

[Shri I. K. Gujral] unfortunately, he is very uneducated in the social aspect of housing. He is now living in a world of the 19th century and he still thinks that houses are built by rich men and the poor live in them. Unfortunately the situation to-day is reverse. Rich men are building houses, but only rich men live in them.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Trespassers also can be given concession ? How can trespassers be given any concession ?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I will come to that. Therefore, in to-day's context, we have evolved a policy of ceiling on urban property, and Rent Control Acts are necessary, to control in the social interest the activity of housing and housing construction so that those sections of the society for which he is crying also get houses. (*Interruption*). He was in the beginning making the point that by bringing a ceiling on urban property or by bringing Rent Control Acts, social housing might be affected. Let him understand that we are concerned that too many affluent houses have been built and these affluent houses are not meant for those whom he wants to help. I would like to know how many houses have been built in the interest of the labour.] I would like to know how many houses have been built for the slum dwellers in Calcutta, Bombay and Delhi. I would like to know how much investment has been made individually by those people who can afford to make investments so that the middle income people, the clerk in the office or the man in the mill can get houses. You will find that almost no investment has been made. That is why this policy of ceiling of urban property has been brought. That is why we have come to the conclusion that some sort of social control is needed. That is why we feel that if middle income housing or low income housing or the janta housing is to be done, the Government is the only authority or the medium through which it can be done. That is why this policy has been evolved. I can assure him that we are deeply concerned over the lot of those who are forced to live in *jhuggis* and *jhonpris*, and we are deeply concerned over the lot of those who have occupied governmental land under difficult social

circumstances. That is why our entire emphasis is on the housing policy.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : How can trespassers be given concession / There should be no trespasses.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We will be discussing the Indo-Soviet Treaty in the afternoon. There are a large number of Members who would like to participate in this debate. So I think we have to adjourn only till 2 P.M.

The House stands adjourned till 2 p. M.

The House adjourned for lunch at six minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

MOTION RE TREATY OF PEACE, FRIENDSHIP AND CO- OPERATION BETWEEN THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI JAG.FIVAN RAM) : Sir, I beg to move :

"That the statement made in the Rajya Sabha on the 9th August, 1971, regarding the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation between the Republic of India and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, be taken into consideration."

Sir, at this stage, I do not propose to make any speech. After hearing the hon. Members, I shall make such remarks as may be necessary.

The question was proposed.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : Sir, I beg to move :

"That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'with particular reference to its

effect on the security of the Indian Ocean and the development of nuclear devices'."

The question was proposed.

THE LEADER OF OPPOSITION (SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Treaty is with us for some time. It has generated many reactions both in India and abroad. We have been witnessing both surprise and shock in certain quarters and agony and ecstasy in certain other quarters. Some of our friends have exaggerated the importance of this treaty and some others have tried to soft-pedal it. Some seem to think that this Treaty provides a milky way for our foreign policy and will be able to create, new Eysian Island which may provide a new vista for our foreign policy. Many expressions have been used, Sir, and you are aware of them. Some have called it a mile stone, some have called it a landmark and some others have said that it is the crowning achievement of our foreign policy. But, in some quarters, some skepticism and doubt have also been expressed and they have been posing the question whether it is only a Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation and nothing else, or whether it affects our ethos and *elan* of our foreign policy. I do not want to read too much into the Treaty nor too little either. But I take the official version, the words expressed by the official spokesman the other day.

Sir, he has said, in effect, that the Treaty has not brought about anything new nor has it brought anything novel. It is just a formal consolidation of our relations with the Soviet Union. But Mr. Gromyko does not agree with this analysis. In his statement, he has said it is a very important landmark. Sir, if I go through the various Articles of the Treaty, I find many platitudinous references to ideals. There is a reference to the end of colonialism and racialism ; there is a reference to the consolidation of universal peace and security ; and there is a promise to work for general and complete disarmament. The Treaty also deals with such matters like trade, transport, communications, etc.

Sir, when we take all these things into our mind, we are inclined to feel anybody can sign these things. The USA can sign

this Treaty ; Germany can do it ; and France can do it. These are all pious expressions which we all cherish, which we all want. But I would like to ask : Is it so simple a Treaty as this ? Is it just the culmination of the negotiations which were conducted for nearly two years ? Is it just a formalisation of our relations with the Soviet Union ? If it is so formal and so simple. Sir, I ask whether this Treaty was at all necessary. We had good relations with that Soviet Union and we do have very cordial relations with the country and it is not necessary to say to the world that we do require, that we do want peace, friendship and cooperation with the Soviet people and their Government for twenty years. We have built many bridges of understanding between this country and the Soviet Union. Therefore, Sir, naturally one asks whether the view of the spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry reflects the correct appraisal of this Treaty. Sir, I really want to look at this Treaty not in this way. It seems to me that this Treaty is an instrument of Real politics. It is a very important diplomatic event which enables to answer a call of certain overriding compulsions. The relevance, the utility and the efficacy of this treaty lie in the fact whether this treaty, with its various clauses, meets these imperatives, or geopolitical compulsions, or the present crisis that is enveloping this sub-continent. And this treaty has got to be judged and understood in two parts. What are the effects of the treaty immediately ? And what are the implications of the treaty and what are the consequences, in the long run ?

Talking about short-term period, I would state what are the elements which have impelled the Government of India and the Soviet Union to sign this treaty, what are the basic elements of the national situation and what is the nature of the crisis. Sir, whatever may be the explanation of the spokesman of the Government of India about the importance of the treaty, I take it that this treaty has been signed to answer certain demands and to meet the challenges that have developed and to contain certain threats that are operating in the Indian subcontinent. . .

What are those trends ? What is this situation ? There may be various elements in the situation. But, broadly speaking, the present situation can be

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

related to four elements. Firstly, for some time past there has been a deterioration of Indo-Pakistan relationship over Bangla Desh issue and the refugess. Secondly, there has been deterioration in the relationship between India and the U. S. A. The U. S. A. has been helping Pakistan in a number of ways, both militarily and economically. The continued shipment of military hardware to Pakistan has created a situation which has driven a large number of people from Bangla Desh to India as refugees. Thirdly, Sir, there is the gravitation of China towards Pakistan's military regime. And the fourth factor—this is the factor emanating from all these three factors—is that there is general disturbance of balance of power in the subcontinent as a result of understanding between Islamabad, Peking and Washington.

The question therefore, really is whether the treaty that has been signed will meet this present situation, whether the treaty will bring about ultimately or immediately a solution to the basic problems confronting India. ... or whether the treaty will bring about a new element to the tension already prevalent here. In other words, will it add to the tension or will it only eliminate the tension ? This is the basic question which is facing us.

Sir, I am not sure whether the treaty will be able to induce second thoughts in the mind of the United States of America. I do not know whether this treaty will prevent the United States from involving itself more deeply with Pakistani affairs. I am not sure, Sir, whether the treaty will deter the United States from supplying more arms and equipment to Pakistan. Also I am not sure whether the treaty is going to deter China from moving fast into the affairs of this subcontinent. I am not either sure whether this treaty will not give a further spurt to China to increase its activities. Lastly, Sir, I do not know—I want an answer from Government—what their assessment of this is, whether this treaty will deter Pakistan from launching a military adventure against India. It may prevent Pakistan for the time being from going headlong to attack us ; but after some time it may not ; it may even encourage Pakistan in a way, supported by the United States and China to launch an attack against us. The point is, whether this treaty will encourage or discourage Pakistan in the

matter of coming into conflict directly with India.

I am raising these issues because I think that the Government must have already made an assessment of the situation and the Government must have come to certain broad conclusions. If these things are not achieved, in my view, the treaty is unnecessary ; the relevance, the efficacy, the utility and the *raison d'eter* of this treaty will be knocked out.

Sir, the treaty may achieve partially all these things or may not achieve partially all these things. But the greatest challenge, according to me, which warranted this treaty is the challenge of Bangla Desh. How will this treaty be able to help to create conditions to help Bangla Desh to be free in the immediate future ? Doubts have been expressed in certain quarters already—I may not share those doubts. Nevertheless, doubts persist that this treaty, instead of helping the people of Bangla Desh to establish their freedom, may restrain India from positively helping the people of Bangla Desh to liberate themselves from the West Pakistan regime. I do not know whether the objective of the Soviet Union and the objective of the United States converge on this. I would like the Minister to answer this point, whether it is a fact that the main objective of the Soviet Union and the United States is the same, that is, to prevent war and to contain the conflict to Bangla Desh and to see that there is no enlargement of the conflict between India and Pakistan. Does it mean by implication that the Bangla Desh people have got to fight their own battles, whether any assistance will be forthcoming as a result of the Treaty and whether the Soviet Union has committed itself to the task of helping the Bangla Desh refugees to go back to Bangla Desh and to bring about political settlement by which Bangla Desh may become independent and sovereign ?

There is already a gossip in the corridor of power in Delhi that the Treaty has virtually brought to an end the question of recognition of Bangla Desh or at least it has postponed the question of recognition of Bangla Desh indefinitely to the future. It is said, the Soviet Union does not want any precipitation and it thinks that the recognition of Bangla Desh has got military implications and, therefore, Bangla Desh should

not be recognised or the issue should be postponed. I have even said, it is better to avoid war with Pakistan than to help the liberation movement in Bangla Desh.

If this is one of the consequences emanating from the Treaty. I am afraid, its efficacy, its utility and its justification is gone and there is no case left at all for signing this Treaty. Sir, my doubt has been confirmed by the Joint Statement issued recently by the Government of India and the Soviet Union and a reference has been made to the Joint Statement by various papers. Editorials have been written on this. My friend, the hon. Minister, must be aware of this. It is said in the Statement (that the two Governments are interested to bring about conditions which may help the entire population of Pakistan. A reference has been made to the people of Pakistan and a reference is further made only to East Bengal. They do not name it as Bangla Desh. Very soon after this Treaty is signed, before the ink is dried, the Joint Statement says that they are only interested in a settlement which enables the people of Pakistan to live in peace. This is the implication of the Joint Statement. My question is, if this is the kind of approach and attitude on behalf of the Government of India or the Soviet Union, where was the need for this Treaty at all, what was the urgency? What was the imperative? Therefore, it confirms by doubt, Sir, that the Soviet Union through the means of this Treaty is bringing pressure on India, debarring it from taking any bold course of action to help the liberation movement in Bangla Desh.

Sir, the immediate test of the Treaty lies in this whether the Soviet Union and India will be able to help Bangla Desh to liberate itself from West Pakistan, whether conditions will be created there to enable the refugees to go back and settle there. And the test is whether these two powers will be able to see that a democratic government functions in Bangla Desh. The test is whether these two powers will very soon recognise Bangla Desh. Sir, in the joint Statement reference has been made to the 7-point proposal of the Provisional Government of South Vietnam.

When such a reference has been made I do not know why no reference specifically has been made to the independence or freedom of Bangla Desh and the struggle going on there; and about the trial of its leader.,

Mr. Mujibur Rehman nothing has been said. Therefore, Sir, this confirms my doubt that this Treaty may be used to restrain India from taking good, healthy, constructive, positive step in the matter of Bangla Desh.

From the long-term point of view the Treaty has got some implications. The Treaty seems to have the potentiality of consolidating the influence of the Soviet Union in India. I would like the Minister to assure me whether it is so or it is not so. It has the danger of landing us in future in what I would call bloc politics which we have avoided scrupulously all these years. It was Jawaharlal Nehru who stood firm against bloc politics and politics of alignment. He condemned the CENTO, he condemned the SEATO and he condemned all Treaties which smacked of military odour, but I am afraid that this Treaty has this kind of danger of landing us in bloc politics and it may take the form of a security pact. They have of course denied that this is a security pact or a defence pact but in spite of their denial I say there are military overtones in it, there are military implications in this Treaty. And if the Treaty is not worked well, properly, carefully, it may take the nature of a security pact and involve us in various commitments which are not our intention at all and at the same time it reduces our options. I would like the Minister to tell us whether they have made any assessment of the long-term implications of this Treaty and its impact on our foreign policy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please conclude now.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : I am concluding. The Treaty records its respect for non-alignment but is it really contended that non-alignment has not been abandoned? Is it the real view of the Government that we have not terminated the policy of non-alignment? Have we not, I think, given a sort of death warrant to non-alignment? Will that not happen in the long run? I would like to be assured whether the non-alignment policy will be pursued. I know, Sir, any policy that we pursue should safeguard the basic interests of the nation. The most important consideration is our basic interests, at the same time we should also remember the previous

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

basic position taken by our Government in their foreign policy. Without compromising on basic principles we should have a policy which protects our interests and safeguards our goods : I should like to know whether this Treaty will not land us into trouble, whether it will not consolidate the Soviet power in our sub-continent, whether it gives the same kind of leverage to India to influence the Soviet policy, whether it will not expose the Indian Ocean to their influence, whether we will be able, in turn, to influence them in the matter of the maps, in the matter of propaganda, in the matter of various slants that they have been giving from time to time against our leaders, against the speeches of many important people here.

In the end, I say that I have raised and posed these questions, so that if an assessment has already been made the Minister may tell us about its implications. Perhaps he may not be able to tell us. . .

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA (Nominated) :
He is a very competent Minister.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : I will plead with him that an assessment of the short-term and long-term implications of the Treaty has to be made. The test of the Treaty is in its working and in its performance. I have raised doubts and suspicions about the working of the Treaty. Of course in course of time the implications of the Treaty will be known, the attitude of the Government will be known and we will also know whether this Treaty will be an answer to the present situation, whether it will provide an effective remedy to the present crisis, whether through the instrumentality of the Treaty we will be able to give relief to the freedom fighting people in Bangla Desh. Let me tell you that without the freedom of Bangla Desh the Treaty would be a dead letter. The Treaty will be like the Locarno Pact which was signed, but forgotten as soon as it was signed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have a long list of Members and I would appeal to them. Members to restrict their observations to fifteen minutes each.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh):

Before we proceed, I would like to seek one small clarification from the hon. Minister. I would like to know whether there are any secret terms attached to this Treaty. (*Interruptions*). Wait please. Let me complete. I would not insist on knowing those secret terms, but I want to know whether there are any such secret terms attached to this Treaty, with regard to the ways of implementing the several clauses of the Treaty. I want to know whether there are any secret terms also

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) :

Some materials should have been made available to the reaction of the world press. We had a system of publishing daily the world press review by the Minister of External Affairs. Now, if these materials were available, we could have easily studied them, but I can tell you that in the Ministry of External Affairs some officials are seeing to it that we do not get any material. For the last several months I have been trying to get this service, sent to us and sent to some other people also. I talked to the Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, and Deputy Minister, Mr. Surendra Pal Singh, and others. They have given orders, but somehow or other I can tell you that the Ministry, some officials, do not give this to us. I raise it as a point of privilege. They used to circulate it to us during the days of Jawaharlal Nehru, but suddenly it was stopped in a precipitous manner and despite my request we are not being supplied with such things. I want to know from the Chair whether the Chair could give us any protection in such matter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let me hear the hon. Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The official responsible should be punished. Mr. Surendra Pal Singh has passed orders. It is an official who is stopping the supply of these materials to us. They were being supplied to us previously.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE
MINISTRY

OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

^SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH) : It is a fact that Shri Bhupesh Gupta spoke to me about this matter, about the publications

of our External Affairs Publicity Department. I have given instructions to our officers to give the publications, not only individually to him, but to all the hon. Members. I am sorry if any delay has taken place. I will look into it and see that these are delivered to him as early as possible.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He has given an assurance that it will be done.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You may get the impression that it will be done, but the matter has been hanging fire for two or three years. I do not blame Mr. Surendra Pal Singh or Sardar Swaran Singh. It seems that some officials in the Secretariat do not show the elementary courtesy to us that when the Minister passes orders, they will not obey the order. The Minister has given the order, but he should tell us who has actually stopped it. This matter should go to the Chairman. I request this matter should be placed before him. I do not want charity from them. We are leading Members of this House. Other Members and also various groups are entitled to get them. We are getting it in Jawaharlal Nehru's time. Suddenly it was stopped. Then, they said that it would be sent and orders had been passed. Even then it has not been supplied to us. Now, Sir, Mr. Surendra Pal Singh should supply us the name of the officer because I want to deal with the officer. The bureaucracy think that they can do whatever they like.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is not proper that bureaucrats or officials should stop supplying the necessary documents to hon. Members . . . particularly when the Minister has already passed an order that such papers and documents, whatever they are, should be made available to the hon. Members. But apart from that, Mr Surendra Pal Singh has already assured that he will definitely look into the matter. Mr. Chagla.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : What about the information that I wanted ?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM : I was going to inform the Members and the House that there is no secret clause attached to this

Treaty, for any purposes whatsoever. Whatever is there, is open Treaty and all the parts of the Treaty have been made available to the Members. There is no secret.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, may I compliment and congratulate the Prime Minister and her Government on signing this Treaty ? To my mind, it is a great act of statesmanship and a notable contribution to the security of this country. Sir, you know— I am not given to praising people in high places but this praise is given with all the sincerity that I possess.

Sir, I was surprised at the assessment of the Treaty by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. He has omitted to consider even the most important clause in that Treaty. What was the situation before this Treaty ? Let us look at that. We were almost alone, faced by Pakistan with the alliance of China, and the duplicity and deception of the USA colluding with Pakistan in putting down Bangla Desh. We could have taken on Pakistan on our own ; we took her on in 1965 ; we could have taken her on in 1971 perhaps with better results. But there was apprehension that China might intervene. And therefore we were faced with a serious crisis. At a time like this, we are now assured, solemnly assured, by the USSR that if there is aggression on this country by any country, China, Pakistan or anybody else, Russia will come and stand by our side. Is it not an important thing ? I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition does not even mention it, he talks about various things. But he does not look at the crux of the matter. Sir, that is the crux of the matter.

I look upon this Treaty not only as a treaty of friendship but as a Treaty of defence and a Treaty of security.

Sir, there is talk of non-alignment. If I might say so, non-alignment has been a sacred cow with the External Affairs Ministry for a long time. But the world moves on. When Jawaharlalji enunciated the famous doctrine, there was a confrontation between the two mighty powers, the USA and the USSR. The alignment of powers has changed and to use the expression my hon. friend, there are different geopolitical compulsions today in the work

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

No foreign policy can be static, it must be dynamic. And if the concept of non-alignment has changed and if non-alignment goes, I am not troubled. What I am concerned with is the national interest of this country and the security of this country. But, Sir, non-alignment in a sense still remains. We have not joined any bloc. There is nothing in the Treaty to say that we will join as such the American bloc or the Soviet bloc. All that the Treaty says is that if we are attacked Russia will stand by our side and if Russia is attacked, we will stand by its side. Therefore, essentially, it is a defence treaty, it is not a treaty of aggression. We do not want to commit aggression on any country. In her long history going back to thousands of years, India can proudly say that she has never committed aggression on any country. And we do not see a word in this Treaty which suggests any idea of aggression.

Now, Sir, I would like to say a word about Bangla Desh. We have shown solidarity with the U.S.S.R. and I think, rightly, on the question of Vietnam, I wish there had been a similar reference in the Communique to Russia's solidarity with us on the question of Bangla Desh.

Sir, I read a very mischievous report in the New York Times today. I am glad the Prime Minister is here and I hope she will emphatically, unequivocally deny that report. What the New York Times says today is that it has got authoritative information that the consideration for this Treaty was that we should give up our right to recognise Bangla Desh and Russia will sign this Treaty and give us the necessary security. I am sure it is a vicious lie and I hope the Prime Minister will authoritatively deny that any such thought was even entertained. It is contrary to what the Foreign Minister said in the other House that our action as far as Bangla Desh is concerned, is our own business. We can take unilateral action on Bangla Desh, I only hope and may I appeal to the Prime Minister that if she recognises Bangla Desh—and I have been asking for it for a long time—it may be that Russia may follow suit and join us in recognising that country?

Now, Sir, the learned hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition said that Mr. Gromyko in a statement to the U.S.S.R. said that

this Treaty was a landmark. He also said—I do not know where he gets from—that we are trying to play down this Treaty. This is not what I have gathered from the statements of the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister or the Defence Minister.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : I had referred to the official spokesman.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I am not concerned with any official spokesman. I am concerned with the Prime Minister. I am concerned with the Foreign Minister. I am concerned with Defence Minister. They have the right to speak for the country and not some official spokesman who does not know what he is talking about. We know how the briefing is done even for the Ministers. But as far as the Prime Minister is concerned . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Chagla, some of the official statements go to him before they are given to the papers.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): That you also do, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I have often criticised the U.S.S.R. in this House particularly on Czechoslovakia. But, Sir, may I say on this occasion that the U.S.S.R. has proved to be a friend in need, and it is only a friend in need who is a real friend. Sir, Russia has realised the importance of India in Asia.

May I say one thing more about this Treaty which is apparent on the face of it? Russia was trying from our point of view, perhaps rightly, to come closer to Pakistan. She was even supplying arms to Pakistan. She has now realised that with the practical break-up of Pakistan, Pakistan has become a third class power, that Pakistan does not count in Asia. The only two countries that count are India and China. Russia realises the threat, the menace, the danger of China. She realises the importance of India. India stands for democracy. It stands for certain values and standards which are still important to us, which we still cherish, and I think it is a great event in the history of our country that a pact like this has been signed. As I said, now we can face the world boldly. We can face China boldly and far from inducing Pakistan

to attack us, as the Leader of the Opposition suggested, this is a very great deterrent. Pakistan will know that she can only attack < our country at her own peril. She knows that Russia will be at our side and we will not be alone. It is a similar warning to China. The Treaty tell China, "Remember, India will not be alone in resisting you. You will be resisted by all the forces of India and also the mighty force of the I S.S.R."

Sir, once more may I compliment the Prime Minister on an act which, to my mind, is one of the finest that she has done during her Prime Ministership.

She has given us a sense of security. And what more does this country want than a sense of security ? We cannot mould our foreign policy all the time looking behind to see whether China will attack us. We can now have our foreign policy as a truly independent country, knowing that if any country commits aggression on us, Russia will stand by our side. Thank you.

SHRT BIPINPAL DAS (Assam) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while welcoming whole heartedly the Treaty signed between India and the USSR, I take this opportunity to congratulate the Government for the same. It is the most significant event in the history of our foreign policy and, in my opinion, it has ushered in a new era in which this great country of ours is destined to play a much more effective role in the affairs of the world. In fact, this Treaty has not come about all of a sudden. For over long years, our relations with the Soviet Union have been developing in the direction of increasingly closer friendship and greater intimacy, based on deep regard for mutual interests and a commonality of outlook on major international questions. Nobody can deny that the Soviet Union has proved to be our best friend all these years and stood by us not only on the issues of Kashmir and Goa, but also in our conflicts with China and Pakistan. And how can we forget their assistance in the field of industrial development as well as in the matter of developing our self-reliance so far as defence equipments are concerned ? This Treaty, therefore, is the natural culmination of such a long process of growing friendship that has stood the test of time and our Government has done the most

correct thing by giving legal and juridical basis to what we have nourished so long and found to be of great benefit to our country.

Sir, I am particularly happy about this Treaty because while speaking in the debate on the issue of Bangla Desh on the 31st July last, I strongly pleaded for such closer and more intimate friendship with the Soviet Union. Not only with the Soviet Union, I also pleaded for such relations with Japan. The hon. Foreign Minister has assured us that this Treaty will provide a pattern for similar treaties with other countries in our neighbourhood. I hope that serious efforts will be made to build up closer and codified friendship not only with our immediate neighbours like Nepal, Ceylon, Afghanistan and other countries in the South-East Asian region, but also with Japan. This has particularly become urgent in view of the developing international situation around us and in the context of new alignment of forces.

In matter of foreign policy, Sir, we must be guided not by considerations of ideology or social systems of different countries, but by the consideration of our national self-interest and national security. It is from that consideration that I am emphasising the need of closer relationship with Japan.

Sir, the Monopoly press in our country has characterised this Treaty as a military alliance. This is mischievous propaganda, not at all based on truth. Article 9 of this Treaty, the only article that deals with this question, makes it absolutely clear that in the event of an attack on either country or of a threat thereof, the two countries would take effective measures through mutual consultations to ensure peace and security, and not that the other contracting country will automatically jump into the conflict. Moreover, there is no question of having a common or unified military command. Therefore, I fail to understand how anybody can call this Treaty a defence pact or a military alliance. Article 9 is aimed at only securing peace and is not directed against any other country. This Treaty, therefore, is essentially a treaty of peace and against all wars.

Then, it has been said by some others that this Treaty has resulted in a sharp departure from our policy of non-alignment. I do not think this criticism is correct. Let

[Shri Bipinpal Das] these critics read the articles carefully. Articles 1, 2 and 3 say nothing but reiterating some of the basic principles of non-alignment, and in article 4 the Soviet Union has categorically expressed their support and respect to our policy of non-alignment. Even articles 5 to 7 deal with certain programmes which directly arise from the principle of non-alignment. And article 8 has defined the principle of non-aggression. It is only articles 9 and 10 which might have caused some misgivings in the minds of certain circles, but they contain only the essential elements of a Peace Pact. So, how can anybody say that this Treaty is a violation of the policy of non-alignment? This Treaty is basically different from the Warsaw Treaty and does not signify any military commitment of the nature that the recent Soviet-UAR. Treaty does. And above all, the Treaty has left us free to follow our own independent foreign policy and does not introduce any inhibition on the exercise of our sovereignty.

The critics should realise that non-alignment has never been a sterile, static and negative policy. In the past it has made great impact on world affairs and but for the non-alignment policy pursued by a large majority of nations in the world, and particularly the developing countries, it would have been extremely difficult perhaps to avert a Third World War. We should also recognise the fact that the Power Blocs have themselves developed cracks and fissures within themselves and the process of polarisation has long come to a halt as a result of the situation created by the non-aligned forces. In the Soviet Block China has virtually broken away and even Rumania has refused to toe the line. On the other side General De Gaulle openly challenged USA's leadership of the Atlantic Block. And only last year we saw the impossible becoming possible when a Treaty was signed between the USSR and West Germany. And this is a Treaty which has broken through the politics of power blocs and the politics of military alliances. The recent move for a rapprochement between China and USA is intended not only to cut across the erstwhile pattern of bloc politics but to bring about a complete overhaul in the pattern of alignment of world forces. It is in this overall context that **we have to examine**

Treaty. Non-alignment as a positive and dynamic policy must be able to adapt itself to new situations and emerging circumstances. To talk and think in terms of the world that is passing out very fast and to refuse to see and appreciate the fast moving developments around us is to look at the realities of the world of today with a myopic vision and astigmatic eye lenses. The policy of non-alignment, if it is to remain positive and dynamic, cannot afford to suffer from such defective vision or outdated outlook. Sir, it has been asked: How does this Treaty help the cause of Bangla Desh? I believe that Pakistan is pining for a war with India, but why? Pakistan knows very well that it cannot fight us single-handed. They were taught a lesson in 1965 and if they again attack us, they will be taught a much more bitter lesson this time. I do not want to believe and I have my doubts whether China or America will get physically involved in such a war in case Pakistan attacks us. Still Pakistan wanted a war with us. Why? That is the main question so far as Bangla Desh is concerned. The have two objectives. Firstly, if there is a war the issue of Bangla Desh will immediately go to the background and the whole question will be converted into one of Indo-Pak conflict and that will ideally serve the purpose of Pakistan. Secondly, and this is more important and this is the real objective, that the war will not be allowed to last for more than a few days. Their masters in the UNO will immediately intervene and give a call for ceasefire. In such a situation it will be difficult for India to say 'No' to ceasefire. Even Russia will find it extremely difficult to say 'No' to such a move from the side of the UNO.

The result will be the presence of U. N. Observers or U. N. Peace Keeping Force along the cease-fire line or India Bangla Desh border. And that will seriously hamper the activities of the Mukti Bahini and prevent them from carrying on their operations. That is precisely what Pakistan wants and has been trying for. But this Treaty will make it impossible for them to attack us and to launch a war against us. This is the positive contribution of the Treaty towards the question of Bangla Desh. And I believe that as a result of this Treaty, the Mukti Bahini will be able to carry on their operation against West Pakistan with greater vigour and I have no doubt that

Bangla Desh will come to success. I believe—and I have said it several times before—that the people must fight their own war of liberation and they have to stand on their own legs. From the way in which Mukti Bahini is succeeding every day in their fight, I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that they will ultimately come to triumph. That is the positive contribution of this Treaty towards the success of Bangla Desh.

And finally, I believe that this Treaty has raised the stature and importance of India in the field of international affairs. There have been attempts all along, particularly from the side of the Atlantic powers and China to ignore us and keep us away from playing an important role in world affairs. This Treaty strengthens our position and ultimately will enable us to alter the balance of forces in our favour in our part of the world and to play the role which naturally belongs to us as one of the major powers in South East Asia and as the greatest democracy in the world. We have at the last emerged as a nation to be reckoned with and with our basic policy of peace, friendship and co-operation with all, I have no doubt that this Treaty will take us forward towards our goal and help us into making the best contribution towards stabilising peace in the world. Thank you.

डा० भाई सहावीर (दिल्ली) : श्रीमन्, रूस के साथ भारत ने मित्रता की सन्धि की है। मित्रता ऐसी चीज है जिसका सदा स्वागत करना चाहिये केवल इसी लिए नहीं बल्कि इस लिये भी हम इस सन्धि का स्वागत करते हैं कि इसने एक ऐसे समय में जब हमें खुले आम लड़ाई की धमकियां दी जा रही थीं और चारों ओर देखने के बाद, इस सदन में भी पूछे जाने के बाद कि अगर लड़ाई हुई तो हमारे साथ कौन होगा, कोई पक्का जवाब नहीं मिल रहा था, ऐसे समय पर संसार की एक महाशक्ति मित्र के रूप में हमें प्राप्त हुई। इस संधि से एक मित्र के रूप में सोवियत संघ हमें प्राप्त हो रहा है इस लिये स्वागत करना जहाँ स्वाभाविक है, वहाँ पर एक प्रश्न जो इस देश के सभी नागरिकों के मन में उठे बगैर नहीं रह सकता

और वह यह है कि आज इस देश में बड़े से बड़े लोग जो इस संधि का स्वागत कर रहे हैं वह इसलिये कर रहे हैं क्योंकि हमें अपने मन के अंदर एक अपनी दुर्बलता दिखाई देती है। हमें लगता है कि अगर लड़ाई हो जाती तो क्या होता, क्या सचमुच में पाकिस्तानी और चीन की सम्मिलित शक्ति का हम सामना कर सकते। पाकिस्तान को अमरीका आज भी जो बड़े-बड़े हथियार देता जा रहा है उसके बाद भी क्या हमारे लिए वह एक संकट नहीं हो जाता। आज आजादी के 21 साल हो गये। इस देश के अन्दर जो स्वाभिमान, जो आत्मविश्वास, अपने पैरों पर खड़े होकर इस तरह के संकटों का अपने बल पर मुकाबला करने की सामर्थ्य जो आनी चाहिए थी वह पैदा नहीं हो सकी। इस सबके कारणों में मैं आना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन आज यह स्थिति है और इसलिये बड़े लोगों का बाहर और इस सदन के अंदर भी इस तरह का स्वर हमें सुनाई देगा कि रूस का इस संकट की घड़ी में हमारे साथ आने के कारण हमें एक मेक्योरिटी और सुरक्षा की भावना मिली।

अभी श्री चागला ने, मैं उनका 3 P. M. बहुत मान करता हूँ, जो शब्द कहे उनमें यह भी भाव उन्होंने व्यक्त किया। प्रश्न यह है कि क्या यह देश सदा किसी महाशक्ति के बल पर जियेगा, क्या हम दुनिया में किसी न किसी सहारे की खोज करते रहेंगे जब-जब कि संकट की घटाएँ हमारे देश के ऊपर घिर कर आयेंगी ! मैं नहीं समझता कि कोई भी स्वाभिमान देश अपने लिये हमेशा के वास्ते इस प्रकार की स्थिति स्वीकार करता है ! हमें नहीं करना चाहिए। लेकिन आज की स्थिति जो है उसमें स्पष्ट है कि पाकिस्तान की तरफ से खतरा था, चीन की तरफ से भी खतरा था, डर था कि चीन पाकिस्तान का साथ दे सकता है और इस वास्ते रूस के साथ मित्रता की सन्धि के कारण हमारे देश के अंदर एक बड़ी भरोसे की भावना आई है, हमें एक

[डा० भाई महावीर]

साथी मिला है, लेकिन सचमुच में जब इस सन्धि की तारीफ की जा रही है, बहुत इधर की और उधर की बातें कही जा रही रही हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि एक सबसे बड़ा सबाल था जिसने इस सन्धि की स्थिति पैदा की। सरकार की तरफ से कहा गया कि दो साल हो गये थे इस सन्धि की तैयारी होते होते, तो आज यकायक वह जो तैयार होकर के घोषित की गई, श्री ग्रेमिको आये, एक दिन के अन्दर इस सन्धि के तीनों संस्करण तीनों भाषाओं के तैयार होकर दस्तखत होने के लिये तैयार हो गये, यह सचमुच में अगर आज की स्थिति को हम न मानें कि इसका एक तात्कालिक कारण हुआ है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सच्चाई नहीं होगी। आज की स्थिति ने इस सन्धि के एकदम दस्तखत किये जाने के लिए कुछ थोड़ा सा कारण जरूर पैदा किया और स्थिति क्या है, महोदय ! यह स्थिति यह है कि पाकिस्तान ने बंगला देश के ऊपर जो बबरता का व्यवहार किया, जिस तरह से वहां से शरणार्थियों की एक बड़ी भारी संख्या को भारत के अन्दर धकेला उसने इस देश के वास्ते एक संकट की घड़ी खड़ी कर दी है। अभी कहा गया, हमारे पूर्व वक्ता ने कहा कि अब पाकिस्तान जुर्रत नहीं कर सकता हमारे ऊपर हमला करने की। जहां मैं इस बात से सहमत हूँ वहां मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस तरह के भाषणों में एक बात जो भुलाई जा रही है वह यह नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान हमला कर चुका है, पाकिस्तान का हमला हमारे देश पर हो चुका है और हमला आज भी जारी है, आज भी हो रहा है। एक डेमोग्रेफिक एग्जेशन हुआ है, एक सिविल एग्जेशन हुआ है। इस देश के ऊपर इस तरह का हमला जैसा पाकिस्तान ने किया है हमारे इस सदन के माननीय सदस्य उस हमले की तरफ से आंखें बन्द करके अगर यह कहेंगे कि पाकिस्तान हमला करने की जुर्रत नहीं कर सकता तो मुझे वह कहानी याद आती है जिसमें एक आदमी

मार खाता जा रहा था और कहता रहता था कि अबकी बार मारो तो तुम्हें बताऊंगा कि किस तरह से मैं मार सकता हूँ। अबकी बार मारो की भाषा अगर हम बोलते हैं तो मुझे लगता है कि हम इस देश के ऊपर आये बड़े संकट का हल कोई निकाल नहीं सकेंगे। पाकिस्तान ने 80 लाख से अधिक शरणार्थियों को इस देश में भेजा केवल भेजा ही नहीं बल्कि रोज जिस तरह की घटनाएं हो रही हैं, जिस तरह के हमले हो रहे हैं, जिस तरह की छेड़खानियां हो रही हैं और शायद आज की जो खबर मिली है कि एक जहाज पाकिस्तान ने गिराया उसके बारे में रक्षा मंत्री जी . . .

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM : It is quite incorrect.

डा० भाई महावीर : रक्षा मंत्री जी शायद इसके बारे में कुछ वक्तव्य देंगे।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He has already said that it is incorrect. He has said that the story is incorrect.

DR. BHA1 MAHAVIR : It is incorrect ?

श्री पीताम्बर दास : यह जो रक्षा मंत्री जी का उत्तर है कि इट इज इनकरेक्ट, इसके ऊपर मैं अभी बहस नहीं करना चाहता क्योंकि महावीर जी का भाषण डिस्टर्ब हो जायेगा। इसलिये इस बात को बाद में लें तो अच्छा होगा।

डा० भाई महावीर : अगर यह बात गलत है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत बड़ा आश्वासन, बहुत बड़ी आश्वांस्ति हमें मिली लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि पाकिस्तान जो कर रहा है क्या वह किसी हमले से कम है और यह जो हमला हो चुका है इसका क्या इलाज हमारी सरकार ने सोचा है और इस सन्धि के अन्दर से हमें मिलेगा। जिस बात के लिए हम डांवांडोल थे, जिस बात को करने के लिए हमारे मन पर कुछ असंतुलन

आता था कि अगर हम बंगला देश को मान्यता देंगे तो क्या-क्या गम्भीर परिणाम होंगे—पाकिस्तान लड़ाई छेड़ देगा, हमला कर देगा, चीन उसके साथ आ जाएगा, अमरीका उसकी पीठ पर खड़ा हुआ है, और इस स्थिति के कारण हमें यह लगता था कि हम यह फ़ैसला नहीं कर सकते हैं, जिस दिन रूस का मित्र के रूप में हमारे साथ मिलना दिखाई दिया, हमने समझा आज भारत सरकार इस बात के लिए साहस बटोर सकेगी, फ़ैसला कर सकेगी, कि हम बंगला देश को मान्यता दे देंगे। न्यूयार्क टाइम्स की खबर है—चांगला साहब ने इसका हवाला दिया है—मैं भी प्रतीक्षा करता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय इसकी तरदीद करेंगी . . .

प्रधान मंत्री (श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी) : मैं अगर बीच में कह सकूँ, तो यह बात बिलकुल गलत है।

डा० भाई महावीर : बहुत अच्छी बात है। मैं प्रधान मंत्री का आभारी हूँ कि उन्होंने इस खबर का इसी समय खण्डन किया। परन्तु मेरा निवेदन यह है कि इस खबर का खण्डन केवल यह कहने से नहीं होगा कि उस अखबार में जो खबर छपी है वह गलत है, बल्कि इस खबर का खण्डन तब होगा जब आज पाकिस्तान लड़ाई करने की अपनी मनोवृत्ति को रोक पावे और जब हमें पता लगे कि हम उस बात के लिए कदम उठा रहे हैं जिस बात के लिए यह सदन और सारा देश मांग करता आ रहा है कि बंगला देश के साथ हम न्याय करें और जिस दिन बंगला देश को हम मान्यता देंगे, वह वास्तविक खण्डन होगा उस समाचार का, इस तरह के झूठे अफवाहों का, जो कि देश के अंदर फैलाए जा रहे हैं और फैलाया करते हैं। न्यू-यार्क टाइम्स की खबर गलत है, मैं मान सकता हूँ, लेकिन यह वही अखबार है जिसने इस बंगला देश के मामले में अमरीका के अखबारों में सबसे पहले अमरीका द्वारा पाकिस्तान को

शस्त्रास्त्र दिए जाने की खबर को देकर भंडाफोड़ किया था इस वास्ते हो सकता है इसी भाव से उन्होंने ऐसी खबर छपी होगी। (अन्तर्बाधा) अगर गलत खबर है तो बड़ी खुशी की बात है। मैं यह कहूँगा, सरकार इस बात को बताए कि इस संधि में से क्या हल निकलने वाला है ?

महोदय, यह प्रश्न इस वास्ते उठता है कि संधि तो ऐसी बात है जो कि उसको लागू करने वाले लोगों पर निर्भर करता है। आने वाले दिनों में पता लगेगा हमारे ऊपर यह संधि किस तरह से लागू होगी, हमारे ऊपर कोई बंधन आया या नहीं, रूस के ऊपर कोई बंधन आया या नहीं, कहीं रूस के साथ हमारी संधि के कारण हम लोगों के अन्दर जो शक्ति थी, सामर्थ्य थी, वह कम तो नहीं हो गई ? महोदय, जब यह सवाल हमारे सामने आता है तो मेरा ध्यान स्वाभाविक रूप से उस वक्तव्य के ऊपर जाता है जो इस संधि के बाद तुरन्त दिया गया और मैंने उस दिन ध्यान-आकर्षण प्रस्ताव के समय भी इस बात का जिक्र किया कि एक ओर जब पाकिस्तान शेख मुजीबुर्रहमान को अपने किसी जेलखाने के अन्दर—कहा जाता है कोर्ट मार्शल करके—सजा देने की तैयारी कर रहा है, उस समय हम प्रोटैस्ट कर रहे हैं, हम संसार की आत्मा को जगाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं हम दुनिया के देशों को अपील भेज रहे हैं जहाँ यह सब कुछ आपकी तरफ से हो रहा है वहाँ प्रश्न यह उठता है कि शेख मुजीबुर्रहमान के साथ इस तरह व्यवहार होना सम्भव क्यों हो रहा है ? क्योंकि शेख मुजीबुर्रहमान को वह स्थान नहीं मिला जिसके वे हकदार हैं। आज वे बंगाल देश के राष्ट्रपति हैं, आज वह हेड आफ स्टेट होते अगर हमने बंगला देश को मान्यता दी होती, और उस स्थिति में इस तरह की बात करने का कोई देश साहस नहीं करता। लेकिन आज वह एक साधारण कैदी की तरह उसे किसी चोर, लुटेरे डाकू को एकजीव

[डा० भाई महावीर]

किया जाता है वह शायद पाकिस्तान की दरिदगी की सरकार हो जायेगी, वह कोई कह हमारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था पर बड़ा वजन पड़ गया, बहुत भार पड़ गया हमारे ऊपर, अर्था-भाव के कारण हमें तकलीफ हो रही है। दूसरी बात कही गई है :

भा. १६२१ मन्त्र का काट कर रहा हूँ .

"The minister of External Affairs of India explained the heavy burden placed on India's resources due to over 7 million refugees who have entered into India."

"There can be no military solution and it is necessary that urgent steps should be taken in East Pakistan for the achievement of a political solu

इससे पता चलता है बंगला देश के बारे में किसी हल का संकेत वक्तव्य के अन्दर नहीं है। प्रश्न यह है महोदय :— क्या हम यह समझते हैं कि अथूब खां किसी राजनीतिक समझौते के लिए तैयार हो जायेंगे . . .

कई माननीय सदस्य : याह्या खां ।

श्री सीताराम केसरी (बिहार) : इतना भी ये नहीं जानते . . .

डा० भाई महावीर : यह आपकी बुद्धिमत्ता से मैं एकदम दंग रह गया हूँ। आपकी होशियारी की दाद देनी पड़ती है।

श्री याहिया खां क्या इस बात के लिए तैयार हो जायेंगे कि एक राजनीतिक समझौते ऐसा स्वीकार कर लें जो कि आबामी लीग चाहती है। इस तरह के राजनीतिक समझौते की इसमें चर्चा है जो सारे पाकिस्तान की बात करता है, सारे पाकिस्तान की जनता की खुश

tion."

सुविधा के वास्ते समझौता होना चाहिये और सारे पाकिस्तान की बात करते हुए 2 अप्रैल को रशिया के राष्ट्रपति ने जो वक्तव्य दिया था, उसका जिक्र करता है। 2 अप्रैल और 11 अगस्त के बीच बहुत कुछ हो गया है। लाशों के बहुत पहाड़ बंगला देश की धरती के ऊपर लग गये हैं, बहुत सारा रक्तपात पदमा नदी के पानी के साथ बह गया है और आंसुओं की कई दरियायें वहाँ पर बह चुकी हैं जिसका हिसाब लगाना बहुत मुश्किल हो गया है। क्या यह सब करने के बाद हमें केवल वही बात मिली है जो 2 अप्रैल को कही जा चुकी थी और क्या इस वक्तव्य के अन्दर से हम कोई ऐसा हाल देख सकते हैं जो रूस को मंजूर करवाने के लिए हम अपने साथ खड़ा कर सकें और जो हल आबामी लीग के नेताओं को स्वीकार हो जायेगा ?

महोदय, जो पाकिस्तान 14 अगस्त 1947 को पैदा हुआ था वह खत्म हो चुका है और यह एक स्पष्ट तथ्य है। अगर यह सच्चाई है तो बंगला देश को मान्यता दिये वगैरह हम नहीं समझते हैं जो 80 लाख शरणार्थी वहाँ पर आयें वे वापस बंगला देश जाने के लिए तैयार हो जायेंगे ? कोई भी जाकर उनसे पूछ ले और कोई भी सही दिमाग रखने वाला आदमी यह नहीं मान सकता है कि ये लोग तब तक वहाँ जाने की बात सोच सकते हैं जब तक कि याहिया खां सैनिक वहाँ पर विद्यमान हैं। ये सैनिक तब तक नहीं हटेंगे जब तक बंगला देश को स्वाधीन नहीं किया जाता है।

महोदय, रूस ने हमसे अपने एक प्रश्न के ऊपर सहमति ले ली है और वियतनाम के बारे में हमने रूस के स्टैंडर्ड की पुष्टि कर दी है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि वियतनाम के सवाल के ऊपर फैसला करने के वास्ते हमें यहाँ पर रूस के साथ सन्धि करने की जरूरत थी ? क्या वियतनाम के सवाल पर आज दुनिया के अन्दर इस सन्धि की जरूरत थी ? मैं वियतनाम के

सवाल पर और वैस्ट एशिया के सवाल के मैरिट्स पर नहीं जा रहा हूँ, इसके बारे में बहस की जा सकती है। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वियतनाम के बारे में यह कहा जा सकता है कि वहाँ पर कोई ऐसी सन्धि नहीं लागू होनी चाहिये जो वहाँ के लोगों को स्वीकार न हो, तो बंगला देश के बारे में यह क्यों नहीं कहा गया कि वहाँ पर आउट साइड इन्टरफियरेन्स नहीं होना चाहिये जबकि वियतनाम के बारे में आउट-साइड इन्टरफियरेन्स की बात कही गई है।

महोदय, सन्धि तो बड़ी अच्छी लगती है और हमें लगता था कि इस सन्धि से बहुत अच्छा फल निकलेगा। लेकिन इसके बाद जो संयुक्त वक्तव्य आया उससे ऐसा लगता है कि हमारी सरकार अपने अधिकार के वास्ते अपने मित्रों के साथ लड़ नहीं सकती है और अपने मित्रों से अपने अधिकारों को नहीं मनवा सकती है ऐसी स्थिति में प्रश्न यह उठता है कि हम बंगला देश की समस्या के हल में इससे क्या कर पायेंगे। मैं इस वक्त अश्वस्त हूँ और मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि इस बात पर कि हमारी सरकार ने इस सन्धि के द्वारा हम लोगों को बांधा नहीं है और जो कुछ हम फैसला करना चाहते हैं वह कर सकते हैं। लेकिन जो कुछ भी हम फैसला करेंगे क्या उसके बारे में सोवियत रूस से पूछना पड़ेगा और क्या रूस की रजामन्दी नहीं चाहिये? मान लीजिए इसके परिणाम-स्वरूप पाकिस्तान से संघर्ष होता है तो इस संघर्ष के लिए रूस का समर्थन और सहायता मिलेगी? ये प्रश्न हैं जिनका जवाब चाहिये। न्यूयार्क टाइम्स में आज लन्दन की एक रिपोर्ट छपी है। ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट की रिपोर्टें यहाँ पर छपी हैं और यह आज के इंडियन एक्सप्रेस में है। यह खबर इंडियन एक्सप्रेस सर्विस की लन्दन की रिपोर्ट है। इसमें कहा गया है—

"Britain would like to think that the treaty would enable Mrs. Gandhi to withstand the pressure for according recognition to Bangla Desh."

ब्रिटेन के अन्दर भी यह बात है और वे लोग समझते हैं कि इंदिरा गांधी को मान्यता के संबंध में जोर पड़ रहा है और उसका मुकाबला करने के लिए, मान्यता को रोकने के लिए इस सन्धि से मदद मिलेगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस संबंध में स्पष्ट शब्द में कहे और इसके बारे में अपने उन सन्देशों को दूर करे।

महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था इस वक्तव्य में ऐसे शब्द हैं जिसमें पोलिटिकल सल्यूशन की बात कही गई है और रशिया के लिए ग्रिटिड्यूड की बात कही गई है। लेकिन आज बंगला देश के संबंध में किसी तरह का पोलिटिकल समझौता करवाना, कोई सल्यूशन निकलवाना एक एसिड टेस्ट है, एक कसौटी है जिस पर यह संधि कसी जायेगी अगर इस सन्धि के द्वारा हम बंगला देश के सवाल को हल कर सकते हैं जिसमें बंगला देश के लोगों के साथ न्याय हो। भारत के उपर 80 लाख शरणार्थियों का बोझ अलग से है और बंगला देश स्वतंत्र और स्वाधीन देश के रूप में भारत का मित्र बनकर भविष्य के लिए रह जायेगा, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सन्धि से बहुत बड़ा लाभ होगा, ऐसा हम कह सकेंगे मगर ऐसा नहीं हुआ तो फिर प्रश्न उठेगा कि हमारे उपर तो बन्धन ज्यादा लग गये और रूस के उपर बन्धन शायद कम लग गये।

आज जो समाचारपत्रों में टिप्पणी आई उनसे स्पष्ट है कि रूस की इस मित्रता के कारण शायद हमारे ऊपर बंधन आएगा कि हमें शांति से रहना चाहिए, अहिंसा के साथ रहना चाहिए, भगड़े नहीं होने देना चाहिए। रूस के राजनैतिक और सामाजिक ढाँचे से हमारा मतभेद बेशक हो, अपने देश के अन्दर जो भी ढाँचा कोई देश रखे वह दूसरे का मित्र बन सकता है, जब चीन और अमेरिका मित्र बन सकते हैं तो रूस और भारत अवश्य बन सकते हैं और बनना चाहिए, लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि भारत देश के अन्दर

[डा० भाई महावीर]

रूस का अब तक जैसा हस्तक्षेप होता रहा है वैसा होने दिया जाय। आज तक गलत नक्शे की बात ठीक नहीं हुई। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह ठीक हो जायगी? मास्को रेडियो और रेडियो पीस एंड प्रोग्रेस भारत के कुछ दलों के ऊपर आक्षेप करते रहे हमले करते रहे, हमारी सरकार उसको सहन करती रही, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह का हस्तक्षेप क्या अब भी जारी रहेगा?

महोदय, सबसे बड़ा सवाल भारत के शक्तिशाली बनने के लिये यह है कि क्या भारत परमाणु शस्त्र बना सकेगा या नहीं। रूस और अमरीका दोनों दबाव डालते रहे हैं कि नान-प्रोलीफरेशन ट्रीट्री पर भारत हस्ताक्षर करे। मैं इस बात के बारे में सरकार का अभिनन्दन करता हूँ कि सरकार ने यह दबाव नहीं माना, लेकिन क्या सरकार यह दबाव डाल सकती है कि इस वक्त हम परमाणु शस्त्र बनाने का फैसला कर सकते हैं, इस सन्धि के कारण उसमें रुकावट तो नहीं आएगी? सन 1950 में रूस और चीन की एक संधि हुई थी, क्या उस संधि के ऊपर हमारी इस संधि का कोई असर पड़ेगा, रूस चीन का भी मित्र रहेगा या हमारा मित्र रहेगा या चीन और हमारा एक साथ मित्र रहेगा?

शिक्षा, विज्ञान, कला, संस्कृति इन सब क्षेत्रों में सहयोग की बात कही गई है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस सहयोग का वह अर्थ होगा जैसा कि यू० ए० आर० के मामले में हुआ है कि हजारों सोवियत एक्सपर्ट वहाँ डेरा डाल कर बैठे हैं? क्या इस तरह का परिणाम भारत में भी निकलेगा?

20 साल का समय इस संधि के लिए रखा गया है। जब तक यह संधि चलेगी इस सदन का कोई भाग्यवान सदस्य ही जिन्दा रहेगा। इतनी लम्बी सन्धि करने की क्या आवश्यकता थी?

(Interrptions)

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : आप रहेंगे।

डा० भाई महावीर : धारा में कम्बल बहता जाता देख एक आदमी उसको पकड़ने के लिए गया था, जब कम्बल को पकड़ने लगा तो उसे मालूम हुआ कि वह भालू है और उस भालू ने उसको दबोच लिया, वह पानी के साथ बहा जा रहा था, लोगों ने कहा कि कम्बल नहीं ला सकते तो छोड़ दो, उसने कहा कि कम्बल को तो छोड़ता हूँ लेकिन अब कम्बल मुझे नहीं छोड़ता। मैं यह कम्बल और भालू की बात इसलिए नहीं कर रहा हूँ क्योंकि रूस को सिम्बोलाइज किया जाता है बिस्वर से, लेकिन अगर यह सिम्बोलाइजेशन सही हो तो इतनी लम्बी सन्धि करने की क्या आवश्यकता थी? क्या यह देश इतनी देर तक के लिए अपने भविष्य को बांधना और अपने विकल्पों को खत्म कर देना उचित समझता था? महोदय, हम चाहेंगे कि इस संधि और उसके बाद हुए वक्तव्य के बारे में सरकार स्पष्टीकरण दे ताकि देश के मन में उठने वाली आशंकाएं दूर हों।

REFERENCE TO REPORTED SHOOTING DOWN OF AN I. A. F. PLANE IN THE EASTERN ZONE—contd.

श्री पीताम्बर दास : मैं दो सवाल पूछ लूँ तो यह मामला खत्म हो जायगा। मैं केवल दो सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : किस नियम के अनुसार श्रीमान पीताम्बर दास जी हर स्पीच के बाद दो सवाल पूछ लेते हैं? यह दूसरा या तीसरा मौका है सवा घंटे में। क्या यह सुख और सुविधा मुझे भी दी जायेगी?

(Interruption)

श्री उपसभापति : उनसे ज्यादा आपको मिलता है।

श्री पीताम्बर दास : गिला तकदीर का है बेसबब तकदीर वालों को। तीन साल में मैं आज दो सवाल पूछ रहा हूँ। अर्जुन अरोड़ा रोज कितना शोर मचाते हैं, एवरीबोडी नोज।