present ruling party is known to be strongly in favour of an understanding with an recognition of Israel. It is a fact that the Minister himself went to Israel several times and came back with a marked leaning towards that country. It is rumoured that the hon. Minister is thinking of asking Israeli technicians to help in desert reclamation. All we can do is to warn him most emphatically that such a step would lead to almost certain catastrophe for us.

The Arab world has continuously identified itself with us as Asian brothers, who are important among Asians with a large body of their co-religionists as our inhabitants. It is gratifying to see, so far, that the Government has overtly made continuing efforts to keep on the best of terms with the Arab world. That area may yet need our wisdom and guidance in many developments and other problem, not to mention advanced skills and fraternal ties. It is therefore hoped that extra-party pressures on the External Affairs Minister will not force a step for which the people of India may be sorry.

India stands for development. It stands for anti-imperialism. In its freedom struggle India constantly advocated socialist path. It entered the era of freedom with socialism on its lips. Yet there is at present no perceptible difference between our relations with the socialist world and imperialist neo-colonialists. This must give us thought for concern. Agreed that we do not want to alienate anyone, that we want to be friends with all, but being friends we must be brotherly towards those who are our immediate neighbours and those who have taken the socialist road.

We are at the worst loggerheads with those whose frontiers march with ours. In

Sri Lanka also the Tamil-Sinhalese problem is partly of our making. Before leaning on far away people, before falling at the feet of exploiters and ex-masters, the External Affairs Minister should try to make peace and create goodwill with China, Pakistan and Bangladesh, even little by little. For lack of this effort, we are being forced to accept the most outrageous claims of the Defence Ministry, claims which none of us is in a position to comprehend and criticise, and these claims have gone on expanding. This year's reduction of fifty-six crores has little meaning because there are still many superfluities that are adding up to defence inefficiency. Muscle and strength is good but much fat has accumulated through the Defence Ministry's accretion which are a danger to the country. The correct road for us is a proper effort and a positive break-through for peaceful and good relations with our neighbours.

Power may 'lie through the barrel of a gun'; but goodwill evaporates barriers. The Janata Party Ministry took an oath at Gandhiji's samadhi. Here is a broad highway through which you can follow him. Next after that will come goodwill to the peoples of the Indian Ocean and the Bay of Bengal with the same feelings of fraternity to all the Asian peoples. We are Indians first but we are Asians also.

So, Sir, while I laud the Government for the enunciation of its policy, a policy of world peace and international co-operation, a wise policy laid down by the great Jawaharlal Nehru, I must share with many of our honourable Members my fears and feelings of doubt about the operation thereof. This great country will live on; and I know that the Government will look into these matters and will consider them and our hon. Prime Minister who is always sensible and just, will do some thing that will keep this country great and with honour. Let us just remember in the words of Iqbal :

“कुछ बात है कि हस्ती मिटती नहीं हमारी, सदियों रहा है दुश्मन दौरे जमां हमारा।”

Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will suggest to the hon. Members that the debate could go on till 7 o'clock; after that, the hon. Minister could give his reply. But this could only be possible if I receive the co-operation of all Members who may kindly be brief.

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर (बिहार) : सभापति जी, कृषि मंत्री जी का भाषण होना चाहिए। फिर उस पर बहस होगी।

श्री उपसभापति : इस बहस को तो चलने दीजिए।

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर : आप चेयर पर हैं, इसलिए मैं विनती करता हूँ। हम कहना चाहते हैं कि बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश में बाढ़ आई है।

(Interruptions)

श्री उपसभापति : इस बहस में व्यवधान नहीं पैदा करिए।

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर : व्यवधान नहीं, मैं आपसे विनती कर रहा हूँ। सदन उठने जा रहा है, इसलिए कहना चाहूंगा कि बाढ़ की समस्या पर कल बहस हो।

श्री उपसभापति : यह चर्चा समाप्त हो गई थी सबेरे। श्रीमती लीला दामोदरन मैनेन।

SHRIMATI LEELA DAMODARA MENON (Kerala) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am very glad that we have had this discussion on foreign policy, at least to get an assurance and we are assured that there is no substantial change in our glorious goals and objectives of our foreign policy.

Sir, the hon. Foreign Minister rightly reminded us that our foreign policy has not been a contentious one between political parties and that it has always had a national consensus. Sir, our anti-imperialistic, anti-colonial and anti-racial policy has had complete acceptance all around. Also, Sir, the much-talked of non-alignment has drained down. Sir, you may remember that when we first started speaking of non-alignment and when our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru placed that novel idea before the world, we had only 25 countries to accept it. Now, the number has gone up to 87 countries and several others are now observing and are deeply interested in this. It is one of the best ways in which we can approach the world problems. But, Sir, after listening to the speeches here, we find that even among the non-aligned nations, there is a difference between one non-aligned nation and the other.

Some are more non-aligned than others. A short while ago, the hon. Minister, Shri Jagjivan Ram, said that we should not refer to what is happening in Bangladesh because we are non-aligned. But Sir, when there are certain problems between non-aligned nations, we have to refer to them. We agree, of course, that we should have greater patience. But all the same, even between non-aligned nations, there should be greater bonds of friendship and understanding.

Much has been said in regard to our relations with other countries, specially with our neighbours. But there are some points in regard to which we need to be reassured. One is with regard to our relations with Pakistan. We thought that the relationship would grow smoothly. But recently, we find that border skirmishes are increasing and the age-old grievances are again being brought up in the international forums and we wonder where all these are going to lead to. At the same time, Pakistan is stockpiling arms and this



[Shrimati Leela Damodara Menon]

is making us very anxious. Another point of disquiet is what is happening in Nepal. We have tried our best to see that the problems of smuggling and other border problems are settled. But today, we find that from the border area, some disquiet is caused to our North-Eastern States. Mizoram, Nagaland and other places are being made the base of operations and this is causing some disquiet to us. I suggest that something should be done in regard to this.

Another disquieting factor is the new problem which has been raised about the Tibetans in India. In spite of the exchange of ambassadors, we find that China is still unpredictable in its attitude towards us. Why should China take this attitude? We just cannot understand this. What we see again is an element of hostility and provocation. Could it be that this attitude of China is an indirect reflection of its antagonism and anxiety in other spheres? All the same, in spite of this attitude, we have extended, as the Report says, the hand of friendship to China. We hope that it is a continuing friendship, and shall we say, continuing non-aligned friendship, towards China. What has become very evident now in the present trend of our foreign policy is a certain tilt in our emphasis. Some of it has been referred to by other Members. I am not repeating it. Take, for instance, the question of our relations with Israel. But I am very glad that the hon. Foreign Minister has made the stand of the Government very clear.

There have been certain imbalances between our intentions and our limitations. We have emerged as a large reservoir of manpower. A large number of engineers, technicians and others have already gone to the developed countries, which we call brain drain, and they are now willing to go to the developing nations. Do we have a policy of mobilising and channelising our manpower

resources? Do we have a policy to see that our agreements and our trade commitments with the developing countries, specially our new agreements with the Gulf countries, are better implemented and consistent with our national interest? In this connection, could we not utilise the brain trust which we have and which is not being mobilised? We also know that our scientists, technicians and others have not been utilised even within the country. This will be of great use. In our own interest, we have to keep pace with the fast-changing technology of the world. The Industrial Revolution has passed over this country without its impact and we have to keep pace with the developing world. Today, we are again falling into the same old position.

Much has been said about nuclear explosions. We have made it very clear that nuclear explosions are not meant for stockpiling of arms. And it is also not to boost up our political prestige. What has not been understandable to me, at any rate, is why our Prime Minister declared that we shall not use it for peaceful purposes. Sir, it is not that in the great wisdom of our Prime Minister. . .

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: When did I say that?

SHRIMATI LEELA DAMODARA MENON: Well, that was in the paper. I am glad that it is not so.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: I had said that nobody can stop us from using it for peaceful purposes.

SHRIMATI LEELA DAMODARA MENON: I am very glad that it is so and I stand corrected. I am feeling proud of my Prime Minister.

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूडावत (राजस्थान): श्रीमन्, 13 जुलाई, को प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने लोक सभा में कहा था कि:

"I have gone into the question. I have come to the conclusion that no-

explosion is necessary for a peaceful use."

SHRI HIMMAT SINH (Gujarat):  
Anyway, we welcome the new assertion.

SHRIMATI LEELA DAMODARA MENON : I heartily welcome the new explanation because we were feeling very much ashamed because when the nuclear explosion took place in this country all those countries which still continue with the explosion, were angry with us and, I am quoting one of the great experts from the U.S.A., who warned:

"In the case of India this must mean that nuclear trade will soon have to be terminated."

Sir, our Tarapore plant had to be shut down for four months because of refuelling. The very same people continue to make the most lethal weapons and the most lethal bombs and when they say or even give a hint that we should not do it, our blood boils. We do not want any assertion on our part. We will not use it for any other purposes. At the same time, we must have the right and we shall have the right to use, in our own way, our technology, our scientific talent and also that will be the greatest tribute that we will pay to our great scientists who have worked so hard and whose only satisfaction has been to see that they have succeeded in this explosion. Sir, we have the raw material available. I would suggest to the Minister of External Affairs and to the Prime Minister who is in charge of Atomic Energy that we should have more funds available so that we shall be able to process the heavy minerals, like ilmenites, etc., that we have in this country and sell it for peaceful purposes abroad and to use it in our country, so that we shall not have to depend on others, so that our Tarapore and other plants will not stop for want of refuelling.

Speaking of aid, we feel that a certain ambiguity has come to light. Sir, we fully agree when the Prime Minister said and the hon. Finance Minister spoke in this House the other day that the rural economy has to be revitalised and everything will be done to see that the rural development is given full importance. But with the help, with the aid that will be coming from the U.K. and the U.S.A., some conditions have been attached that the aid shall be earmarked for rural and village industries, food storage and agricultural production. Sir, we do need rural development and agricultural inputs. We hope that in a few years we will be self-sufficient in food production. But are you going to spend all the finances on increasing the agricultural inputs, so that finally we shall end up as a food-exporting country and only food-producing country? We have a lot of other things to do. It is not for other people to say what we shall do with the aid. We shall go ahead with the plans that we have formulated for ourselves. We are poor. We have a lot to do for the nation's progress, for its very existence. We want to do it with dignity and honour. We shall not like to be treated like a little child who has an important trinket in his hand and thinks that somebody else will tell him what to do with it.

6 P. M.

Another problem that has been worrying us is with regard to the report that the hon. Minister placed in this House. It says that India is promoting relations with the EEC through greater and more diversified trade. If that is so, what is actually happening? India is the biggest exporter of ready-made garments and textiles and we have had trade with the EEC countries. But now this has stopped. If they are going to let us down in the mid-stream like this, what does this promotion of diversified trade mean? And how does this promote our relations with the EEC?

[Shrimati Leela Damodara Menon]

I do not want to take up more time of the House. I only want to say that I agree with some of the hon. Members who have congratulated the hon. External Affairs Minister for taking into account the problems of the large number of people who are leaving the country to serve and be of assistance to friendly countries.

Sir, the passports pose a big problem. We find that the Passport Offices are inadequately staffed and they have not been equipped to cope with this great exodus from our country. In Kerala alone, 80,000 applications are pending for issue of passport. The staff is inadequate and there is nobody to see that at least some load is taken off from that office. There has been a request for another Passport Office at Calicut. When I speak about two Passport Offices in Kerala, please don't misunderstand me. I am saying this keeping in view the requirements of Kerala. Kerala has the largest number of people going outside this country. It is the smallest place but with a large population and with people willing to take the risk of going abroad for earning a livelihood. Therefore, I request the hon. Minister on behalf of Kerala, to see that the passport facilities are a little more expanded and the offices strengthened to meet the requirements of that State.

I heartily congratulate the hon. Minister for the stand he has taken outside and for continuing to pursue the great objectives that we have had. We assure him that we shall continue to give him our co-operation as long as these objectives and these highest goals are maintained.

شری سید نظام الدین : (جموں و

کشمیر) — جذبات والا — میں نے سارے

ممبران صاحبان کی تقریریں سنی انہوں

نے خارجہ معاملات کے سنبھالنے میں اپنے خیالات کا اظہار کیا لیکن ایک بات ممبری سمجھ میں نہیں آئی — کچھ ممبر صاحبان نے خدشات اور شک و شبہ کا اظہار کیا — کچھ ممبر صاحبان نے دباؤ کی بات کہی لیکن پیچھے چار مہینے سے جب سے شری اٹل بھاری باجپٹی نے اس کا چارج سنبھالا ہم دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ ابھی تک کوئی دباؤ والی بات ہمارے سامنے نہیں آئی بلکہ موجودہ حکومت نے کم و بیش اپنی وہی پالیسی اپنائی ہے اور اسی پالیسی پر قائم ہے جو گذشتہ حکومت کی پالیسی تھی اور جو سابقہ حکومتوں کی خارجہ پالیسی تھی۔ میں تو شری اٹل بھاری باجپٹی کو دلی مبارکباد پیش کرتا ہوں انہوں نے اس تھوڑے وقت میں جس تھلگ سے اور جس خوش اسلوبی سے اپنے کام کو نبھایا ہے جس تھلگ سے انہوں نے اس کام کی ابتدا کی ہے وہ بہت سوائے کے قابل ہے — پہلے تو ہم شری اٹل بھاری باجپٹی کو ایک ایوزیشن لیڈر ایک جذباتی ایوزیشن کے لیڈر کے روپ میں جانتے تھے لیکن جب سے انہوں نے وزیر خارجہ کا قلمدان سنبھالا ہے اور جس سلجھدگی، متانت اور ذہانت کا ثبوت دیا ہے وہ

قابل فخر ہے - یہ قہیک بات ہے کہ آج کل کے زمانہ میں جو خارجی معاملات ہیں اور خاص کر دوسری جنگ عظیم کے بعد وہ روز بروز پیچیدہ ہو رہے ہیں اور وقت گزرنے کے ساتھ نت نئی پیچیدگیاں رونما ہو رہی ہیں اور خارجی معاملات کی وسعت بھی آج کل کی دنیا میں بڑھتی جا رہی ہے - جلد بالا - ہم دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ دنیا میں نئے قسم کے انتہا نئے قسم کی تنظیمیں وجود میں آ رہی ہیں - کچھ تنظیمیں ایسی ہیں جن کی بنیاد علاقائی ہے کچھ اصولوں کی بنیاد پر ہیں کچھ معاشی گٹھ جوڑ ہیں کچھ اقتصادی گٹھ جوڑ ہیں - آج وقت گزرنے کے ساتھ نئے انتہا وجود میں آ رہے ہیں - اس لئے خارجی معاملات کی وسعت بڑھتی جا رہی ہے اور خارجہ معاملات کا جو دائرہ ہے وہ بڑھتا جا رہا ہے جو نیک نیتی پر مبنی ہے جن کا مقصد صحیح ہے لیکن کچھ ایسے بھی انتہا ہیں کچھ ایسی بھی تنظیمیں دنیا میں وجود میں آ رہی ہیں جو بظاہر سیدھے سادھے اور بے ضرر معلوم ہوتے ہیں - لیکن وقت گزرنے پر ان کے چہرے ساری انسانیت گھبرا اٹھتی ہے - اس طرح دنیا کے وہ ممالک جو بالترتیب ممالک ہیں ایسی پالیسی کا اعلان

کرتے ہیں جو صالح اور مقدس لگتی ہیں لیکن جب تہذیبی دیر کے بعد اس کے مضمون اثرات دنیا پر واضح ہونے لگتے ہیں اس کا پردہ فاش ہونے لگتا ہے تو بھیانک اور خطرناک شکل سامنے آ جاتی ہے اس لئے خارجہ معاملات کی نسبت جس چوکسی کی ضرورت آج کل کی دنیا میں ہے اس میں کوئی بھی حد مبالغہ کی حد ہو نہیں سکتی ہیں - جلد بالا - آج کل کے خارجہ معاملات میں خارجی اور اقتصادی تعلقات اتنے خفا ماط ہو چکے ہیں کہ ان میں کوئی فرق یا دوری نہیں رہی ہے - تو سامراجی طاقتیں جو ہیں وہ اپنی خارجہ پالیسی میں سبھی پہلوؤں سے دوسروں پر نظر انداز ہونا چاہتی ہیں اس کوشش میں پوری طرح مصروف ہیں - وہ سیاسی طور پر بھی - معاشی اور اقتصادی میدانوں میں بھی - اعتقادی ذرائع سے بھی اور تمدنی راستوں سے دوسرے ملکوں میں اپنا جال بچھانے کی کوشش کر رہے ہیں - اس لئے وہ عوام و جماعتیں جو ان کے خلاف جدوجہد کر رہی ہیں ان کو بھی اپنا دفاع کرنا پڑتا ہے وہ اپنی جدوجہد کے تمام پہلوؤں کو سامنے رکھ کر جاری رکھتے ہیں - یہ بات ہمیں واضح ہے جو نو سامراجی طاقتیں ہیں

[شرعی سود نظام الدین]

جن کو ہم نیو کالونسٹ پرور کہتے ہیں خارجی معاملات میں معاشی اور اقتصادی پہلوؤں کو سب سے زیادہ اہمیت دیتے ہیں وہ اس میدان میں پوری اور صحیح نشانہ بازی کے چکر میں پورے ہوئے ہوں۔ اور وہ ممالک بچھڑے ہوئے ممالک میں ایسا اثر قائم رکھنا چاہتے ہیں اور وہ ممالک اور ان ممالک میں دھلے والے جو لوگ ہیں ان کو دھری جگہ لونا پوتا ہے۔ ایک طرف سے فارن کپیٹل کو اپنے قابو میں رکھنا چاہتے ہیں دوسری طرف سے وہ فارن کپیٹل کو ملٹی اثرات کو بھی ذائل کر دینا چاہتے ہیں اس لئے میں یہ ساری بات کہہ رہا ہوں کہ جب بھی کوئی خارجہ پالیسی واضح کی جائیگی تو یہ ساری بات ہمارے ذہن میں دھلی چاہئے کیونکہ ہم لوگ جو تیسری دنیا سے تعلق رکھتے ہیں، تیسری دنیا میں لوگ سامراج واد - جاگیر دارانہ نظام زندگی اور سرمایہ داری کے خلاف پورے زور سے سر ہیکر ہیں اور خاص کر یہ چھڑا فریقہ اور ایشیا میں بہت واضح اور نمایاں ہے - اگر ہم تمام حقائق کو کھپی ہوئی اینٹی نظر سے اوجھل کر دیں تو جو بھی ہماری خارجہ پالیسی ہوگی اس کو ہم کیسی ہواڑ سے

کامیاب خارجہ پالیسی کہہ سکتے کیونکہ مخصوص وقت میں اور تاریخ انسانیت کے خاص روز پر خارجہ پالیسی کے کچھ عوامل ہوتے ہیں۔ مخصوص عوامل ہی کی بنیاد پر وہ پالیسی وجود میں آتی ہے - وہ تو جذبات میں پہلے بھی عرض کر چکا ہوں ہماری موجودہ حکومت کی خارجہ پالیسی وہی پالیسی ہے جو سابقہ حکومت کی تھی اور ابھی تک اسی کو ہم چلا رہے ہیں لیکن اس کے باوجود بھی اگر بنیادی پالیسی ایک بھی ہو لیکن اس کے عملدرآمد سے بہت بڑا فرق پڑ سکتا ہے اور نتائج مختلف بھی ہو سکتے ہیں - میں نے ابھی ذکر کیا جذبات - علاقائی اتحاد کا نظریہوں کا یہاں ڈاکٹر زید - اے - احمد صاحب نے بھی ایشیوں کا ذکر کیا جہانتک ایشیوں کا تعلق ہے وہ کچھ مدت پہلے وجود میں آگیا اور اس وقت اس کے بارے میں کہا گیا تھا کہ اس کا بنیادی مقصد یہ ہے - کہ وہ اس خطہ کو خطہ امن بنانے کی کوشش کریگا کہ وہ ان ممالک کی آزادی کو برقرار رکھنا چاہتے ہیں - غیر جانبداری کو بڑھاوا دینا چاہتے ہیں اس طرح سوائے ایسٹ ایشیا کے ممالک کو سیاسی اقتصادی اور معاشی ترقی کا موقعہ مہیا کرینگے اور اس خطہ

کو دنیا کی بڑی طاقتوں کی رسمہ  
کشی سے محفوظ اور آزاد رکھا جائے  
گا۔ چنانچہ ہمارے سابقہ وزیر خارجہ  
جناب رائی - بی - چوان نے اس  
اقدام میں کو خوش آمدید کہا لیکن  
حال ہی جن خدشات کا اظہار کیا گیا  
ہے ان تنظیم کے بارے میں جس  
کے مقاصد ہمارے سامنے بہت نیک  
تھے اور ایشیوں کے ممالکوں کا اتحاد  
بھی صحیح مقصد کے لئے وجود میں  
آیا تھا۔ میں نے آج سے دو چار روز  
پہلے اخبار میں پڑھا تو یہ میرے  
لئے بڑی حیران کن بات تھی کہ  
ویٹ نام کے لوگوں نے اب اس کے  
میں اپنے خدشات کا اظہار کیا اور  
سمجھا جاتا ہے کہ امریکہ اب بیک  
دور اتر کر کے ان ممالک میں  
نئے قسم کا جال بچھانا چاہتا ہے  
یہ معاملہ ہے اور ہمیں اس کے لئے  
بہت چوکس رہنے کی ضرورت  
کیونکہ ابھی اندوچاننا میں جس چیز  
سے ہم ابھی چھٹکارا نہیں پا رہے ہیں  
وہ چیز دوبارہ اس ایریا میں آئیگی  
دوبارہ اس ایریا میں جال بچھانے کی  
کوشش کی جائیگی۔ تو ہندوستان کے  
لئے کوئی چارہ نہیں ہے کہ وہ اس  
معاملہ میں بہت چوکس رہے اور

کوشش کرنی چاہئے ہماری حکومت  
کو وہ امریکہ کے اثر سے باہر رکھنے کی  
ہر ممکن کوشش کرے۔ اس خطہ  
میں اگر دوبارہ سامراج وادیوں نے  
جمہوریت کے نام پر آزادی کے نام پر  
اپنا پلنگہ پھیلانا شروع کر دیا تو اس  
کے خطرناک نتائج ہو سکتے ہیں۔  
جناب میں وزیر صاحب کو اس بات  
کے لئے بدھائی دیتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے  
جنوبی افریقہ کے بارے میں بہت  
واضح الفاظ میں مجاہدین آزادی کو  
ہر ممکن امداد دینے کا جو اعلان کیا  
ہے وہ یقیناً ہمارے سابقہ کا جو  
کمٹمنٹ (commitment) تھا اس  
میں زیادہ واضح اور زیادہ صحیح ہے۔  
اس کے لئے ہم ان کو بہت مبارکباد  
دیتے ہیں لیکن ہمارے ملک کو جو  
سب سے اہم بات دھیان میں رکھنی  
چاہئے اور جس کا اور لوگوں نے بھی  
ذکر کیا اور جس کی طرف ہمیں پورا  
دھیان دینا ہوگا وہ یہ ہے کہ ہم براعظم  
کے جو ممالک ہیں - ہندوستان -  
پاکستان اور بنگلہ دیش اور اس کے  
ارد گرد جو دوسرے ممالک نیپال - بھوٹا  
ہیں افغانستان میں ان کو زیادہ سے  
زیادہ قریب تر لانے کی کوشش جاری  
رکھنی چاہئے۔ کیونکہ اب ساری دنیا

[ شری سید نظام الدین ]

میں کوئی نہ کوئی علاقائی اتحاد تو  
ہے ہی - علاقائی اتحاد تو ہر جگہ  
موجود ہے ہر خطہ میں موجود ہے  
عرب لیگ ہے او - اے - یو دنیا میں  
موجود ہے - افریقن ممالک کا ایک  
اتحاد موجود ہے - اس طرح ایشین  
وجود میں آگیا ان ممالک کے درمیان  
قریبی معاشی تعلقات اور اقتصادی  
تعلقات کو استوار کیا جا سکتا ہے -

جناب میں انریبل وزیر خارجہ  
سے یہ گزارش ضرور کروں گا کہ عزم  
بالعزم کے ساتھ اور بلا کسی شک و شبہ  
مہڈل ایسٹ کے بارے میں ساؤتھ  
ایشیا کے بارے میں جو اظہار کیا گیا  
ہے عرب اور اسرائیل ممالک کے بارے  
میں جو پالیسی ہے وہ اس کو واضح  
کر دیں جیسا پہلے انہوں نے کیا ہے - اس  
ملک کی پالیسی مہڈل ایسٹ کے  
بارے میں یہ ہے کہ جو فلسطینی  
عرب ہیں ان کو حق خود ارادیت  
ملنی چاہئے - فلسطینی ریاست کے  
قیام کو ہم پوری طرح سے سہجہ کرتے  
ہیں اور ان کی مدد کرتے ہیں اور  
اس کے علاوہ ۱۹۵۷ کی جنگ میں

عرب ممالک کے جس حصہ پر اسرائیل  
کا قبضہ ہے اس کو خالی کئے بغیر  
اس علاقہ میں امن قائم نہیں ہو  
سکتا ہے - مجھے امید ہے کہ انریبل  
وزیر خارجہ صاحب اس بارے میں  
بالکل صاف اور واضح کر دیں گے تاکہ  
اس معاملہ میں کسی شک و شبہ  
کی گنجائش نہ رہے جیسا کہ اس  
بات کو کافی بوجھ چڑھا کر دیکھا گیا  
جا رہا ہے کہ موجودہ حکومت پالیسی  
اسرائیل کی نسبت پہلی حکومت  
کے مقابلہ میں ذرا نرم ہے اور یہ  
حکومت اسرائیل کے لئے سافٹ کارنر  
دکھتی ہے - تو اس بات کو ہمیں پھر  
واضح کرنا چاہئے - ہم عرب دنیا کے  
ساتھ ہیں ہم عرب فلسطینیوں کے ساتھ  
ہیں ہم ان کا ساتھ دیتے رہیں گے -  
اسرائیل کے بارے میں ہمیں صاف  
کرنا چاہئے کہ وہ ایک امپریلسٹ  
کپشن ہے دنیا میں اور ٹیلشن کو  
قائم رکھنے کی ایک بہت بڑی  
کوشش ہے -

(Time bell rings)

جناب والا — میں اور کئی باتوں  
گزارش کرنا چاہتا تھا لیکن جناب والا  
نے گھنٹی بجائی ہے میں خالی ایک

اور بات کے سلسلہ میں کہوں گا میں  
فارن مینسٹر صاحب کا بہت مشکور  
ہوں کہ انہوں نے حج کے اخراجات  
میں بہت کمی کر دی ہے ہمارا کرایہ  
کم کر دیا ہے جو بہت عرصہ سے  
ہمارا مطالبہ رہا ہے۔ اس سلسلہ  
میں ہم پہلے بھئی وزیر خارجہ سے  
ملتے رہے کہ اس میں کمی کی جائے۔  
تو میں اس بارے میں ان کا بہت  
شکر گزار ہوں اور میں یہ امید کروں  
گا کہ حج جانے والے زائرین کے سلسلہ  
میں وہ زیادہ سہولیات دیئے گی  
کوشش کریں۔

ان الفاظ کے ساتھ میں جلاب کا  
بڑا مشکور ہوں کہ آپ نے مجھے بولنے  
کا موقع دیا۔

† شری سید نیراموہین (جम्मू اور  
کاشمیر) : جانا بے والا، میں نے سارے ممبران  
ساہبان کی تکریر سنی۔ انہوں نے خراج  
ماملات کے سمبندھ میں اپنے خیالات کا  
اظہار کیا۔ لیکن ایک بات میری سمझ میں  
نہی آئی کہ کچھ ممبر-ساہبان نے خدشات  
اور شک-شباہ کا اظہار کیا۔ کچھ  
ممبر ساہبان نے دواو کی بات کہی۔  
لیکن پچھلے 4 مہینے سے جب سے شری اٹل

بھاری واجپےہی نے اسکا چارج سمبالا،  
ہم دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ ابھی تک کوئی دواو والی  
بات ہمارے سامنے نہی آئی، بلکہ مائوڈا  
ہوکومت نے کمویشن اپنی وہی پالیسی، اپنائی  
ہے، اور اسی پالیسی پر کام ہے جو  
گجسٹا ہوکومت کی پالیسی تھی اور جو  
ساوہکا ہوکومتوں کی خراج پالیسی تھی۔ میں  
تو شری اٹل بھاری واجپےہی کو دلی مبارک-  
واو پش کرتا ہوں۔ انہوں نے اس بڑے وقت میں  
جس ڈنگ سے اور جس خوض اسلوب سے اپنے  
کام کو نبھایا ہے، جس ڈنگ سے انہوں نے اس  
کام کی ہفتدا کی ہے، وہ بڑے سرہانے کے  
کابیل ہے۔ پہلے تو ہم شری اٹل بھاری  
واجپےہی کو ایک اپوژیشن کے لیڈر، ایک  
ججواہی اپوژیشن کے لیڈر کے رپ میں جانتے  
تھے لیکن جب سے انہوں نے ججیہ خراج کا  
کلمدان سمبالا ہے، اور جس سنجیدگی  
متانت اور جہانت کا سبوت دیا ہے وہ  
کابیلے فک ہے۔ یہ ٹیک بات ہے کہ آج  
کل کے زمانے میں جو خراج ماملات ہیں  
اور خاصکر دوسرے جگہ آجیہ کے باوڈ  
وہ روج-ب-روج پچیدا ہو رہے ہیں۔ اور  
وقت گزرنے کے ساتھ نئی پچیدگیاں  
رہنما ہو رہی ہیں اور خراج ماملات  
کی بومت بھی آجکل کی دنییا میں  
بڑتی جا رہی ہے۔ جانا بے والا، ہم دیکھ  
رہے ہیں کہ دنییا میں نئے کسٹ کے ایتہاد،  
نئے کسٹ کی تہجیہ، بڑوڈ میں آ رہی ہے۔  
کچھ تہجیہ میں ایسی ہیں جنکی بونیاوڈ ایلکاری  
ہیں، کچھ اوسلوں کی بونیاوڈ پر ہیں، کچھ  
ماہشی گٹجیوڈ، ہیں، کچھ اکتساہی اٹجیوڈ ہیں۔  
آج وقت گزرنے کے ساتھ نئے ایتہاد بڑوڈ  
میں آ رہی ہے۔ اسلیئے خراج ماملات



[ गै मैयद निजामुद्दीन ]

की बसअत बढ़ती जा रही है और खारिजा मामलात का जो दायरा है वह बढ़ता जा रहा है। जो नेक नीयती पर मुबनी है जिनका मकसद सही है, लेकिन कुछ ऐसे भी ऐतिहाद है कुछ ऐसी भी तेजीमे दुनिया में वजूद आ रही है जो बजाहर सीधे साधे और बेजरर मालूम होते हैं लेकिन वक्त गुजरने पर उनके छिपे हुए मकसद जब सामने आते हैं तो सारी इंसानियत घबरा उठती है। इस तरह दुनिया के वे मुमालिक जो वाअसर मुमालिक हैं ऐसी पालिसी का एलान करते हैं जो सालेह और मकदूस लगती है लेकिन जब थोड़ी देर के बाद उनके मुजमिर असरात दुनिया पर बाजेआ होने लगते हैं उसका पर्दाफाज होने लगता है तो भयानक और खतरनाक शकल सामने आ जाती है इसलिए खारिजा मामलात की निस्बत जिस चौकसी की जरूरत आजकल की दुनिया में है उसमें कोई भी हद मुबालगा की हद नहीं हो सकती। जनाबेवाला आजकल के जो खारिजा मामलात में खारजी और इक्तसादी ताल्लुकात इन्हे खलत-मलत हो चुके है कि उनमें कोई फर्क या दूरी नहीं रही है नौ साम्राज्यवादी ताकते जो हैं वे अपनी खारिजा पालिसी में सभी पहलुओं से दूसरों पर असर असर दाज होना चाहती है। इस कोशिश में पूरी तरह मंसकफ है जो याससी तौर पर भी माशी और इक्तसादी मैदानों में भी—एतकादी जराम से भी और तमद्नी रास्तों से दूसरे मुल्कों में अपना जाल बिछाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। इसलिए वह आवाम वह जमाते, जो उनके खिलाफ जद्दोजहद कर रही हैं उनको भी अपना दफा करना पड़ता है और वह अपनी जद्दोजहद के तमाम पहलुओं को सामने रख कर जारी रखते हैं। यह बात बहुत बाजे है जो नौसाम्राज्यवादी ताकते हैं जिनको हम न्योकालोनिस्ट पावर्स कहते हैं खारजी मामलात में माशी और इक्तसादी पहलुओं को सबसे ज्यादा अहमियत देते हैं। वह इस मैदान में इस दिशा में पूरी और सही निशानाबाजी के चक्कर में पड़े हुए हैं और वो मुमालिक पिछड़े हुए मुमालिक में अपना

असर कायम रखना चाहते हैं और वह मुमालिक और इन मुमालिक में रहने वाले जो लोग है उनको दोहरी जंग में लड़ना पड़ता है। एक तरफ से फारेन केपिटल को अपने काबू में रखना चाहते हैं दूसरी तरफ से वह फारेन केपिटल को मनफी असरात को भी जायिल कर देना चाहते है इसलिए मैं यह सारी बात कह रहा हूं कि जब भी कोई खारिजा पालिसी बाजे की जाएगी तो यह सारी बात हमारे जहन में रहनी चाहिए। क्योंकि हम लोग जो तीसरी दुनिया से ताल्लुक रखते हैं तीसरी दुनिया में लोग साम्राज्यवाद जागीरदाराना निजामी जिदगी और सरमाय्येदारी के खिलाफ पूरे जार से बरसरे पयकार हैं। और खासकर यह चीज अफ्रीका और एशिया में बहुत बाजेह और नुमाया है। अगर हम इन तमाम हाकायत को कभी भी अपने नजर से ओझल कर दें तो जो भी हमारी खारिजा पालिसी होगी उसको हम किसी प्रकार से कामयाब खारिजा पालिसी नहीं कह सकते क्योंकि मखसूसी वक्त में और तारिके इन्सानियत के खास मोड पर खारिजा पालिसी के कुछ अवामिल होते हैं, मखसूस अवामिल होने की बुनियाद पर वह पालिसी वजूद में आती है। यों तो जनाब मैं पहले भी अर्ज कर चुका हूं हमारी मौजूदा हुकूमत की खारिजा पालिसी वही पालिसी है जो साबका हुकूमत की थी और अभी तक इसी को हम चला रहे है लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी अगर बुनियादी पालिसी एक भी हो लेकिन उसके अमल दरामद से बहुत बड़ा फर्क पड़ सकता है और नतायज मुख्तलिफ भी हो सकते है। मैंने अभी जिक्र किया जनाब इलाकाई इत्तिहाद का, तंजीमी का। यहां डाक्टर जेड० ए० अहमद साहब ने भी एशियान का जिक्र किया। जहां तक एशियान का ताल्लुक है वह कुछ मुहत पहले वजूद में आ गया और इस वक्त उनके बारे में कहा गया था कि इसका बुनियादी मकसद यह है कि वह इस खित्ता को खित्ताये अमन बनाने की कोशिश करेंगे। वह इन

मुमालिक आजादी को बरकरार रखना चाहते हैं। गैर-जानिबदारी को बढ़ावा देना चाहते हैं। इस तरह साउथ ईस्ट एशिया के मुमालिक को मियासी, इक्तिसादी और मासी तरक्की का मौका मुहैया करेंगे और इस खित्ते को दुनिया की बड़ी ताकतों की रस्सा कस्सी में महफूज और आजाद रखा जायेगा। चुनाव हमारे साबका वजीरे खारिजा जनाब वाई०बी० चव्हाण ने इस इक्तिदाम को खुश आमदीद कहा लेकिन हाल ही में खदसात का इजहार किया गया है इस तजीम के बारे में जिसके मकासिद हमारे सामने बहुत नेक थे और एशियान के मुल्कों का वह इत्तिहाद भी सही मकसद के लिए जूद में आया था। मैंने आज से 2-4 रोज पहले अखबार में पढ़ा तो यह मेरे लिए बड़ी हैरानकुन बात थी कि वियतनाम के लोगो ने अब उसके बारे में अपने खदसात का इजहार किया है और यह समझा जाता है कि अमरीका अब बैकडोर इट्टी करके इन मुमालिक में नये किस्म का जाल बिछाना चाहता है। तो यह मामला है और हमें इसके लिए बहुत चौकस रहने की जरूरत है क्योंकि अभी इंडो चाइना में जिस चीज से हम अभी छुटकारा नहीं पा रहे हैं वह चीज दुबारा उस एरिया में आयेगी, दुबारा उस एरिया में जाल बिछाने की कोशिश की जाएगी तो हिन्दुस्तान के लिए कोई चारा नहीं है कि वह इस मामले में बहुत चौकस रहे और कोशिश करनी चाहिए हमारी हुकूमत को कि वह अमरीका के असर से बाहर रखने की हर मुमकिन कोशिश करे। इस खित्ते में अगर दुबारा साम्राज्यवादियो ने, जम्हूरियत के नाम पर, आजादी के नाम पर अपना पंजा फैलाना शुरू कर दिया तो उसके खतरनाक नतायज हो सकते हैं। जनाब मैं वजीर साहब को इस बात के लिए बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने जून्बी अतीका के बारे में बहुत वाजे अल्फाज में मुजाहिदीन आजादी को हर मुमकिन इम्दाद देने का जो एलान किया है वह यकीनन हमारे साबका जो

कमिटमेंट था उसमें ज्यादा वाजे और ज्यादा सही है इसके लिए हम उनको बहुत मुबारकबाद देते हैं लेकिन हमारे मुल्क को जो सबसे अहम बात ध्यान में रखनी चाहिए और जिसका और लोगो ने जिक्र किया और जिसकी तरफ हमें पूरा ध्यान देना होगा वह यह है कि हम वरीआजम के जो मुमालिक है हिन्दुस्तान, पाकिस्तान और बंगलादेश और उसके इर्द गिर्द जो दूसरे मुमालिक नेपाल, बर्मा है, अफगानिस्तान है इनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा करीबतर लाने की कोशिश जारी रखनी चाहिए क्योंकि अब सारी दुनिया में यह कोई न कोई अलाकाई इत्तिहाद तो है ही, अलाकाई इत्तिहाद तो हर जगह मौजूद है, हर खित्ते में मौजूद है, अरब लीग है, ओ० ए० यू० दुनिया में मौजूद हैं। अफ्रीकन मुमालिक का एक इत्तिहाद मौजूद है। इस तरह एशियान अमीन वजूद में आ गया इन मुमालिकों के दरमियान करीबी माशी ताल्लुकात और इक्तिसादी ताल्लुकात को अस्तवार किया जा सकता हैं। जनाब मैं आनरेबल वजीरे खारिजा से यह गुजारिश जरूर करूंगा कि इज्म विल जुम्म के साथ और बिला किसी शक व शुबहा, मिडिल ईस्ट के बारे में, साउथ एशिया के बारे में इस बात का ऐलान करें, अरब और इसराईल मुमालिक के बारे में जो पातंसी है, वह उसको वाजेह बख्श दें, जैसा पहले उन्होंने किया है। इस मुल्क की पालिमी मिडिल ईस्ट के बारे में यह है कि जो फिलस्तीनी अरब में उनको हक्के खुद इरादियत मिलना चाहिए, फिलस्तीनी रियासत के कयाम को हम पूरी तरह से सपोर्ट करते हैं और उनकी मदद करते हैं तो इसके अलावा 1957 की जंग में अरब मुमालिक के जिस हिस्से पर इसराईल का कब्जा है उसको खाली किए बगैर उस इलाके में अमन कायम नहीं हो सकता है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि आनरेबल वजीरे खारिजा साहब इस बारे में विलकुल साफ और वाजेह कर देंगे ताकि इस मामले

[श्री सैयद निजामुद्दीन]

मैं किसी शको गुबहा की गुंजायश न रहे जैसा कि इस बात को काफी बड़ा-चढ़ा कर पेश किया जा रहा है कि मौजूदा हुकूमत की पालिसी इसराईल की निस्वत पहली हुकूमत के मुकाबले में जरा नरम है और यह हुकूमत इसराईल के लिए साफ्ट कार्नेर रखती है तो इस बात को हमें फिर एक बार वाजेह करना चाहिए। हम अरब दुनिया के साथ हैं, हम अरब फिलस्तीनियों के साथ हैं, हम उनका साथ देते रहेंगे। इसराईल के बारे में हमें साफ करना चाहिए कि वह एक इम्पीरियलिस्ट क्रिएशन है और टेन्शन को कायम रखने की एक बहुत बड़ी कोशिश है।

(Time bell rings)

जनावेवाला, मैं और कई बातें गुंजारिश करना चाहता था लेकिन जनावेवाला ने घंटी बजायी है। मैं खाली एक और बात के सिलसिले में कहूंगा। मैं फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब का बहुत मशकूर हूं कि उन्होंने हज के अखराजात में बहुत कमी कर दी है, हमारा किराया कम कर दिया है जो बहुत अरसे से हमारा मुतालबा रहा है। इस सिलसिले में हम पहले भी बजीरे खरिजा में मिलते रहे कि उसमें कमी की जाए। तो मैं इस बारे में उनका बहुत शुक्रगुजार हूं और मैं यह उम्मीद करूंगा कि हज जाने वाले जायरीन के सिलसिले में वे ज्यादा सहूलियत देने की कोशिश करें।

इन अलफाज के साथ मैं जनाब का बड़ा मशकूर हूं कि आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया। ]

SHRI N. G. RANGA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, if an angel from the Heaven were to come here, he would be surprised to find that there are no two parties here. All of us are of one party and one mind and belong to the same nation so far as the foreign affairs and the foreign policy are concerned. And, for this, I am very glad

indeed that my honourable good old friends Morarji Bhai and Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee have made their very constructive contribution in this direction. There were times when we were all sitting together on the other side in that House and we had our feelings in regard to this non-alignment policy. We had our fears and we had our doubts. Now we have discarded all of them. Non-alignment is a national policy of this country. We have realised now that it is not only our policy but it is the best possible policy under the circumstances during this decade and possibly the next decade for the whole of Asia and also Africa and other ex-colonial countries and peoples. This is all for the good. I also wish to congratulate my friend, Mr. Vajpayee to have buried quite a number of skeletons so far as our ideas and criticisms of the earlier Congress regime are concerned. I have also buried them.

It is good that today our Prime Minister has begun to speak on atom bomb and atom power in the accent of Mahatma Gandhi. I feel proud of it because I am also a Gandhian. And, I am glad that in America there is a new accent, a pleasant accent also in regard to foreign affairs. We are ready to welcome it. I hope our friends, both the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, would be able to take open as well as non-open initiatives and moves in order to extend our hand of friendship to them and win their hand of friendship. I wish to congratulate Mrs. Indira Gandhi also on the courage that she had displayed at that testing time when Bangladesh was going through a period of trouble the courage she displayed in welcoming Russia's hand of friendship and in concluding that treaty. That treaty stood by us. It has done us good. I hope my hon. friends would be able to achieve similar agreements with America and as soon as possible, Sir, with China. My hon. friend, Mr. Vajpayee, was saying, "We are doing

our best. Yet there must be some response from the other side." There was not much of a response from China towards America, but Kissinger made so many visits in order to be able to achieve that big change in the foreign policy of China, on the one hand, and of America, on the other, with the result that they are now best friends. A similar achievement is needed. In this direction, there was one advice given by our friend, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, in regard to Aksai Chin, which was very much resented by so many of us at that time, including myself and my friend and those who were behind us. I think the time is coming when we should be thinking once again in this direction of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan's advice whether we cannot possibly move in that direction and, if so, to what extent in order to be able to firmly develop friendship with China. In this matter we must be bold now. In India there is a change. It has come. He did not hope for it. Our friends did not think it was going to come. But it has come. I take this change to be a gift of God. Let us try and become deserving of this change by making similar changes, bold, courageous, patriotic changes which would be worthy of the new world aimed at in our foreign policy and in our activities also in foreign policy affairs so that we may be able to make our effective contribution in the United Nations. Sir, the United Nations is not what it was in the beginning. Now there are more than 100 members in it and the great majority of members no longer belong to the ex-colonial powers, who are shivering in their shoes, although they put up a bold front. But that does not mean that we should try in a childish manner to take advantage of it and drive them to extremes. We should be able to persuade them. This is the best possible period, I think, to change the Constitution of the United Nations so that on the Security Council an effective representation is given, is yielded by them,

to Asia, Africa and Latin America, so that we are able to make our own effective contribution. At the same time, we, the majority in the United Nations, should also learn to move in a statesman-like manner. I hope it will be possible for our friends to persuade them. There is this Israel. We are all in favour of the national solidarity, national integrity of Israel. At that time, Sir, while we were in the Opposition, all of us were very unhappy about our Government's attitude in regard to the Arab nations vis-a-vis Israel. Today we are obliged to deal with both. My friend from that end who has just now spoken has said some wise words. We want the friendship of these two great powers. One is a small country with a small population. But it is a great nation with a great history behind it, a great tradition behind it. The other is a large one, large in the number of countries, their population and their mineral resources also. They are at war with each other. At the same time they are anxious to come together. They speak very boldly about their extreme demands against each other. But nevertheless they are willing to negotiate with each other in a very sensible manner. Some-one has got to help them. Let us explore the possibility, to what extent India can help them to come together and achieve a bit of friendship between themselves, if not the totality of friendship.

Then, my honourable friend, Mr. Dinesh Singh, has made a very valuable suggestion. For some time some of us have been talking about Asian Security Council or whatever it is. From there we moved to Afro-Asian Security. Then also we were not quite satisfied because it might not be quite practicable. But his suggestion, I think, is practicable. I would like it to be explored, how far we along with two or three other nations can take the initiative in persuading all these Asian countries and their leaders,

[Shri N. G. Ranga]

to agree to constitute in an informal manner, if need be in the beginning, an Asian Foreign Ministers' Council. Call it, if you like, CONCORD. But we must move in this direction. Let us try and make some experiments. There is no question of losing face by making experiments and then finding that they have not succeeded.

Then coming to nuclear power, let me tell you I am wedded to Rajaji's conception—Shri Morarjibhai's also, Mahatma Gandhi's also—and I do not want India anyhow to become one of the guilty powers in the world to be using atom bomb. But at the same time we also want to develop capacity to utilise atom power to warm all such other people who might be having evil intentions against us, that we are capable, of using this power if we are driven to that necessity. Shrimati Indira Gandhi has achieved that. Therefore, I am not going to quarrel with other people who may not be able to agree with me. But let us be quite clear that we should develop this atomic capability not for making atomic bomb but for using it for peaceful purposes. That is where I join hands with my friend, Shri Morarjibhai—and, I do not know when he has consulted his colleagues. Possibly he has consulted them. But as a true Gandhian he came forward and then said, I am not going to allow atomic bomb to be used by India as long as I am the Prime Minister. I am proud of that Prime Minister.

**SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD** (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am very glad that our honourable Foreign Minister, Shri Vajpayee, after his taking over the portfolio of foreign affairs, has made an impact on foreign affairs, and through his shrewd, mature and well-balanced foreign policy he was able to take the image of India to the different countries of the world within such a short

period of time. I am quite sure very soon he will be able to push the image of our country to the topmost of the world map. India was continuing the non-alignment policy formulated by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I am very glad that the present Government also preserved the non-alignment policy—the policy of live and let live—in its letter and spirit. I doubt very much whether the previous Government, even though they were advocating non-alignment policy, were actually implementing it. I doubt very much. Anyhow, I am quite sure that this Government will implement this non-alignment policy as it has been put by our Prime Minister—that our relationship with all the countries of the world will be very friendly. We will have to be very friendly with our next-door neighbours, other neighbouring countries and also with countries which are far away from us. Shri Vajpayee has studied the problems of Arab countries and I am quite sure that he will try to keep up the friendship and cordiality which the previous Government had maintained with these countries.

Israel has not been recognised by India fully at the diplomatic level and that country is not represented in Delhi through an embassy. They have only a Consulate located in Bombay. Now I understand that this Consulate is being permitted to shift to Delhi. I do not know why they are being allowed to shift from Bombay to Delhi. According to press reports, Mr. Zubin Mehta will lead an Israeli Orchestra Symphony to India and give a performance in Bombay in February 1978. I do not know whether this will be resented by the Arab countries. We have already condemned Zionism and racialism in several U.N. forums as they constitute a menace to world peace. But now various Zionist organisations are working in Bombay openly for the cause of Zionism.

Our Foreign Minister has liberalised the procedure for issuing passports.

But at the same time endorsements on passports to countries like Oman, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia are not freely given. He says he has done it now. I am very glad that bottleneck has now been removed and many of our youngsters who want to go abroad, particularly to Saudi Arabia, Bahrain and Oman can get these endorsements. In fact, once a passport is given it is his business to find out how to get visa from the foreign countries. I am very glad that our Foreign Minister has liberalised these matters.

Now, for the convenience of those who want to go abroad in search of jobs, employment exchange bureau is being started by the Government. Kerala Government is also doing it. But my fear is that this may lead to corruption and nepotism. I would, therefore, want the Government to be very careful with regard to the employment exchange bureau.

Many of our youngsters go abroad and return after working there for two or three years. But when they come back to the country with their families, many of them are harassed by the customs officials. I have seen this happening in Bombay and other places. This should be looked into.

Many of our people go to Haj on pilgrimage. During the election time some of our friends in the Congress Party and those who were opposing Janata Party—I do not want to name them—were carrying on a vicious propaganda in my State that if the Janata Party comes to power no Muslim will be permitted to go to Mecca....

(Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER : This is wrong.

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD: I have got a paper cutting with me. I am not giving my view. I am giving a fact. There was a cartoon—it is now in my possession—depicting a Muslim voting for Janata Party as one who has

eaten pork which is 'haram' for Muslims. But after Janata Party has come to power, Shri Vajpayee has reduced the ship rate for going to Mecca by Rs. 300/- He has liberalised in this field also. And, Sir, he has liberalised many of the formalities required to be complied in going to Mecca. I would also like to make an appeal to the Minister of External Affairs. There is one custom which has been continued by the Congress Government and it is this : Some quota is being reserved for the Prime Minister and for the Minister of External Affairs for going to Mecca and that is not given to the Central Haji Committee and that quota would be released at the last moment. Some Congress MPs or some people with some influence would get it. My own experience is this. Somebody wanted to go to Mecca and he approached the Bombay Central Haji Committee and they could not give it and they said, "You can get it if you go to the Foreign Minister." And, Sir, the Foreign Minister said: "Approach the Prime Minister." This is how it happened. So, I would appeal to the Minister of External Affairs to give the entire thing to the Central Haji Committee in Bombay. Do not reserve anything for you. Whatever quota is there should be left to the Haji Committee and given through proper channel.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:  
From next year.

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD:  
Thank you. I am very glad. Whatever bad things were done by the Congress Government must be removed by you and for heaven's sake, do not continue their bad things. Thank you very much.

شری محمد یونس سلیم : (آندھر)

پرديش) جلاب دہتی چیرمین صاحب  
آج مجھے یقین ہے کہ میرے دوست  
شری اٹل بھاری باجپئی صاحب

[شری محمد یونس سلیم] -

جب آپ گھر جائینگے اور اپنا وزن لہنگے تو ایک کلو ان کا وزن ضرور بڑھ گیا ہوگا - انہی تعریف کی بوجھاریں ان کے اوپر ہوئی ہیں کہ مارے خوشی کے یہ پھول کٹے ہیں اور اگر یہ آپ کو تولیوں کے تو آپ وزن کو ضرور بڑھا ہوا پائیں گے - میں بھی اس میں تھوڑا اضافہ کرنا چاہتا ہوں - جب سے جلتا پارٹی کی حکومت برسر اقتدار آئی ہے اس وقت سے باجھٹی صاحب نے وقتاً فوقتاً فارن پالیسی کے متعلق ملک کے اندر اور ملک کے باہر پارلیمنٹ میں اور پارلیمنٹ کے باہر جو بیانات دیئے ہیں وہ بہت ہی بلیفٹ اور بہت متوازی ہیں اور گرفت سے قطعی باہر ہیں - اس میں کوئی شک نہیں ہے - لیکن قبل اس کے کہ میں آئے ہوں یہ عرض کر دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ کئی ایسی باتیں کہی گئی ہیں جن سے تھوڑی غلط فہمی پیدا ہو رہی ہے - اس ہاؤس کے کئی ممبروں نے حج کے کرایہ میں کمی کر دینے کے لئے باجھٹی صاحب کو مبارکباد دی ہے اور باجھٹی صاحب نے اس کو قبول بھی کر لیا ہے لیکن حقیقت دوسری ہے - قصہ کیا ہے اس پر توجہ دینے کی ضرورت ہے - قصہ یہ ہے پرائم منسٹر صاحب کے لہول تک

یہ بات کئی تھی کہ حج کے موجودہ کرایہ میں اضافہ کیا جائے اور اس کا اعلان بھی کر دیا گیا کہ حج کے کرایہ میں اضافہ کر دیا گیا ہے اس کے خلاف پروٹسٹ کیا گیا کہ لوگوں کی معاشی حالت اس قابل نہیں ہے کہ وہ بڑھے ہوئے کرایہ کو برداشت کر سکیں - اس بارے میں کئی ڈیپوٹیشنس آئے اور پرائم منسٹر صاحب سے ملے - سنا ہے کچھ لوگ فارن منسٹر صاحب سے بھی ملے ہیں - یقیناً یہ لوگ شکریمہ کے مستحق ہیں کہ انہوں نے لوگوں کے فریاد پر توجہ دی اور جو کرایہ میں بڑھوتری کرنے والے تھے اس سے باز آ گئے - یہ نہیں ہوا کہ انہوں نے کرایہ میں کوئی کمی کر دی ہو جس کے لئے انہیں مبارکباد دی جائے یعنی پہلے مسئلہ پیدا کر دینے جاتے ہیں -

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : पिछले सालों में जो किराया बढ़ता था, वह इस साल नहीं बढ़ा इसलिए वह हमें मुबारकवाद देना चाहते हैं ।

شری محمد یونس سلیم : یہ بھی آپ غلط کہہ رہے ہیں کہ پچھلے کئی سالوں سے ہر سال بڑھتا تھا -

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं हर साल नहीं कह रहा हूँ ।

شری محمد یونس سلیم : کہی

کہی بڑھتا تھا۔ یہ بھی صحیح ہے۔  
ریلوے کا بڑھا ہے ہوائی جہاز کا بھی  
بڑھا ہے اور چیزوں کے بھی بڑھے ہیں۔  
نو وہ جو آپ بدھائی ایکسپریٹ کر  
رہے ہیں ذرا اس میں تھوڑی سی  
حقیقت پسندی ہونی چاہئے۔

اب میں جناب ایک اہم مسئلہ  
کی طرف آپ کو متوجہ کرنا چاہتا  
ہوں۔ ویسٹ ایشیا کی پالیسی کے  
مخلاف بہت سی باتیں آج کہی گئی  
ہیں۔ ادھر سے بھی اور پچھلی ہیلتھ  
کی طرف سے بھی۔ میں جناب ذہنی  
چیرمین صاحب—جو باتیں دوہرائی  
گئی ہیں ان پر آپ کا وقت نہیں  
لوں گا۔ میں ایک بات آپ سے یہ  
عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں ویسٹ ایشیا  
کے تعلق سے اور خاص طور پر اسرائیل  
کے تعلق سے ہمارے ملک کی جو  
پالیسی ہے وہ کوئی نئی پالیسی  
نہیں ہے۔ یہ پالیسی ہمارے اس  
ملک کی بھل فوری ڈکلیئریشن سے  
مسلل چلی آ رہی ہے۔ جب  
کانگریس اس ملک میں آزادی کی  
لڑائی لڑ رہی تھی۔ گاندھی جی کی  
قیادت میں اس وقت انہوں نے  
اسرائیل کے تعلق سے کچھ باتیں کہی  
تھیں اور بعد میں ڈکلیئریشن کے خلاف  
اپنے خیالات ظاہر کئے تھے۔ وہ سلسلہ  
برابر چلا آ رہا ہے اس پر آج ہم قائم  
ہیں لیکن میں ایک بات آپ کے

سامنے کہنا چاہتا ہوں یہ بات کہی  
جا رہی ہے کہ جلتا پارٹی کی  
گورنمنٹ اس پالیسی سے تھوڑا بہت  
شیفت ہو رہی ہے یہ بات صرف  
ہندوستان میں ہی نہیں کہی جا  
رہی ہے یہ خیال کس بلید پر ہے  
اس کی چھان بین ایکسٹرنل منسٹر  
صاحب کریں گے۔ میں گذشتہ مہینہ  
ماسکو گیا۔ ایک ورلڈ ریلمین کانفرنس  
میں شرکت کرنے کے لئے۔ اس کانفرنس  
میں تقریباً تمام عرب ممالک تھے  
یورپین ممالک تھے امریکہ کے لوگ  
آئے تھے ان سے ہمیں بات کرنے کا  
موقعہ ملا تبادلو خیال کرنے کا موقعہ  
ملا اور اگر لوگوں نے اس بات کو ظاہر  
کیا کہ ہمیں ایسا محسوس ہو رہا  
ہے کہ ہندوستان میں جو نئی  
حکومت آئی ہے عرب اسرائیل کے تعلق  
سے اس کی پالیسی میں کچھ وہ  
بات باقی نہیں ہے جو پہلے تھی۔  
میں نے کہا کہ نہیں۔ ابھی تک  
ہمارے یہاں پارلیمنٹ میں یا  
پارلیمنٹ کے باہر ایکسٹرنل منسٹر  
صاحب نے کوئی بات نہیں کہی ہے۔  
آپ کا شہدہ صحیح نہیں ہے لیکن  
بات دور تک پہنچ چکی ہے اور یہ  
بات بھی سامنے آ چکی ہے جناب  
ذہنی چیرمین صاحب کو خود ملک  
کے طرز عمل میں اسرائیل کے تعلق  
میں اب تبدیلی آ رہی ہے۔ لہذا  
میں جناب اٹل بھاری باجپئی صاحب



[ شری محمد یونس سلیم ]  
 سے یہ خواہش کروں گا اور خوش  
 قسمتی سے پروائم مٹسٹر صاحب بھی  
 یہاں موجود ہیں جو کہ اس پالیسی  
 کو بنانے والوں میں ہیں جو اس  
 ملک میں پچیس تیس سال سے  
 ویسٹ ایشیا کے تعلق سے چل رہی  
 ہے۔ میں اٹل بھاری باجپئی صاحب  
 کی اہدوانی صاحب کی ارد ان ساتھیوں  
 کی ان تقریروں کو بھولا نہیں ہوں جو  
 انہوں نے ۱۹۶۷ میں اسرائیل اور  
 ایجنٹ کے تصادوں کے وقت کہی۔  
 وقتاً فوقتاً اسرائیل کے تعلق سے برسر  
 اقتدار آنے سے پہلے ان کے خیالات آتے  
 رہتے ہیں۔ ان کی وجہ سے دل میں  
 شبہ ہے۔ کیا اب اٹل بھاری باجپئی  
 صاحب وہ نہیں ہیں جلدہوں نے  
 اسرائیل کے متعلق لوگ سبھا کی  
 دیہیت میں اپنے خیالات ظاہر کئے تھے۔  
 کیا اب ان کے ساتھ وہ چیز نہیں  
 ہے جلدہوں نے اسرائیل کے تعلق  
 سے عرب پالیسی کے تعلق  
 سے یہ خیالات ظاہر کئے تھے  
 آج اس بات کی وضاحت کو تیار  
 ہیں کہ جب ہم ایوزیشن میں تھے  
 تو ہمارے سوچنے کا ڈھنگ دوسرا تھا  
 آج ہم برسر اقتدار آ گئے ہیں ہم

حقیقت پسند کرتے ہیں اس لئے  
 کہ حقیقتوں کا مقابلہ کرنا ہے۔  
 جناب قیٹی چیئر مین صاحب آپ  
 اس بات سے اچھی طرح واقف ہیں  
 کہ اسرائیل کے مقابلہ میں نہ صرف  
 عرب دیہے کے لوگ بلکہ پورے  
 اسلامی ممالک بہت دیہستہ ہیں  
 وہ کسی بھی قیمت پر اس بات کو  
 برداشت کرنے کے لئے تیار نہیں  
 ہوتے کہ ہلدوستن اسرائیل کے تعلق  
 سے اپنی مسلسل پالیسی میں کسی  
 قسم کی تبدیلی کرے ورنہ اس کے  
 بہت خطرناک نتائج پیدا ہو  
 سکتے ہیں۔ یو۔ این۔ او۔ میں آپ کی  
 کٹلی تعداد ہے۔ کتنے آج گذشتہ برسوں  
 کے اندر پندرہ سالوں کے اندر تجارتی  
 تعلقات ویسٹ ایشیا کے ملکوں سے بڑھے  
 ہیں۔ عرب ممالک نے سے ویران سے  
 افغانستان سے شملہ اینگریمنٹ کے بعد  
 پاکستانی سے ہمارے تعلقات بڑھے ہیں  
 یہ سب چیزیں ہم کو سامنے رکھلی  
 پوری - اگر ہم بگازنے کے لئے برداشت  
 کرنے کے لئے تیار ہیں اسرائیل ہمیں  
 کے ساتھ تعلقات سے اپنی پالیسی کو  
 دہانہ کرنا شاید مناسب معلوم ہو۔  
 ورنہ یہ بڑا خطرناک کھیل ہوگا۔

اگر اسرائیل سے دوستانہ تعلقات رکھیں تجارتی تعلقات رکھیں چھوٹا نہ اخباروں میں چھپا ہے کہ اس حکومت نے کچھ لوگ چاہتے ہیں نگوشیشسن کیا جائے کہ اسرائیل سے تجارتی تعلقات رکھیں - کچھ ٹیکنیشینس سائنس کو بلا کر اس ملک کو دکھایا جائے اور کھلایا جائے - برابر ایسے لوگ ہیں جو گورنمنٹ سے تعلق رکھنے والے ہوں چھ چھ سات سات دفعہ اسرائیل جا چکے ہیں - اگر عرب ملکوں سے ہمارے تعلقات بگڑینگے تو اس کو پھر ہمیں پریش کرنا پڑے گا اور بھگتنا پڑے گا - آج صرف یو - اے - ای - ای - ای ہمارے تجارت ہو رہی ہے - کل اسرائیل سے دوستانہ تعلقات قائم ہو جائیں تو ان کے پاس جو تجارت کر رہے ہیں جو مال بھجوا جا رہا ہے جس کو لے کر کاروبار کر رہے ہیں اور کروڑوں عربوں کو لے کر کی صورت میں جو فارن ایکسچینج بھیجی جاتی ہے - اس لئے میں فارن مسٹر صاحب سے یہ خواہی کروں گا گزارش کروں گا کہ اس معاملہ میں خاص طور پر اس بات کا اعلان کریں کہ جو پالیسی اس ملک سے اسرائیل اور عربوں کے تعلقات رہے

ہیں اس میں کسی قسم کی تبدیلی نہیں ہے اور نہ ہی آنے والی ہے چاہے حالت کا کوئی تقاضا ہو چاہے ہمیں کوئی لالچ دے چاہے ہمیں پریشواؤں کیا جائے - پریش کی بات میں کہہ رہا ہوں یہ بات آج کسی سے چھپی نہیں ہے - اس دنیا میں ایسی طاقتیں ہیں جو ایسے کھیل کھیل رہی ہیں - مجھے ان طاقتوں کے ہاتھ بہت دور دور تک نظر آ رہے ہیں - اس کا سلسلہ اگر شروع کیا جائے کنگ فہصل کے اسپریشن سے انکے قتل سے لیکر مسیحیہ الرحمان کے خاندان کے قتل تک جو انقلابات ہونے ہیں الیکشن کے ذریعے سے یا ملتلی انقلابات کروا کر کے ساؤتھ ایسٹ ایشیا کے اندر ہوج کی جائے تو ممکن ہے وہی ہاتھ نظر آئیں جو لیبیا اور مصر کو لڑانے میں دل چسپی رکھتے ہیں لیماں اور بیوروں میں مسلمانوں اور عیسائیوں نے خون کی ہولی کھیلی ہے ان کے ہاتھ نظر آئیں گے - اس لئے بڑی نگہانی کی ضرورت ہے کہ ریست ایشیا کے اندر یہ کھیل کھیلنا چاہتے ہیں اور اپنی طاقت کا رعب قائم کہ ہیں پریشاؤں کرنا چاہتے ہیں - ہم اپنی خارجہ پالیسی

[ شری محمد یونس سلیم ]

کے اندر ایسی تہذیبی لائوں جو ان کی مرضی کے مطابق ہو - میں ایکسٹرنل منسٹر صاحب سے خواہش کروں گا کہ اپنے خیال کا اظہار کریں -

دوسری بات جو میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں وہ ہے قیادریمنٹ کی بات - دوسرے ممالک سے ہمارے دوستانہ تعلقات کی بات - شاید ہمارے وزیر خارجہ کے پاس وہ ریزولیشن آئے ہونگے جو ماسکو کانفرنس میں ورلڈ ریلیجس کانفرنس کے قیادریمنٹ نے پاس کئے ہیں - آج دنیا کے کچھ ممالک میں اسلحہ کی ہوز ہو رہی ہے - کچھ ممالک ایسے ہیں جن کا کاروبار اسلحہ بڈانا ہے اربوں ڈالر اربوں اسٹریلنگ کی دولت اس کام میں لگی ہوئی ہے - اسلحہ کے لئے وہ ملک مارکیٹ تلاش کر رہے ہیں - اسلحہ جو وہ بڈاتے ہیں اگر وہ دوسرے ملکوں کو نہ بیچیں اور اس کی خرید و فروخت دوسرے ملک نہ کریں تو ان کے لئے ایک ٹروبل پیدا ہو جاتی ہے لیہر ٹروبل پیدا ہو جاتی ہے اور ایک کیبسنجن پیدا ہو جاتا ہے

اس لئے بیلنس آف پاور کا بہانہ بفا کر دوسرے ملکوں کو وہ اسلحہ بیچتے ہیں اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوتا ہے کہ ساری دنیا میں جنگ کے آثار پیدا ہو رہے ہیں - جنگ کے باطل مڈلا رہے ہیں اس لئے بہت زیادہ ہوشیار رہنے کی ضرورت ہے - اگر بارود اکٹھا ہو گیا اور ایک ذرا سی چمکاری دمکی تو وہ کافی ہو گی اور پھر آپ کو جنگ کا اعلان کرنے کی کوئی ضرورت نہیں ہے - یہ اعلان کرنا کہ نیو کلیر ایکسپلانڈز کی کوئی ضرورت نہیں ہے - میں بہت خوش ہوں کہ پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے آج ایوان میں اس بات کی وجاحت کی ان کا یہ مقصد نہیں تھا کہ لوگ یہ سمجھیں کہ یوسفل ایکریزا نے لئے صنعت و حرفت کی ترقی کے لئے اس ملک کی زعمی ترقی کے لئے آج اگر نیو کلیر پاور کے استعمال کرنے کی ضرورت ہوگی تو ہم کوئی تجربہ نہیں کریں گے - یہ مطلب ہرگز نہیں تھا ان کا مطلب صرف یہ تھا کہ ہم اس ملک میں نیو کلیر پاور اسلحہ کے طور پر کسی ملک

کی تباہی اور بربادی کے لئے استعمال کرنے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہیں ورنہ اس ملک کی سائیلیٹنگ ترقی کے لئے نہ تو کلیم ایگسپلائزن کی ضرورت ہے - تو ہمارا ملک جو مناسب ہو گا وہ کریکا - میں بہت ہی خوش ہوں ان کو سپارکباد دیتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے اس بات کا اعلان کر دیا - میں آخری بات یہ کہہ دینا چاہتا ہوں آپ نے گھنٹی بھئی بجھا دی ہے - ابھی پروفیسر رنگا صاحب نے اور راجہ دنوہس سنگھ صاحب نے اس تجویز کی تائید کی ہے کہ ایشیا کے فارن منسٹر کی ایک کونسل قائم ہونی چاہئے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ تجویز جو اس سے پہلے آئی تھی اور اس پر کچھ غور کیا گیا تھا اور اس کو وردان میں قائل دیا گیا تھا - یہ قابل ہے اور اس پر سوریسلی غور کیا جائے - پرائم منسٹر تشریف فرما ہیں اٹل بھاری باجپئی جی مختلف ممالکوں میں جا رہے ہیں وہاں بات کر رہے ہیں

وہاں کے فارن منسٹر سے وہ تہادلہ خیال کر کے ان کا ری ایکشن دیکھیں اگر فہور اہل دی ایکشن ان کو ملتا ہے تو اس سے بہتر کوئی چیز نہیں ہو سکتی ہے - اس لئے کہ آپ کو علم ہو گا کہ بہت ممالک کے فارن منسٹر کے آج بہت سے فورم قائم ہیں اس لئے ایشیا کے فارن منسٹر کے فورم بھی قائم ہوں اور بیٹھ کر ایسے مسائل پر غور کریں جس سے ایشیا کے مسائل کو آگے بڑھانے کے لئے آپس میں سمجھوتہ آپس میں اتفاق اور تہادلہ خیال کیا جاسکے - تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ بہت ہی اچھا اقدام ہو گا جہاں تک کہ عرب کے تعلق پالیسی کا تعلق ہے میں ایک بات اپنے دوست اٹل بھاری باجپئی جی سے اور عرض کروں گا کہ ۱۹۶۷ میں عرب اور اسرائیل کے درمیان جو لڑائی ہوئی تھی اس لڑائی میں اسرائیل نے عربوں کے اس سر زمین پر قبضہ کر لیا تھا جس میں فلسطین کا

[ شری محمد یونس سلیم ]

وہ حصہ بھی شامل ہے جس کا کہ

وہ واقعہ ہے جس میں تمام ایسے

مذہب پرستوں کا جذباتی لگاؤ ہے

جس میں کہ عیسائی بھی شامل

ہیں اور مسلم بھی شامل ہیں -

اس کی حیثیت کو بدلنے کی

باتوں ہو رہی ہیں اس کی صورت

کے بہانہ - میں ایکسٹرنل افیئر منسٹر

صاحب سے یہ گزارش کروں گا کہ

یو - این - او - نے اس ریذولوشن کی

یابندی کرانے کے لئے وہ ہندوستان

کی ان تمام طاقتوں کو ایذا ہم

خیال بنا کر ایذا پورا اثر استعمال

کریں کہ یو - این - او - کا ریذولوشن

کس لئے ہے - یہ کس مرض کی

دوا ہے - اگر یو - این - او - کا ریذولوشن

تعمیل نہ کیا جائے اگر اس پر

عمل نہ کیا جائے اگر یو - این - او -

کے ریذولوشن کو خود یو - این - او -

کے ممبر رسی کی ٹوکری میں ڈال

دیں تو یو - این - او - کے ریذولوشن

کی کیا سہولیتی رہے گی - اس دنیا

میں اور کون اس کی وقعت کرے گا -

لیکن ہم یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ خالی

ہندوستان نہیں بلکہ ہندوستان کے

جو بھی ہم خیال ممالک ہیں ان

سب کے اتفاق رائے سے اٹل بھاری

باجپئی صاحب یو - این - او - میں

تشریف لے جانے والے ہیں خاص

طور سے وہ اس معاملہ پر گفتگو

کریں تو وہ کروڑوں انسانوں کا دل

چھٹیں گے اور اس ملک کی ساکھ

کو بہت زیادہ اونچا کرینگے - مجھے

اس بات کا یقین ہے اور ہندوستان

نے جو عظمت حاصل کی ہے ۲۰

سال اور پندرہ سال کے اندر اپنی

خارجہ پالیسی کی بنیاد پر اس

میں کچھ اضافہ ہوگا اس میں کوئی

کمی ہونے والی نہیں ہے - میں

انہیں الفاظ کے ساتھ ختم کرتا ہوں -

[ श्री मुहम्मद युनुस सलीम : जनाब

डिप्टी चियरमैन साहब, आज मुझे यकीन है

कि मेरे दोस्त श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी

साहब जब अपने घर जायेंगे और अपना

† [ ] Devanagari Transliteration.

वजन लेंगे तो एक किलो इनका वजन जरूर बढ़ गया होगा। इतनी तारीफ की बौछारें इनके ऊपर हुई हैं कि मारे खुशी के ये फूल गये हैं और अगर ये अपने आपको तोलेंगे तो अपने वजन को जरूर बढ़ा हुआ पायेंगे। मैं तो उसमें थोड़ा इजाफा करना चाहता हूँ। जब से जनता पार्टी की हुकूमत बसरे इक्तदार में आई है उस वक्त से वाजपेयी साहब ने वक्तन-फवक्तन फारन पालिसी के मुत्तलिक मुल्क के अन्दर और मुल्क के बाहर, पालियामेन्ट में और पालियामेन्ट के बाहर जो बयानात दिये हैं वे बहुत ही बेलेन्ड और बहुत ही मुतावातित हैं और गिरफ्त से कतई बाहर हैं, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है। लेकिन कबल इसके कि मैं आगे बढ़ूँ, यह अर्ज कर देना चाहता हूँ कि कई ऐसी बातें कही गई हैं जिनसे थोड़ी गलतफहमी पैदा हो रही है। इस हाउस के कई मेम्बरों ने हज के किराये में कमी करने के लिए वाजपेयी साहब को मुबारकबाद दी है और वाजपेयी साहब ने उसको कबूल भी कर लिया। लेकिन हकीकत दूसरी है। किस्सा क्या है, इस पर तबज्जह देने की जरूरत है। किस्सा यह है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब के लेवल तक यह बात गई थी कि हज के मौजूदा किराये में इजाफा किया जाये और इसका एलान भी कर दिया गया कि हज के किराये में इजाफा कर दिया गया है। उसके खिलाफ प्रोटेस्ट किया गया कि लोगों की माली हालत इस काबिल नहीं है कि वे बढ़े हुए किराये को बर्दाश्त कर सकें। इस बारे में कई डेपुटेशन आए और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब से मिले। सुना है, कुछ लोग फारन मिनिस्टर साहब से भी मिले हैं। यकीनन ये लोग शुक्रिया के मुस्तहक हैं कि इन्होंने लोगों की फरयाद पर तबज्जह दी और जो किराये में बढ़ोत्तरी करने वाले थे उससे बाज आ गये। यह नहीं हुआ कि इन्होंने किराये में कोई कमी कर दी हो जिसके लिए इन्हें मुबारकबाद दिया जाये। यानी पहले मसले पैदा कर दिये जाते हैं।

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** पिछले सालों में जो किराया बढ़ता था वह इस साल नहीं बढ़ा, इसके लिए वे हमें मुबारकबाद देना चाहते हैं।

**श्री मुहम्मद यूनस सलीम :** यह भी आप गलत कह रहे हैं कि पिछले कई सालों से हर साल बढ़ता था।

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** मैं हर साल नहीं कह रहा हूँ।

**श्री मुहम्मद यूनस सलीम :** कभी कभी बढ़ता था। यह भी सही है। रेलवे का बढ़ा है, हवाई जहाज का भी बढ़ा है और चीजों के भी बढ़े हैं। तो वह जो आप बघाई एक्सेप्ट कर रहे हैं, जरा उसमें थोड़ासा हकीकत पसन्दगी होनी चाहिए।

अब मैं जनाब, एक अहम मसले की तरफ आपको मुतवज्जो करना चाहता हूँ। वेस्ट एशिया की पालिसी के मुत्तल्लिक बहुत सी बातें आज कही गई हैं, इधर से भी और ट्रेजरी बेंचज की तरफ से भी। मैं जनाब डिप्टी चैयरमैन साहब, जो बातें दोहराई गई हैं, उन पर आपका वक्त नहीं लूंगा। मैं एक बात आपसे अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। वेस्ट एशिया के ताल्लुक से और खास तौर पर इजरायल के ताल्लुक से हमारे मुल्क की जो पालिसी है, वह आज नई पालिसी नहीं है। यह पालिसी हमारे इस मुल्क की बेलफोर्ड डिक्लरियेशन से मुसलसिल चली आ रही है। जब कांग्रेस इस मुल्क में आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रही थी, गांधी जी की क्वात्त में, उस वक्त उन्होंने इजरायल के ताल्लुक से कुछ बातें कही थीं और बाद में डिक्लरेशन के खिलाफ अपने खयालात जाहिर किये थे। वह सिलसिला बराबर चला आ रहा है। उस पर आज हम कायम हैं। लेकिन मैं एक बात आपके सामने कहना चाहता हूँ। यह

## [श्री मुहम्मद यूनुस सलीम]

बात कही जा रही है कि जनता पार्टी की गवर्नमेंट उस पालिसी से थोड़ा बहुत शिफ्ट हो रही है, यह बात सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं कही जा रही है, यह ख्याल किस बुनियाद पर है, इसकी छान-बीन एक्सटरनल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर साहब करेंगे। मैं गुजिस्तां महीने मास्को गया था एक वर्ल्ड रिलीजन कान्फ्रेंस में शरकत करने के लिये। उस कान्फ्रेंस में तकरीबन तमाम अरब मुमालिक थे, युरोपीय मुमालिक थे, अमरीका के लोग आये थे। उनसे हमें बात करने का मौका मिला, तब्दीले खयाल करने का मौका मिला और अक्सर लोगों ने इस बात को जाहिर किया कि हमें ऐसा महसूस हो रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो नई हुकूमत आई है, अरब-इजरायल के ताल्लुक से उसकी पालिसी में कुछ वह बात बाकी नहीं है, जो पहले थी। मैंने कहा कि नहीं। अभी तक हमारे यहां पार्लियामेंट में या पार्लियामेंट के बाहर एक्सटरनल मिनिस्टर साहब ने कोई बात नहीं कही है। आपका शुबहा सही नहीं है। लेकिन बात दूर तक पहुंच चुकी है और यह बात भी सामने आ चुकी है, जनाब डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, कि खुद मुल्क के तर्ज-आमल में इजराइल के ताल्लुक में अब तब्दीली आ रही है। लिहाजा मैं जनाब अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी साहब से यह ख्वाहिश कलंगा और खुशकिस्मती से प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब भी यहां मौजूद हैं, जो कि उस पालिसी को बनाने वालों में हैं, जो इस मुल्क में 25-30 साल से वेस्ट एशिया के ताल्लुक से चल रही है। मैं अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी साहब की, आडवाणी साहब की और उन साथियों की उन तकरीरों को भूला नहीं हूं जो उन्होंने 1967 के इजराइल और इजिप्ट के फसादों के वक्त कहीं। वक्तन-फवक्तन इजराइल के ताल्लुक से बरसरे इक्तेदार आने से पहले उनके खयालात आते रहे हैं। उनकी वजह से दिल में शुबहा है।

क्या अब अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी साहब वह नहीं हैं, जिन्होंने इजराइल के मुताल्लिक लोक सभा की डिबेट में अपने खयालात जाहिर किये थे। क्या अब उनके साथ वह चीज नहीं है जिन्होंने इजरायल के ताल्लुक से, अरब पालिसी के ताल्लुक से यह खयालात जाहिर किये थे, आज इस बात की वजाहत को तैयार है कि जब हम अपोजीशन में थे तो हमारा सोचने का ढंग दूसरा था। आज हम बरसरे इक्तेदार आ गये हैं, हम हकीकत पसन्द करते हैं, इसलिये हकीकतों का मुकाबला करना है।

जनाब डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, आप इस बात से अच्छी तरह वाकिफ हैं कि इजराइल के मामले में न सिर्फ अरब देश के लोग बल्कि पूरे इस्लामी मुमालिक बहुत सेन्सेटिव हैं। वे किसी भी कीमत पर इस बात को बर्दाश्त करने के लिये तैयार नहीं होंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान इजराइल के ताल्लुक से अपनी मुसलसिल पालिसी में किसी किस्म की तब्दीली करे वरना उसके बहुत खतरनाक नतायज पैदा हो सकते हैं। यू० एन० ओ० में आपकी कितनी तादाद है। कितने आज गुजिस्ता वर्षों के अन्दर 15 सालों के अन्दर, तिजारती ताल्लुकात वेस्ट एशिया के मुल्कों से बढ़े हैं। अरब मुबालिक से, ईरान से, अफगानिस्तान से, शिमला एग्रीमेंट के बाद से पाकिस्तान से हमारे ताल्लुकात बढ़े हैं, यह सब चीजें हमको सामने रखनी पड़ेंगी। अगर हम बिगाड़ने के लिए बर्दाश्त करने के लिए तैयार है तो हमें इजराइल के साथ ताल्लुकात से अपनी पालिसी को रिवाइज करना शायद मुनासिब मालूम हो वरना यह बड़ा खतरनाक खेल होगा। अगर इजराइल से दोस्ताना ताल्लुकात रखें, तिजारती ताल्लुकात रखें जैसे कि अखबारों में छपा है कि इस हुकूमत के कुछ लोग चाहते हैं, नेगोसिएशन किया जाए कि इजराइल से तिजारती

ताल्लुकात रखें, कुछ टेक्नीशियंस, साइंटिस्ट को बुलाकर इस मुल्क में दिखाया जाये और धमाया जाए। बराबर ऐसे लोग हैं जो गवर्नमेंट से ताल्लुक रखने वाले हैं।

छ: छ: सात सात दफा इजराइल जा चुके हैं। अगर अरब मुल्कों से हमारे ताल्लुकात

बिगड़ेंगे तो उसको फिर हमको बर्दाश्त

करना पड़ेगा और भुगतना पड़ेगा। आज

सिर्फ एक यू० ए० ई० से हमारी तिजारत

हो रही है, कल अगर इजराइल से दोस्ताना

ताल्लुकात कायम हो जायें तो उनके पासन

जो तिजारत कर रहे हैं, जो माल भेजा

जा रहा है जिसको लेकर कारोबार

कर रहे हैं और करोड़ों अरबों डालर की

सूरत में जो फारेन एक्सचेंज भेजी जाती

है, इसलिए मैं फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब से

यह ख्वाहिश करूंगा, गुजारिश करूंगा कि

इस मामले में खास बाजे तौर पर इस बात

का ऐलान करें कि जो पालिसी इस मुल्क

से इजराइल से और अरबों के ताल्लुकात

रहे हैं उसमें किसी किस्म की तबदीली नहीं

है, नहीं आने वाली है। चाहे हालात का

कोई तकाजा हो, चाहे हमें कोई लालच दें,

चाहे हमको प्रेशराइज किया जाए। प्रेशर

की बात मैं कह रहा हूं यह बात आज

किसी से छिपी नहीं है। इस दुनिया में

ऐसी ताकतें हैं जो ऐसे खेल खेल रहे हैं।

मुझे इन ताकतों के हाथ बहुत दूर दूर तक

नजर आ रहे हैं। इसका सिलसिला अगर

शुरू किया जाये किंग फैजल के अससिनेशन से,

उनके कत्ल से लेकर मुजीबररहमान के खानदान

के कत्ल तक जो इनकलाबात हुये हैं इलेक्शन के

जरिये से या मिलिटरी इनकलाबात करवा कर

साउथ वेस्ट एशिया के अन्दर खोज की जाये तो

मुमकिन है वही हाथ नजर आयें जो लीबिया

और मिस्र को लड़ाने में दिलचस्पी रखते

हैं, लेबनान और बेरूत में मुसलमानों और

इसाइयों ने खून की होली खेली है उनके

हाथ नजर आयेंगे। इसलिए बड़ी निगरानी

की जरूरत है कि वेस्ट एशिया के अन्दर

यह खेल खेलना चाहते हैं और अपनी

ताकत का रोब डाल कर हम को प्रेशराइज करना चाहते हैं। हम अपनी खारिजा पालिसी के अन्दर ऐसी तबदीली लायें जो उनकी मर्जी के मुताबिक हो, मैं एक्सटरनल मिनिस्टर साहब से ख्वाइश करूंगा कि अपने ख्याल का इजहार करें।

दूसरी बात जो मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं वह है डिसआर्मामेंट की बात। दूसरे मुबलिक से हमारे दोस्ताना ताल्लुकात की बात। शाब्द हमारे वजीरे खारिजा के पास वह रेजोल्यूशन आये होंगे जो मास्को कांफ्रेंस में वर्ल्ड रिलिजियस कांफ्रेंस के डेलीगेट्स ने पास किया है। आज दुनिया के कुछ मुबलिक में असले की दौड़ हो रही है। कुछ मुबलिक ऐसे हैं जिनका कारोबार असला बनाना है। अरबों डालर, अरबों स्टर्लिंग दौलत इस काम में लगी हुई है। असले के लिए वे मुल्क मार्केट तलाश कर रहे हैं। असला जो वह बनाते हैं अगर वे दूसरे मुल्कों को न बेंचें और उसकी खरीदो-फरोक्त दूसरे मुल्क न करें तो उनके लिए एक टूबल पैदा हो जाती है, लेबर टूबल हो जाती है और एक क्वांस हो जाता है। इसलिए बैलेंस आफ पावर का बहाना बना कर दूसरे मुल्कों को वे असला बेचते हैं और इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि सारी दुनिया में जंग के आसार पैदा हो रहे हैं और जंग के बादल मंडरा रहे हैं। इसलिए बहुत ज्यादा होशियार रहने की जरूरत है। इसलिए अगर वारुद इकट्ठा हो गया हो तो एक जरा सी चिंगारी दमकी तो वह काफी होगी और फिर आपको जंग का ऐलान करने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है यह ऐलान करना कि न्युक्लियर एक्सप्लोजन के लिए कोई जरूरत नहीं है।

मैं बहुत खुश हूं कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने आज इस ऐवान में इस बात की मजाहुर की। उनका यह मकसद नहीं था कि लोग यह समझें कि पीसफुल एग्रजा के लिए सन्तो हाफिद की



## [ श्री मुहम्मद यूनुस सलोम ]

तरक्की के लिए इस मुल्क की जरूरत की तरक्की के लिए अगर न्युक्लियर पावर के इस्तेमाल करने की जरूरत होगी तो हम कोई तज्जुबा नहीं करेंगे यह हरगिज मतलब नहीं था । उनका मतलब सिर्फ यह था कि हम इस मुल्क में न्युक्लियर पावर असलहे के तौर पर किसी मुल्क की तबाही और बरबादी के लिए इस्तेमाल करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं वरन इस मुल्क की साइंटिफिक तरक्की के लिए न्युक्लियर एक्सप्लोजन की जरूरत है तो हमारा मुल्क जो मुनासिब होगा करेगा । मैं बहुत खुश हूँ उनको मुबारकबाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस बात का ऐलान कर दिया । मैं आखिरी बात कहना चाहता हूँ, आपने घंटी भी बजा दी है । अभी प्रोफेसर रंगा साहब ने और राजा दिनेश सिंह साहब ने इस तजवीज की तारीफ की है कि एशिया के फारेन मिनिस्टर की एक काउन्सिल कायम होनी चाहिए । मैं समझता हूँ कि यह तजवीज जो इससे पहले आयी थी और इस पर कुछ गौर किया गया था और उसको बरददान में डाल दिया गया था यह काबिल है और इस पर सीरियसली फिर गौर किया जाये । प्राइम मिनिस्टर तशरीफ फरमा हैं । अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी जी मुख्तलिफ मुल्कों में जा रहे हैं वहां बात कर रहे हैं, वहां के फारेन मिनिस्टर से यह तबादले ख्याल करके उनका रिएक्शन देखें । अगर फेबरेबुल रिएक्शन उनको मिलता है तो इससे बेहतर चीज कोई नहीं हो सकती है इसलिए कि आपको इल्म होगा कि बहुत से मुमालिकों के फारेन मिनिस्टर के आज बहुत से फोरम कायम हैं इसलिए एशिया के फारेन मिनिस्टर्स के फोरम भी कायम हों और बैठकर ऐसे मसायल पर गौर करें जिससे एशिया के मसायल को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए आपस में समझौता, आपस में इत्तिफाक और तबादले ख्याल किया जा सके । तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत ही अच्छा

इत्तिदाम होगा । जहां तक कि अरब के ताल्लुक पालिसी का ताल्लुक है मैं एक बात अपने दोस्त अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी से और अर्ज कलंगा कि 1967 में अरब और इसराइल के दरमियान जो लड़ाई हुई थी उस लड़ाई में इसराइल ने अरबों की कुछ जमीन पर कब्जा कर लिया था जिसमें फिलस्तीन का वह हिस्सा भी शामिल है जिसका कि वह वाक्या है जिसमें तमाम ऐसे मजहब परस्तों का जजबाती लगाव है जिसमें कि ईसाई भी शामिल हैं और मुस्लिम भी शामिल हैं । उसके हैयान को बदलने की बातें हो रही है, इसकी मसम्मा के वहाने मैं एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर साहब से यह गुजारिश कलंगा कि यू० एन० ओ० के उस रिजोल्यूशन की पाबंदी कराने के लिए वह हिन्दुस्तान के और उन तमाम ताकतों को अपना हम ख्याल बनाकर अपना पूरा असर इस्तेमाल करें कि यू० एन० ओ० का रिजोल्यूशन किस लिए हैं यह किस मर्ज की दवा है । अगर यू० एन० ओ० का रिजोल्यूशन तामील न किया जाये अगर इसमें अमल न किया जाय, अगर यू० एन० ओ० के रिजोल्यूशन को खुद यू० एन० ओ० के मेम्बर रूढ़ी की टोकरी में डाल दें तो यू० एन० ओ० के रिजोल्यूशन की क्या सैक्टिटी रहेगी इस दुनिया में और कौन उसकी वकत करेगा । लेकिन हम यह चाहते हैं कि खाली हिन्दुस्तान नहीं बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान के जो भी हम ख्याल मुमालिक हैं उन सबकी इत्तिफाक राय से, अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी साहब यू० एन० ओ० में तशरीफ ले जाने वाले हैं, खास तौर से वह इस मामले पर गुप्तगू करें तो वह करोड़ों इंसानों का दिल जीतेंगे और इस मुल्क की शाख को बहुत ज्यादा ऊंचा करेंगे । मुझे इस बात का यकीन है और हिन्दुस्तान ने जो अजमत हासिल की है 10 वर्ष और 15 वर्ष के अन्दर अपनी खारिजा पालिसी की बूनियाद पर, उसमें कुछ

इजाफा होगा उसमें कोई कमी होने वाली नहीं है। मैं इन्ही अल्फाज के साथ खत्म करता हूँ। ]

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON (Kerala): Sir, from the speeches delivered in this House today it will be seen that everybody has supported non-alignment. But everybody has given his own meaning to the term 'non-alignment.' Certain people have gone to the extent of saying that non-alignment means impartiality or neutrality. Sir, this is not the meaning of non-alignment as it was envisaged or as it was being practised in this country. Non-alignment is a positive slogan. It is not a negative or a neutral slogan. It has got some meaning which means anti-colonial, anti-imperialist. When I was hearing the arguments of Prof. Ranga—such a senior man—he was saying that equal treatment to all nations including U.S.A. such approach in foreign affairs will be suicidal.

Sir, in the field of non-alignment India has built up its image before the whole world and on each and every issue we have taken our side along with the down-trodden, along with the people fighting for liberation, but now the plea is to have all kinds of relationships with all kinds of forces, including American imperialism. This is not the non-alignment that has been envisaged. Fortunately, till now our External Affairs Minister was proceeding on the policy that was being followed in this country. Sir, in this connection, the first confusion took place when the hon. Prime Minister used the word 'genuine' along with non-alignment. Then began the confusion actually. What is the "wonderful" idea about 'genuine' I do not know. But, anyhow, non-alignment that was being practised in this country had a history behind it and it had a clear-cut picture, namely that it meant anti-colonial, anti-imperialist. I do not know why he has used the adjective 'genuine'. Why was this adjective added?

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: I have already explained that.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: I have read it but even then that confusion is there.

Within the last three months, after the Janata Government came into power, about external affairs, there is nothing much about which we can complain of, though my Congress friends try to raise something or other.

On the Arab-Israel question, Sir, it is well known how we recognised the Arab world and the controversy between Arab and Israel is also known to us. If you are suddenly going to throw up that entire policy, I am sure the Arab world will not be happy about it. Anyhow till now we have not taken any reverse steps. My request to the hon. Minister is to see that there is no reversal of policy on any of these things.

Coming to the question of Soviet Union, although we may not be so happy about the over-zealous attitude of the Soviet Union in supporting Shrimati Indira Gandhi and her Emergency, that should not influence our policies, because the Indo-Soviet Treaty has done us good. That point actually the Janata Government has taken up and I congratulate them on that account. Although the Soviet Union may have bungled in their foreign policy by supporting the Emergency and internal issues of India, that does not mean that we should go against the Soviet people.

Sir, coming to another important point which was not so much discussed here, my humble submission is that Mr. Vajpayee should rise to the occasion and clear the differences between China and India. On the question of Aksai Chin, although we have to be hosts to the Dalai Lama, that does not mean that we should compromise for his sake, that we should fight for his sake.

[Shri Viswanatha Menon]

7 PM.

My humble submission is that on the question of China, Mr. Chavan, when he was the Minister of External Affairs had taken some steps. Now, that must be followed up and a good relationship should be built up. I know when Mr. Vajpayee was a Jana Sangh M.P. in the Lok Sabha, even at that time I remember his speech one day, appreciating the development in China. So, China has got its own qualities. We may have differences of opinion about their political line but we should come to an understanding with China and the problem of Aksai Chin must be, once and for all, settled.

Sir, I am not going into other points, like Diego Garcia or other issues. But I want to speak on one important point. Some of the utterances of some of the important members of the Janata Party are also creating confusion. For example, the utterances of Mr. Subramanian Swamy. Wonderful utterances are coming from him and I do not think that it is the policy of the Janata Government. The Prime Minister, as the leader of the Janata Party, should ask him to keep quiet; otherwise, some action should be taken against him, against his going all over the country and making such utterances. I am not saying that there is political acumen ...

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD:

That is individual's freedom of expression.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: I am sure, Mr. Schamnad will not speak anything against his party's policy. On the basic question of international relationship, such utterances must be stopped; or, if he is not stopping, I leave the matter to the Prime Minister as the leader of the Janata Party.

Sir, coming to another important point, our entire foreign policy was based on anti-colonial and anti-imperialistic lines. By continuing it, naturally, we are in alliance with the socialist bloc,

That policy must be continued and our External Affairs Minister must act as a champion of the down-trodden.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: The cat is out of the bag.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: That is our line, Sir, our party's line. Now, coming to my own State, Sir, I have got only one more point, and that is, I have to ask for a passport office....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: At Cochin ?

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: No, at present, we have got one at Cochin?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Or Calicut or Trivandrum ?

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: Yes. At least 25 per cent or even more of the people of India are going through Kerala. So, one more passport office should be there. It is a small thing for you; you are not going to lose anything; you are going to get more money. How can we live and starve there ? We must have some job and, therefore, people have to go out for jobs. You are not giving us employment; we are not finding jobs here. So we are going out. I am not finding fault with you, because the previous Government was also responsible. But, anyhow, this is the present position. We want to get some food somewhere. So, please give us a passport office there at least.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: You want to have more space for yourself in Kerala..

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: We are having the finest family planning unit working in Kerala; without any compulsion we are doing it. That is not the problem. The problem is we are not getting jobs and there is no possibility to get jobs. That is the main problem. If you are going to solve it, we do not want any passport office

but if you are not going to solve it, give us at least one more passport office and our Minister should find some jobs somewhere outside India for us. That is the only burning problem.

Now, before concluding, I want to stress once more that the anti-colonial and anti-imperialistic policy of non-alignment must be continued and in that respect, I request the hon. External Affairs Minister to champion the cause. Thank you, Sir.

**श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी षंडावत :** उप-सभापति महोदय, अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि हमें न्यूक्लियर इनर्जी बनाने के लिए कोई नहीं रोक सकता। क्या मैं मानूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी की घोषणा है कि न्यूक्लियर में जिस तरह से हमारी जो रिसर्च वर्क है पहले से चल रहा था उसी प्रकार से रिसर्च वर्क बराबर जारी रहेगा क्योंकि पहले जब प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कई स्टेटमेंट दिये, लोक सभा में भी, बाहर भी, उनमें और उसमें कुछ फर्क रहा था प्रधान मंत्री जी ने स्पष्ट शब्दों में यह कहा था—

"If anything is necessary, we can do it always in consultation with other people. Nobody will object to it if they are convinced."

यह इशारा किसकी तरफ है ? किससे यह रजामन्दी करने जा रहे हैं ? किसको कंविस कर दिया जा रहा है ? किसके साथ ये कंसल्ट करने जा रहे हैं इस बात को मेहरबानी करके स्पष्ट करें। क्या भारत सरकार किसी एक की इजाजत से अपनी नीति बनायेंगे, दूसरे क्या इसमें खुश होंगे तब हम आगे बढ़ेंगे। तो मेरा एक नम्र निवेदन है कि राष्ट्र की नीति के ऊपर देश में इस प्रकार का वक्तव्य विचार का विषय बन गया है, आप कृपया इसे स्पष्ट करें। इसके पीछे कारण कुछ और

बन जाते हैं। आज मुल्क के लोगों में एक तरह का विचार या सन्देह पैदा होते हैं क्योंकि कार्टर सरकार की स्पष्ट नीति यह रही है कि प्लूटोनियम दुनियां भर में जहां कहीं बनता हो उसको बन्द किया जाये। कल ही अमरीका के एम्बेसेडर महोदय ने कहा कि जब हिन्दुस्तान में सबसे पहले न्यूक्लियर एक्सप्लोजन हुआ तो वी वर शाब्द। साथ ही साथ जो अमरीका के प्रतिनिधि आये हैं वह हमारे साइंटिस्ट्स सेठना से भी मिले हैं और आपके भी इस तरह के स्टेटमेंट रहे हैं। इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि इस मामले में आप अपनी स्पष्ट घोषणा करें। जो केरल में हमारे पास 5 लाख टन के थोरियम के डिपोजिट्स पड़े हैं उसे हम इनर्जी बनाने के लिए काम में लायेंगे या नहीं ?

दूसरे मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहूंगी कि अभी आप जब तेहरान से लौटकर आये थे तब आपने यह बयान दिया था कि ईरान की सरकार राजस्थान कैनाल में रुचि दिखा रही है। तो रुचि क्या दिखाई उसके बारे में क्या किया जा रहा है वह भी स्पष्ट करें।

तीसरे, डिगो गार्शिया के बारे में संक्षेप में मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि जिस तरह से पब्लिक ओपीनियन बनाई जानी चाहिए थी इस पर हम क्यों चुप हैं ; क्या आपकी साइलेंस को कहना चाहिये कि—साइलेंस इज हाफ कंसेंट ? क्यों नहीं पूरी पूरी ओपीनियन बनाने जा रहे हैं जब कि कार्टर सरकार ने यह घोषित कर दिया है कि डिगो गार्शिया के मामले में हमारी नीति स्टेट क्यों रहेगी ?

ये तीन चीजें जो मैंने सरकार के सामने रखी हैं, उन्हें स्पष्ट करने की घोषणा करें।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपसभापति महोदय, इस चर्चा में जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने भाग लिया है मैं उन्हें धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। कुल मिलाकर चर्चा का स्तर ऊँचा रहा है। विदेश नीति जैसे गम्भीर विषय पर ऐसा होना आवश्यक भी है।

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने मुझे बधाई दी है, कुछ ने आलोचना भी की है। अगर तारीफ से थोड़ा सा खून बढ़ता हो तो वह आलोचना से कम हो गया है। लेकिन जोड़ बाकी है : लेकिन व्यक्ति की तारीफ का प्रश्न नहीं है। जो भी नीति अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में अपनाई जा रही है वह सरकार की नीति है। एक कदम आगे बढ़कर मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि वह किसी दल की नीति नहीं है, वह सारे राष्ट्र की नीति है। विदेश नीति के सवाल पर थोड़े बहुत मतभेद होते रहे हैं लोकतंत्र में मतभेद स्वाभाविक हैं, एक मात्रा में मतभेद आवश्यक हैं—मुन्डे मुन्डे मतभेद। लेकिन जहाँ तक संसार के शक्ति-गुटों से अलग रह कर हर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न पर गुण तथा दोषों के आधार पर निर्णय करने का सवाल है यह नीति हमारे स्वतन्त्रता संग्राम के आदर्शों से अनुप्राणित है। सचमुच मैं यह नीति अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हमारी घरेलू आजादी का विस्तार है। मैंने लोक सभा में पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू को इस नीति का शिल्पकार कहा था लेकिन मैंने यह भी कहा था कि अगर पंडित की जगह कोई और व्यक्ति प्रधान मंत्री होता, मान लीजिये सरदार पटेल हमारे प्रधान मंत्री होते और कांग्रेस की जगह और कोई पार्टी सत्ता में आती तो स्वतन्त्रता की प्राप्ति के बाद स्वतन्त्र विदेश नीति पर चलने के अलावा कोई विदेश नीति नहीं अपना सकती थी।

उपसभापति जी, क्या विदेशी चंगुल से छूटने के बाद हम किसी महान शक्ति के चरणों के दास बन जाते ? क्या अपने घर में आजाद होने के बाद हम अपनी आजादी दुनिया के किसी बाजार में नीलामी पर चढ़ा देते। भारत जैसा स्वाभिमानी प्राचीन और महान राष्ट्र ऐसी भूल नहीं कर सकता था। इसलिए यह हमारी राष्ट्रीय गरिमा के अनुकूल था और हमारे राष्ट्रीय हितों का भी तकाजा था कि हम शक्ति गुटों से अलग विदेश नीति पर चलें। यह कहा जाता है कि स्वतन्त्र विदेश नीति उस समय बनी थी क्योंकि दुनिया दो शक्ति गुटों में बंटी थी और हम किसी के झगड़े में नहीं पड़ना चाहते थे लेकिन उपसभापति जी, आज दुनिया दो शक्ति गुटों में नहीं बंटी है, आज तो दुनिया अनेक गुटों में बंटी हुई है। कुछ और भी शक्ति के केन्द्र उभर कर खड़े हो गये हैं। यूरोप में तनाव शिथिल हो गया है। सोवियत संघ और अमरीका कुछ मामलों में बातचीत के द्वारा समझौता करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। लेकिन गुट निरपेक्ष देशों की संख्या बढ़ती जा रही है। आज 87 देश गुट निरपेक्ष आन्दोलन का अंग हैं क्योंकि वह समझते हैं कि स्वाधीनता ने, उनके आगे बढ़ने की जो बंधन की स्थिति थी उसको समाप्त किया है। वह घर में आजाद हुये हैं लेकिन उन्हें अपनी स्वाधीनता को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में भी प्रतिष्ठापन करना है और शक्ति गुटों से अलग रह कर अपने आर्थिक, सामाजिक पुनर्निर्माण के क्रांतिकारी काम को भी आगे बढ़ाना है।

उपसभापति जी, कभी-कभी विदेश मन्त्री बनने के बाद, क्योंकि माननीय प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने यह भार मुझ पर सौंप दिया है, मैं सोचा करता हूँ कि सचमुच में हमारी विदेश नीति का लक्ष्य क्या होना चाहिये ?

क्या अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय शान्ति की स्थापना, या एक नई अर्थव्यवस्था की रचना, या सम्पूर्ण निशस्त्रीकरण, या सारे संसार में मानवधिकारों की प्रतिष्ठा, या रंग-भेद का उन्मूलन ? ये लक्ष्य अपने में महान् हैं और हमारी विदेश नीति के उद्देश्यों का और इन लक्ष्यों का कोई विरोध नहीं है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि मेरा प्राथमिक काम है भारत के उदात्त हितों का संरक्षण और संवर्धन करना। भारत की सीमाएं सुरक्षित रहना चाहिए। भारत अखण्ड और अक्षुण्ण रहना चाहिए। भारत की प्रभुसत्ता सारे विश्व द्वारा स्वीकार की जानी चाहिए और भारत अपने देश में अपनी इच्छा के अनुसार अपना समाज जिसमें समता और ममता हो, बनाने के लिए स्वाधीन रहना चाहिए। लेकिन ऐसा भारत ऐसे संसार में ही बन सकता है जिस संसार में शान्ति हो और वह शान्ति न्याय पर आधारित होगी। वह शान्ति किसी की भूमि पर जबरदस्ती कब्जा करने की वृत्ति में से नहीं निकलेगी। भारत लोकतन्त्रवादी देश है। हम चाहते हैं कि सारे संसार में लोकतन्त्र हो। लेकिन इच्छाओं के घोड़े पर सवार होकर वास्तविकता की धरती को पार नहीं किया जा सकता है। दुनिया जैसी है, कुछ मात्रा में हमें वैसा स्वीकार करना पड़ता है। हमने पंचशील के सिद्धान्त को स्वीकृति दी है। हम चाहते हैं कि सारे संसार में लोकतन्त्र हो। मगर हर देश को अपनी आवश्यकताओं के अनुसार अपना समाज बनाने की छूट है, अपनी राज्य रचना कायम करने की आजादी है। हम तो पसन्द नहीं करेंगे कि कोई हमारे घरेलू मामलों में दखल दे और जिन्होंने आपत्कालीन स्थिति के दौरान में विदेशी हस्तक्षेप को निमंत्रण दिया उन्होंने भारत का भला नहीं किया। वर्तमान सरकार ऐसी भूल कभी नहीं करेंगी। घर के झगड़े घर में सुलझाये जाने चाहिए। उनके लिए विदेशी प्रशस्ति-पत्रों की आवश्यकता नहीं है। लेकिन ऐसा हुआ।

उपसभापति महोदय, अभी यहां पर पड़ोस के प्रश्न उठाये गये हैं। हमारी सरकार चाहती है कि पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे मित्रता के सम्बन्ध और भी गहरे हों। पाकिस्तान के साथ संबन्ध सामान्य बनाने की प्रक्रिया चल रही है। हम उसे और तेजी से बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। मगर वहां पर आन्तरिक कठिनाइयां पैदा हो गईं। अगर ये कठिनाइयां नहीं होतीं तो यह प्रक्रिया और भी तेजी से आगे बढ़ती। हम पाकिस्तान का भला चाहते हैं। हम पाकिस्तान में स्थायित्व चाहते हैं। हम ऐसी एक भी बात कहने से अपने को रोकते हैं जिससे यह पता लगे कि भारत पाकिस्तान के आन्तरिक मामलों में दखल देना चाहता है। हम आशा करते हैं कि पाकिस्तान में जल्दी चुनाव होंगे और फिर हमारी मित्रता का क्रम और भी आगे बढ़ेगा।

श्रीलंका में अभी अभी चुनाव हुए हैं। भारत की तरह से जनता ने शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से सत्ता में परिवर्तन किया है। मुझे वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री श्री जयवर्धने से कोलम्बो में सन् 1974 में मिलने का मौका मिला था। यह बात अलग थी कि मिलने के बाद जब मैं विदेश से वापस आया तो कारागार में भेज दिया गया। मेरे कारागार में भजने का उनकी मुलाकात से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है और न ही यहां के चुनाव परिणामों का कोलम्बो के चुनाव परिणामों से कोई सम्बन्ध है। मगर ऐसा लगता है कि जनता लहर जरा तेजी पर चल रही है। हमें खुशी है कि श्रीलंका की सरकार ने गुट-निरपेक्षता की नीति में अपनी आस्था प्रकट की है। जैसाकि माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि उनके विदेश मंत्री ने यह कहा है कि वे क्षेत्रीय आर्थिक सहयोग बढ़ाने पर बल देना चाहते हैं। हम भी अपने ढंग से इस दिशा में प्रयत्नशील हैं। यूरोप में एक कामन मार्केट बना है। दीवारें उठी हैं। राष्ट्रों

[ श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ]

की सीमाएं मिटी हैं। जन-कल्याण के लिए कुछ समन्वयवादी नीतियां बनी हैं। हम उस दिन की आशा करते हैं कि हमारे भू-खण्ड में भी घनिष्ठ आर्थिक सहयोग होगा। इसी दृष्टि से हम एशियान के देशों के बीच हो रहे सहयोग को भी बड़ी रुचि से देख रहे हैं। लेकिन हम यह चाहेंगे कि एशियान को कोई कम्युनिस्ट विरोधी बाना धारण करके मैदान में लाने की गलती न करे। बड़ी मुश्किल से वियतनाम में एक संघर्ष समाप्त हुआ है, वियतनाम संयुक्त राष्ट्रसंघ का सदस्य बना है। वियतनाम के विदेश मंत्री हमारे देश में आये थे। उनके सामने पुनर्निर्माण की समस्या है। अपनी शक्ति के अनुसार हम उसमें योगदान देने को तैयार हैं। एशिया के और भी देशों को चाहिए कि मिल कर एशिया के आर्थिक पुनर्निर्माण की योजना बनायें। श्री दिनेश सिंह जी ने मुझे स्मरण दिलाया है कि कोई एशिया के फारेन मिनिस्टर्स की कौंसिल थी। अब मैं पता लगाऊंगा कि वह कौंसिल कब थी और कब विलीन हो गई। यदि उसको पुनर्जीवित किया जा सके, तो मुझे खुशी होगी।

लन्दन में प्रधान मंत्री के सामने आस्ट्रेलिया के प्रधान मंत्री ने यह सुझाव रखा था कि दक्षिण एशिया में, पैसिफिक में, जो राष्ट्र-मण्डल के देश हैं, वे समय-समय पर मिला करें। हमारे प्रधान मंत्रीजी ने उस सुझाव को तत्काल स्वीकार कर लिया। आपस में मिलने का, मिल कर बैठने का, बैठ कर समस्याओं पर विचार करने का और सवालियों को हल करने का जितना भी अवसर हो सकता है, हम उस को स्वीकार करने के लिये तैयार हैं। क्योंकि हम विश्वास रखते हैं कि समस्याएं संघर्ष से नहीं सहयोग से हल हो सकती हैं।

उपसभापति महोदय, जनता सरकार की विदेश नीति के बारे में अब दुनिया में कहीं

सन्देह नहीं है। मगर जब दुनिया में सन्देह नहीं है तो हमारे कुछ कांग्रेसी मित्रों के दिमागों में शक और शुबहा पैदा हो रहे हैं।

(Interruption)

उपसभापति महोदय, मैं मानता हूँ कि जब हम चुन कर आये थे, तब यह शक था और जब मैं विदेश मंत्री बनाया गया और प्रधान मंत्री ने मेरे लिये विदेश मंत्रालय चुना तो यह शक और भी बढ़ा। यह इसलिये बढ़ा, क्योंकि आप लोगों ने दुनिया में हमारी तस्वीर ऐसी पेश करके रखी थी कि जिसका सच्चाई से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं था। आपने हमें बदनाम किया।

एक माननीय सदस्य : उसी की सफाई में आप अच्छा काम कर रहे हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उप-सभापति महोदय, ये अरबों और इजरायल के संघर्ष की बात कर रहे हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने या तो हमारे भाषण सुने नहीं और अगर सुने हैं तो याद नहीं रखे हैं। 1967 में, जब अरब और इजरायल का संघर्ष हुआ तो मेरी पुरानी पार्टी जो अब खत्म हो गई है, मिट गई है, जिसका हमने स्वाह कर दिया है—उस पार्टी ने यह घोषणा की थी कि इजरायल को अरबों का सारा इलाका खाली करना पड़ेगा। उपसभापति महोदय, आक्रमण, आक्रमण है। चाहे वह पश्चिम एशिया में हो और चाहे दुनिया के किसी भी भू-खण्ड में हो। आक्रमण का समर्थन नहीं किया जा सकता। इजरायल को वापस जाना होगा। इसके साथ ही हमने इजरायल से यह भी कहा था कि अपने को एशिया और अफ्रीका का देश समझना शुरू करे। अपने को यूरोप और अमरीका का हिस्सा न मानें। फिलिस्तीनी मारे-मारे फिर रहे हैं, उन्हें भी सिर छिपाने को जगह चाहिए। सरकार संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ द्वारा स्वीकृत प्रस्तावों से बंधी हुई है। अरब मित्रों को कोई गलत-फहमी

नहीं है, अगर हमारे कांग्रेस के मित्र गलत-फहमी पैदा न करें तो । लेकिन अगर वह गलत-फहमी पैदा करेंगे तो यह किसी पार्टी का नुकसान नहीं होगा, यह देश के लिये नुकसान की बात होगी ।

उपसभापति महोदय, इसलिये मैं अपील करना चाहता हूं कि विदेश नीति का मामला ऐसा है, जिस पर एक राष्ट्रीय मतैक्य होना चाहिए, हो सकता है और है । छोटी-मोटी बातें आपस में बैठ कर तय हो सकती हैं । जैसा बंगला देश का सवाल है । मेरे वरिष्ठ सहयोगी श्री जगजीवन राम जी ने गंगा जल के वितरण के बारे में विस्तार से प्रकाश डाला है । जो कुछ उन्होंने कहा है, उसे दोहराने की आवश्यकता नहीं है । इतना विश्वास रखिये हम किसी के दबाव में आकर कोई समझौता करने वाले नहीं हैं । कलकत्ते के बन्दरगाह की समृद्धि का सवाल हमारे सामने भी है । फरक्का का निमणि इसलिए हुआ है । लेकिन बंगला देश हमारा पड़ोसी है । गंगा वहां भी बहती है । हमें लेन-देन के आधार पर समझौता करना पड़ेगा । दोनों को थोड़ी कुर्बानी देनी होगी । अभी तक समझौता अन्तिम रूप से हुआ नहीं है, नहीं तो हम आपको उसकी सारी विस्तृत बातें बता देते । कृपा करके इसे दल का सवाल मत बनाइये ।

बंगला देश से जो लोग आये हैं उनकी राजनीतिक आश्रय देने के सवाल को भी पार्टी का सवाल मत बनाइये । मैं इसका खंडन करना चाहता हूं कि किसी को उसकी इच्छा के विरुद्ध बंगला देश में भेजा गया है, यह खबर गलत है । खबर तो यहां तक छप गई कि उन्हें गोली से उड़ा दिया गया । लेकिन उनमें से कुछ लोगों को सशरीर पेश कर दिया गया, जिनके बारे में यह कहते थे कि मार डाले गये

यह कहते हैं कि मार डाले गये  
( *Interruption* ) महाराज प्रेस स्वतन्त्र है, अब इमरजेंसी खत्म हो गई है . . . . . ( *Interruption* ), लेकिन आप अगर सभाचारपत्रों के आधार पर तिल का ताड़ न बनायें तो समस्या पैदा नहीं होगी । लेकिन एक बात . . .

( *Interruption* )

श्री मुहम्मद युनुस सलीम : यह कैसे मालूम होगा कि कौन सी खबर सच्ची है और कौन सी झूठी है । क्या इसके लिए कोई पैमाना है ? मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि . . .

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : युनुस साहब, अगर मामला किसी दूसरे देश से ताल्लुक रखता है और नाजुक है तो यहां बोलने से पहले हम से गुप्तगू कर लीजिये ।

श्री मुहम्मद युनुस सलीम : जनाब, आपको खत लिखे जाते हैं और आप कोई जवाब नहीं देते । मैंने यहां क्वेश्चन भी उठाया । मैंने कई खत लिखे, लेकिन कोई जवाब नहीं मिला ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, यह जितने हसीनों के खतूत हैं, हम मरने के बाद यहीं सब छोड़ जायेंगे । श्रीमन्, इस विनोद के लिए मैं क्षमा चाहता हूं । मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि राजनीतिक उत्पीड़न से जो लोग भारत में आते हैं या चाहे तिब्बत के हों, चाहे बंगला देश से आए हों, उनको राजनैतिक आश्रय देना हमारा नैतिक कर्तव्य है । वह आश्रय हम देंगे और दे रहे हैं । इसीलिये चीन ने जो विरोध प्रकट किया है उसे हमने स्वीकार नहीं किया । दलाईलामा कोई राजनीतिक गति-विधियां नहीं कर रहे हैं । वे दक्षिण की यात्रा



[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

पर जा रहे थे, प्रधान मंत्री से मिले, कुछ फोटो भी खिचे और वे छप गये। हमारे चीनी मित्रों को यह समझना चाहिये कि भारत में लोकतंत्र है और समाचार पत्र भी स्वाधीन हैं और अब तो रेडियो पर भी कोई सरकार का गिरंजा हीं है। ( *Interruption* ) हम तिब्बती शरणार्थियों को राजनीतिक गतिविधियां नहीं करने देंगे। उसी तरह से बंगला देश से आए हुए शरणार्थियों को राजनीतिक गतिविधियां नहीं करने देंगे, जिससे बंगला देश के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध बिगड़ जाएं। बहुत बड़ी संख्या में सीमा पर लोग इकट्ठे हो जाएं और शिविर बना कर रहें इस बात की भी इजाजत नहीं दी जाएगी। थोड़े से लोग अगर रहना चाहें तो भारत के भीतर आकर रह सकते हैं। हम किसी को उसकी इच्छा के खिलाफ नहीं धकेलेंगे। इस बारे में किसी प्रकार की गलत-फहमी नहीं होनी चाहिए। अगर माननीय सदस्य कुछ और जानकारी प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं तो मैं उनको अलग से दे सकता हूं। मेरे सामने यदि कोई घटनाएं हुई है तो लाई जा सकती हैं लेकिन हमारी तरफ से पूरी जांच कर ली गई है ...

( *Interruption* )

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have personally verified. I have met people. I cannot obviously give the names here; nor is it desirable to do so. But I am convinced from my talk with them and from the material given to me—which is also being published in some Bangladesh papers—that some people—the number is not very small—have been pushed out of our country, handed over to the Bangladesh Rifles. I do not know how to prove it. Mr. Vajpayee, we personally went over there, talked to the people who are living around and came to a certain conclusion. How can I prove it if the Prime Minister of the country and you do not accept it? We go and verify again and again and come

to the same conclusion. But, still you deny it.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : वह बात छोड़ दें। इस तरह की शिकायतें मिली थीं हमने उसकी जांच कराई। केवल एक मंत्रालय के तरफ से नहीं, दो मंत्रालयों के अफसर मिल कर गये और लोगों से बातचीत की और वे रिपोर्ट लाए कि किसी को उसकी इच्छा के खिलाफ नहीं भेजा गया। जो लोग अपनी मर्जी से जाना चाहते हैं, उनको कोई रोक नहीं सकता है। जो नहीं जाना चाहते हैं वे भारत में रह सकते हैं मगर हम उन्हें सीमा पर नहीं रहने देंगे।

डा० जैड० ए० अहमद : यही पॉइंट है, उनको सीमा पर नहीं रहने देंगे। वहां तो उनको धक्के मार कर भेज दिया गया ...

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह गलत है, बिल्कुल गलत है। अगर माननीय सदस्य चाहें तो इसके लिए दोबारा भी जांच करवा सकते हैं आपको इसके बारे में कोई शिकायत नहीं होनी चाहिए।

श्री मोरारजी आर० देसाई : आपको भी साथ भेजा जा सकता है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उप-सभापति जी, मुझे यह देख कर खेद हुआ है कि विदेश नीति के सवाल पर जो एक राष्ट्रीय मतैक्य है उसमें कुछ विरोध के स्वर सुनाई दे रहे हैं और यह कहा जा रहा है कि सरकार अपनी नीति को बड़ी चतुराई से बदल रही है—स्लाइड बट सबटल चेंज।

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM :  
One can feel it.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हमारी नीति जड़ नीति नहीं है, यह गतिमान नीति है। हमारी नीति ... ( *Interruption* )  
... तो क्या, यू वांट ए स्टेटिक पालिसी ?

फारेन पालिसी डाइनेमिक होगी, फारेन पालिसी फ्लेक्सिबल होगी, फारेन पालिसी बदलती हुई परिस्थिति का उत्तर देने में सक्षम होगी, समर्थ होगी। लेकिन एक बात का मैं आश्वासन देना चाहता हूँ : भारत किसी विदेशी शक्ति के दबाव में आकर अपनी विदेश नीति में परिवर्तन नहीं करेगा।

अब क्या बातें कही जा रही हैं न्यूक्लियर इनर्जी के सारे में ? प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उसका उत्तर दे दिया, हमने नान गालिकरेशन की ट्रीटी पर दस्तखत नहीं किए हैं, न हम दस्तखत करने वाले हैं; क्योंकि वह ट्रीटी, वह सन्धि, भेदभाव-मूलक है, वह ट्रीटी असमान है। एक ओर जिनके पास आणविक हथियार हैं वे हथियारों के अम्बार लगा रहे हैं—और हम शान्तिपूर्ण कार्यों के लिए भी अगुशक्ति का उपयोग नहीं कर सकते। यह सन्धि हम नहीं मानेंगे। इस नीति में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं होगा...

**डा० जंड० ए० अहमद :** मैं एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ : क्या यह हकीकत है कि कुछ दिन पहले एक युनाइटेड स्टेट्स के आफिशियल, (एन वाई ई) मिस्टर नाये, यहां आये थे। प्रधान मंत्री से मिले और फिः बम्बई रहे हैं। उनको जो सारे न्यूक्लियर कॉम्प्लेक्स थे वे दिखाए गए। क्या हम इससे समा सकते हैं कि सुपरविजन हमारे न्यूक्लियर कॉम्प्लेक्स का हो रहा है और प्रधान मंत्री ने उसकी इजाजत दी ?

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** उपसभापति महोदय, यह बहुत अच्छा हुआ कि यह सवाल पूछा गया है। गन्तफहसी दूर हो जाएगी। कुछ एटॉमिक इंस्टालेशंस ऐसे हैं जो हमने अमरीका के सहयोग से बनाए हैं इसीलिये तो उनसे एनरिचड यूरेनियम के लेने का सवाल पैदा होता है; इसलिए एनरिचड यूरेनियम देने में देर लगा दी। कुछ हमने कैनडा के सहयोग से बनाए हैं अब इन इंस्टालेशंस के बारे में अमरीका और कैनडा से बातचीत

हो रही है; हम बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार हैं। इन इंस्टालेशंस की अगर वे देख-भाल करना चाहें तो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नियमों के अनुसार तो उसके लिए भी सरकार पहले से सहमत है। कोई नई नीति नहीं है। लेकिन जो इंस्टालेशंस हमारे वैज्ञानिकों ने अपनी प्रतिभा से, अपनी योग्यता से, अपनी कुशलता से कायम किये हैं, उनको हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय इंस्पेक्शन के लिए खोलने को तैयार नहीं हैं। वह हमारी अपनी धरोहर है।

**श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूड़ावत :** आगे बराबर डेवलप होती रहेंगी कि नहीं, यह भी कहिए।

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** जरूर होती रहेंगी, कोई बाधा नहीं है। लेकिन एक बात मैं स्पष्ट करना चाहूंगा कि यह जो बार-बार अमरीका का नाम लिया जा रहा है, जहां तक एटॉमिक एनर्जी का सवाल है, अमरीका और रूस के दृष्टिकोण में कोई अन्तर नहीं है।

**SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA** (Gujarat): In this connection, I want to ask only one question. You say that only installations which are covered under this agreement are shown to him. But here is a report in the *National Herald* which says that Mr. Nye was taken to the plutonium separation plant of the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre. That is not covered under this agreement. How did this happen ?

(Interruption).

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:** That is open to many dignitaries who come from abroad. That is not a secret installation. We are not opposed to foreigners going to that installation. I am sorry he has tried to mix up things.

**SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI:** Twist, not mix up.

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** अब मैं ट्विस्ट तो नहीं कहता हूँ।

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

उपसभापति महोदय, वह कौन सी चीज है जिस पर भारत की सरकार पर दबाव आ रहा है। हमें अगर सदन का समर्थन है, देश की जनता का समर्थन और विश्वास प्राप्त है और जब तक मोरारजी भाई के नेतृत्व में देश की बागडोर है हम किसी दबाव से झुकने वाले नहीं हैं। यह मैं सदन को विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ शक नहीं है वहाँ शक देखना, जहाँ डेवियेशन नहीं है वहाँ डेवियेशन की कल्पना करना, जहाँ मतैक्य है वहाँ मतभेद खोजना क्षमा, कीजिएगा यह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति के लिए बहुत अच्छी चीज नहीं है। शक की दवा तो हकीम लुकमान के पास भी नहीं थी, मैं भला कहां से लाऊंगा। शक और संदेह से दूर, राष्ट्र के उदात्त हितों के संरक्षण के लिए बुद्ध परिकर विदेश नीति हम आदर्श और यथार्थ के मेल के आधार पर चलाना चाहते हैं। किसी माननीय सदस्य ने ठीक ही कहा था कि महात्मा गांधी ने कहा कि हम स्वाधीन हो गये और दूसरे देश गुलाम हैं तो भारत की स्वाधीनता का कोई अर्थ नहीं है। अभी तक अफ्रीकी जनता गुलामी की जंजीरों में जकड़ी हुई है, उन पर अत्याचार किये जा रहे हैं, रंगभेद के नाम पर उनके ऊपर कहर बरपा किये जा रहे हैं। पुरानी सरकार भी उनकी मदद कर रही थी, नैतिक मदद कर रही थी, राजनैतिक मदद कर रही थी और थोड़ा सा भौतिक मदद भी कर रही थी। हमने उस मदद को बढ़ाने का फैसला किया है। हमें और आगे जाकर गोरों की सत्ता को समाप्त करने के लिये जो भी करना पड़ेगा हम करने के लिए तैयार हैं और अगर इससे दुनिया का कोई देश हमसे नाराज होता है तो हमें कोई चिन्ता नहीं है।.. (Interruption)

उपसभापति महोदय, एक बात मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि भारत और रूस के घनिष्ठ संबंध है। कुछ रूस में भी आशंका थी कि नई सरकार बनी है पता नहीं कौन सी नीति आनायेगी। हमने रूस के विदेश मंत्री

श्री ग्रोमिको को भारत आने का निमंत्रण दिया उनसे बात की, प्रधान मंत्री जी से उनकी मुलाकात हुई, मैंने उनसे बात की और वह संतुष्ट लौट गये। रूस संकट के समय हमारे काम आया है, हम इस मित्रता को बरकरार रखना चाहेंगे। मगर भारत और रूस की मित्रता भारत को किसी तीसरे देश को मित्र बनाने से नहीं रोकती है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : उसकी अपेक्षा किसी को नहीं है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : राष्ट्रपति कार्टर के नेतृत्व में अमेरिका ने भारत की ओर मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ाया है। आत्म-विश्वास से भर कर हमने उस हाथ को ग्रहण करने का फैसला किया है। यह मित्रता बराबरी के आधार पर होगी। यह मित्रता देश और विश्व के हित में होगी। इस मित्रता के साथ शर्तें नहीं होंगी। अमेरिकी अर्थ सहायता के लिए हम यह मित्रता कायम नहीं करने जा रहे हैं। लेकिन जब रूस और अमेरिका हिंद महासागर के निशस्त्रीकरण के बारे में, पश्चिमी एशिया की समस्या को सुलझाने के बारे में मिल कर बैठ सकते हैं, बात कर सकते हैं, अपने सम्बन्ध सुधार सकते हैं तो सन् 1971 में अमेरिका ने जो गलती की थी उस गलती को अब अगर अमेरिका सुधारना चाहता है तो हम उसका क्यों न स्वागत करें। चीन के साथ भी हम अपने सम्बन्धों को सामान्य बनाना चाहते हैं। यह प्रक्रिया भी पहले से चल रही है। हम ने कोई नयी चीज नहीं की। हम ने उस को थोड़ी सी गति दी है, लेकिन भूमि का सवाल बाकी है। इस लिये मैं माननीय सदस्यों से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इस मामले में कदम ब कदम चलने की जरूरत है। बहुत से विदेश नीति के सवाल ऐसे होते हैं, इतने नाजुक होते हैं कि इन पर कुछ कहना भी मुश्किल है और चुप रहना

भी मुश्किल है। आप कह दें तो हम कैसे चुप रहें, लेकिन अगर आप चुप रह जायें तो हम भी कुछ न बोलें। ऐसा समझौता तो होना चाहिए। राजदूतों का आदान-प्रदान हो गया। चीन के साथ व्यापार सम्बन्ध कायम हो गये। एक पत्रकार हमारे गये थे, एक डाक्टर गये थे। उन के कुछ डाक्टर आ रहे हैं। हमारे जहाजों को छूट है, अगर वह चीन के बंदरगाहों पर माल ले जाना चाहते हैं तो ले जा सकते हैं। सिलसिला शुरू हुआ है। देखें ऊंट किस करवट बैठता है। हमारी इच्छा है कि हमारे सम्बन्ध सामान्य बनें चाहिए। अगर दूसरी ओर से भी ऐसी ही इच्छा होगी तो जरूर सम्बन्ध सामान्य बनेंगे और अगर एक बार सम्बन्ध सामान्य बन गये तो सम्बन्धों को मत्रीपूर्ण बनाने का रास्ता खुल जाएगा।

**श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर :** आप नेपाल गये थे। वहां के बारे में कुछ कहिये।

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** नेपाल के सम्बन्ध में इतना ही कह सकता हूं कि उस के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध बहुत अच्छे हैं और मेरे जाने से और भी मधुर बने हैं। यह सम्बन्ध अटूट हैं।

**श्री मुहम्मद यूनस सलीम :** आप की मधुर वाणी ने वहां बहुत अच्छा असर पैदा किया है।

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** और भी पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध सुधरे हैं। यह हमारा प्रयत्न है और इस कार्य में हम सारे सदन की शुभकामना और सदभावना चाहते हैं। बहुत बहुत धन्यवाद।

#### STATEMENT BY MINISTER

#### FLOOD SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Agriculture Minister now.

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** बजाय इसके कि कृषि मंत्री जी अपना वक्तव्य दें, मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि यह सदन समाप्त हो रहा है और अगला सदन नवम्बर में होगा। तो इतनी अनुमति दी जाय कि मंत्री जी से कुछ प्रश्न हम वक्तव्य के बाद पूछ सकें।

**श्री कल्प नाथ राय (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि बाढ़ के कारण बहुत परेशानी है। लाखों जानवर मर गये हैं, हजारों घर बह गये हैं और यह राष्ट्रीय संकट का सवाल है। राजस्थान में अजमेर डूब रहा है। इसलिये इस पर बहस होनी चाहिए और इसके लिये सदन का समय एक दिन के लिये और बढ़ा दिया जाय।

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION (SHRI SURJIT SINGH BARNALA): Sir, in reply to a Calling Attention Notice in Rajya Sabha on the 4th of August, 1977 a statement on the flood situation was made giving the flood position as on that date. This statement deals with the subsequent situation in various parts of the country.

The season's total of the monsoon rainfall from the 1st of June to the first week of August is either normal or in excess over most of the country except in sub-Himalayan West Bengal, Arunachal Pradesh and Telengana where the deficiency is marginal and in Nagaland, Manipur, Mizoram and Tripura and Marathwara where it is deficient. The Statewise position is as follows:—

**Assam:** In river Brahmaputra the fourth wave of floods has been continuing since the 2nd July. The Northern tributaries of Brahmaputra Puthimari, Pagladiya, Beki, Manas and Subansiri and Dhansiri from the South have also been in moderate floods.