

not a way-side port. Like Bombay and Calcutta, Madras is also a national port.

I demand that the Government should pay attention to the following:

Why should not the system of awarding the agency to a private individual at Madras be stopped, since there is not private agency at other Forts?

Is it impossible for the Shipping Corporation of India to run this job by itself?

Is the private Commission agency more competent and talented than the Shipping Corporation of India?

Is there any interference from bureaucrats in the Shipping Corporation for ending this private agency system?

In the interest of the people and also in the interest of Shipping Corporation, the Central Government should direct the Shipping Corporation of India to end this private agency system at Madras immediately.

(vii) RELIEF MEASURES FOR PEOPLE AFFECTED BY HAILS FROM IN FARRUKHIA-

श्री छोटे सिंह यादव (कन्नौज) : सभापति महोदय, उत्तर प्रदेश के फरखाबाद और इटावा जनपद में दिनांक 24-3-82 को भीषण उपलब्धि हुई करीब ऐतिहासिक एक-एक किलो से अधिक बजन के ओले गिरे।

सभापति महोदय : मेरे जिले में तो ढाई किलो बजन का ओला गिरा।

श्री छोटे सिंह यादव : करीब 800 ग्रामों के 15 करोड़ से अधिक रुपये की फसल बर्बाद हुई। सैकड़ों पशु तथा हजारों पक्षी मरे। विश्वगढ़ निवासी मिठु लाल शाक्य को उक्त उपलब्धि देखते ही दिल का दौरा पड़ गया और वे घटनास्थल पर ही मर गये। इतनी भीषण उपलब्धि एक शतक में इस क्षेत्र में कभी नहीं हुई थी। फलस्वरूप लोगों के पास

खाने-पीने का कुछ शेष नहीं बचा है। तमाम लोग घर छोड़ने पर विवश हो रहे हैं। लेकिन सबसे खेद एवं आश्चर्य की बात है कि प्रशासन द्वारा अभी तक कोई राहत कार्य नहीं आरम्भ हुआ है। यही स्थिति पड़ौसी जनपद मैनपुरी और आगरा की है।

उक्त इलाके को गरीब एवं भुक्तभोगी किसान एवं गरीब जनता ने जिलाधिकारी के समक्ष प्रदर्शन करके उनकी लगान, सिचाई, सहकारिता, राजस्व तथा विजली के बिलों की माफी तथा उस क्षेत्र में उचित दर की दुकानें खोलने, खाद्यान्श योजना के अन्तर्गत काम शुरू किये जाने अनुदान तथा भुगतान चैकों द्वारा वितरण किये जाने, बच्चों को स्कूल फीस आदि की माफी की मांग की है।

अतएव सदन के माध्यम से सकरार से साग्रह निवेदन है कि उक्त क्षेत्रों के गरीब किसानों एवं पीड़ित लोगों की सुविधा एवं राहत कार्य अविलंब शुरू करने की व्यवस्था की जाये।

—
13.25 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1982-83—
contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now resume further discussion on the Ministry of External Affairs.

Shri Madhavrao Scindia will continue his speech.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (Guna): Mr. Chairman, Sir, had yesterday talked how the entire world situation was in a state of flux, a prismatic world whose view was hazy, a

[Shri Madhavrao Scindia]

world where nationalism was locked in a fierce battle with proxy leaderships in former docile client States. I am just briefly running over what I said yesterday so that I can link it up. I had said that in this fragile international situation, the Soviets have exhibited consistency in their friendship with us, but the US attitude, however, was unfortunate, not simply because of the rearmament of Pakistan, but also because of their actions on Tarapore and the IMF loan and various other such actions. I had also mentioned that the US was the second largest democracy in the world, but ironically it seems to be cosier in its relationship with the largest communist nations and not the largest democratic one, and that the US role in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala and South Africa were glaring even to the non-discerning eye. I had ended yesterday by saying there may be some truth in saying that no country had permanent friends, only permanent interests. But even permanent interests must be based on some minimum principles of international morality, otherwise one's credibility fast erodes as is happening in the American case.

Sir, there are clear indications in the United States too that public opinion is building up against the actions of their Administration in the world. Even in the US relations with China, Taiwan is proving a very difficult hurdle. In fact, Alexander Bovin, a senior political commentator talking about the American-Chinese partnership has this to say and I quote:

"It is a partnership without confidence or, let us say, with a minimum of confidence. They now regard each other with more suspicion than previously. History is not only the past and the present, but also the future. And that which can be seen as a success today, can turn

out for the Americans to be a complete failure tomorrow...."

Conversely, there are clear indications of Soviet and the Chinese attempts to mend their fences with the Soviet call for new border talks, and the Chinese probes in the direction of economic cooperation. Post Khomeini Iran too is another situation which may be full of uncertainties with very wide and far-reaching implications. Cannot the foreign policy planners in the White House envisage a possible changing situation where it may become imperative for a much closer relationship between us in the quest for peace, stability and progress? The very fragility of Pakistan's internal situation can culminate in the complete overturning of the American apple cart if a democratically elected Pakistani leader came to power with a popular democratic mandate? Cannot Washington see the possibility of a backlash in Pakistan against previous American dealings with the military dictatorship? American policies in Pakistan are fraught with grave dangers not only for the countries of this region, but also for America itself, and for their future in this part of the world. And it is high time that they had a rethink about it.

India has a vested interest in a strong and stable Pakistan. The collapse of Pakistan would mean the removal of an important buffer, with a part of the world which is very disturbed. It would mean the *de facto* sharing of a common border, with a very sensitive region in which the Super Powers are deeply embroiled. Chanakya has said that common borders are always ultimately followed by the emergence of new friction points. Above all, we are fighting a war in India a war against abject poverty. And, under the leadership of

our Prime Minister, we are determined to win this war; we are determined to succeed in giving a fair deal to the farmer toiling in his field; to the labourer labouring in his factory; to the *Sarvahara* or proletariat suffering crushing economic burdens and social injustice. And what, may I ask, would be the economic consequences of a conflict with Pakistan, on this war? What would be its effect on the outcome of this crusade which we have launched against poverty—disastrous, catastrophic! It is obvious that a war with Pakistan not only goes against the very grain of the philosophy of peaceful co-existence which is the philosophy which has guided the basic Indian approach from the days of Gandhi and Nehru, but also goes against our very self-interest. Surely, enlightened public opinion in Pakistan understands this. Can we forget that basically we originate from the same stock? Can we forget the due to certain circumstances, whole families were separated? Can we forget that citizens of Pakistan were, are and will always remain our brothers? And as brothers, we will always respect our individual sovereignties?

Can we simply wash away the bond between the peoples of these two sovereign and great countries? I am convinced that this underlying amity and brotherhood between the peoples of the two countries remains. It is unfortunate, it seems almost deliberate, that this is deliberately suppressed and kept dormant, to serve the ends of a few who do not necessarily reflect the true aspirations of the people. This is the only explanation for the inconsistent behaviour of the Pakistani regime. A tranquil relationship may destroy the very *raison-d'être* of the Pakistani military dictatorship. Otherwise, why repeatedly reject

India's offer of a No-War Pact, right from 1951?

I quote Jawaharlal Nehru, the supreme architect of our foreign policy, whose impact endures even to-day. He said in Parliament on 14th August 1951:

"Our approach is not, if I may say so, one of piety or pacifism. It is an approach based on hard facts, and on a cold-blooded realisation of facts. Since we want to avoid war, we offered Pakistan a "No War Declaration" which Pakistan did not wholly accept or agree to. And even a few days ago this offer was repeated, but they declined to accept it....."

Repeatedly from 1951, our No-War offer has been rejected, and even President Zia last year said that it would not be worth the paper it was written on. Then, all of a sudden, a few months later, we receive an offer of a No War Pact almost as an after-thought, a post-script—ironically at the end of a statement telling us about their arms deal with the United States. And when the Indian response was positive, just before the second phase of talks were to commence in Islamabad the Pakistani representative—Mr. Bhagat is also sitting here, and he faced the brunt of his attack—in the U. N. Human Rights Commission comes out with a preposterous statement—in the Indian Ambassador's words, he throws a spanner in the works. There is innocent surprise expressed at India's strong reaction. This is the country which, through great sacrifices made by its people under the leadership of such giants as Gandhi and Nehru achieved its own freedom from the colonial yoke; this is the country which pioneered not only in this country itself but for the entire world, the struggle for freedom. This is the country in which thousands of young men and women, with smiles on their faces, sacrificed their lives at the sacred altar of their country's liberation. Such a nation is compared to those

[Shri Madhavrao Scindia]

perpetuating injustice and oppression in Palestine and Namibia. As long as the Palestinians do not get their homeland and the Namibians do not get their independence, no free nation can truly consider itself free; unless such injustice is eliminated from every nook and corner of the globe, our freedom is not truly complete. These are the sentiments of our Government and our people; and yet, the Pakistani delegate has the gall to compare us to the oppressors, when the world knows how our heart bleeds for the oppressed. We understand the sentiments of friendship that must surely exist in Indian and Pakistani hearts, inspite of two wars forced on the two peoples by military dictatorships....

(Interruptions)

No; two wars forced on the people by the military dictatorships, Prof. Ranga Ji. Inspite of these two wars forced on us we have tried to maintain friendship because we acknowledge this underlying bond.

But let not the Pakistani military regime misuse our sentiment for the people of Pakistan. Let the present rulers of Pakistan not mistake this for weakness. Like envy, aggression grows on appeasement every success it achieves inflames it further. It will truly be a sad day for the people of our two nations, if this destructive flame succeeds in setting the sub-continent on fire, for inspite of any subsequent military success achieved, in the ultimate analysis the only victor will be those interests, who aim at retarding the flowering of the bud of progress in our two great nations.

President Zia is obviously catering to the three audiences. When he speaks of Soviet expansionism and the desire for a cordial relationship with India, he is catering to the American audience in the hope of a generous military aid; when he speaks of Kashmir and raises the bogey of aggressive Indian intentions, he is talking to Pakistan; and when he refutes the

possibility of Pakistan being used willingly as a base by the United States for facilities, he is talking to India. How can you emit three different signals to three different audiences, and yet be consistent? He seems to be torn between the compulsions of sabotaging his own offer at the one time, and trying to develop it at another.

"No War" pacts have had a chequered history. The Briand Kellogg Pact in the late '20s, did not endure.

The Molotov Ribbentrop pact was torn up by Hitler within two years of signing it. The Molotov-Matsuoka Pact was renounced by the Soviets in 1945 when they invaded Japan; within a short period of signing of the Pan-chasheel agreement between India and China in 1954, China started nibbling at bits of Indian territory. The Sino-Soviet mutual Security Pact of 1950 met with a similar fate. History has shown, as Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty said yesterday, that 'No War Pacts, in most cases, are used as a camouflage to ply for time. I do hope that this is not the same in this case. As Dorothy Thompson, has written "The trouble with Non-Aggression pacts is that they are only made for avoiding war—which is not the same thing as achieving peace" It is in this context that the friendship pact on which our hon. Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi has consistently stressed upon from time to time, has more relevance and significance; it has a more positive element; it has a much wider dimension; it opens up a wide vista for active cooperation and abiding goodwill; and that is the objective that Indian diplomacy has to set for itself. Friendship is a two-way street. Friendship must and does exist between the two people of the two nations. But if the Pakistan Government is really genuine about its intentions towards India, let there be a freer exchange of culture; let there be more

trade leading to greater mutual benefit; let there be a more open border to enable brother to meet brother. This will automatically lead to confidence replacing suspicion, and the re-emergence of the traditional ties between the two sovereign people.

With our northern neighbour China, the statesman like initiative taken by our Prime Minister a few years ago, has set in motion very healthy negotiations. I will only say that the combination and friendship of these two giants of the world will result in immense benefits, not only to both of us but to the under developed and developing as well.

With Nepal, we share a strong culture and historical relationship, but the relationship between two brothers is always a little more hyper-sensitive. We respect this long relationship and we have always extended our hands in friendships. Let Nepal grasp this hand without fear, as nation to nation. Indian technological advance would result in great mutual benefit for the harnessing of river waters. The mind boggles at the economic benefits that would accrue to our two countries. Let us take strong confidence building measures to create a right climate; let there be a determined effort to expedite the river water agreements and negotiations instead of the long delays that are hampering us both. It is gratifying to note in the hon. External Affairs Minister's reply to my question on the Zone of Peace that India was giving it serious consideration. I look forward to the day when that serious consideration takes a more concrete shape as a further extension, a further elaboration and a natural result of the friendship treaty that exists between us. We must sweep away, in a statesman like, manner the cobwebs of suspicion which are woven by the busy spiders of negative interests and together herald a new era of progress and development, and march ahead in tandem.

Referring to Bangladesh, our hon. External Affairs Minister has very rightly said that it is purely an inter-

nal matter of Bangladesh. We can only hope that stability is maintained in the region because there are always powers who are ready to swoop to take quick advantage of any instability in developing countries. In the case of Bangladesh in spite of the fact that technically we can go ahead on our own on the Brahmaputra-Ganga link, yet we believe in the principle of development and partnership and we therefore look forward to Bangladesh for co-operation in this regard.

I will not touch on the North-South relations at great length, because my friend Mr. Chakrabarty has touched upon it and in a discussion on the international situation in December, 1931. I had dwelt at length on the New International Economic Order and the North-South talks. The South-South talks, held at the initiative of our Prime Minister, were a step in the right direction. There is much India can contribute technically and the OPEC countries can contribute by way of oil and financial assistance to the South countries. The African countries are looking for technology. Suffice it to say that there will be no real and lasting solution to the tensions, contradictions and political conflicts that threaten international relations till the new international economic order is established, in a spirit of grand partnership based on the principle of inter-dependence. But let the South countries not lag behind within themselves, on this resolve. Let us also look for a closer economic relationship with European countries like France and Germany on the one side, and the ASEAN countries on the other. Our hon. Prime Minister's recent trip to these countries and those already undertaken and those proposed to the Arab countries, whose cause we are always supporting, are significant steps in the right direction which will lead to a greater understanding of each other's position.

The world today is in torment. We stand at the crossroads. The human being is the only species on this globe who has the capacity to alter his own

[Shri Madhavrao Scindia]

future. Will he take a giant leap forward to wards the goal of economic emancipation for all, in a climate of peace and tranquillity or will he tumble backward into the gaping pit-hole of complete self-destruction? This is the question which confronts us all and this is the question which only we have the power to resolve. India is in a unique position. As the great Poet Iqbal has said,—Civilisations and empires have come and gone, but India's philosophy and civilisations have and will, endure for ever.

Our philosophy, our principles, must always leave an indelible stamp on our foreign policy. Our great potentials are rightly being used in the pursuit of peace. There are sinister forces at work, some with foreign inspiration, whose one solitary aim is to create chaos and instability in India, through any means and lead to its balkanisation by weakening the living symbol of national unity, the personality of our Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. But let these forces know well that under her leadership we are determined to achieve our goals both nationally and internationally. Where petty thinking is replaced by sentiments of sacrifice for the greater good; where negativeness wilts under the determined onslaught of positiveness; unlike them, construction not destruction is our watchword. Our soil has produced colossus like Swami Vivekananda, Mahatma Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore, Jawaharlal Nehru, Lokmanya Tilak and Subash Chandra Bose. They are all like emeralds, which glow and sparkle in the necklace that is India's moral and cultural heritage. It is these jewels, who dreamt of an India which would represent the perfect synthesis between the old and the new, between age-old history and modern technological advance, an India where young

men and women would strive for material advance, but on the stable foundation of a great culture and philosophy, an India which would be a light house and shine like a vibrant beacon of hope to ships, which in spite of materials progress, seem doomed to flounder in the stormy seas of unhappiness and despair. It is for this generation of Indians to strive to be worthy of these great men and build the India of their dreams, the India of tomorrow, the embodiment of pragmatic progress, in an ocean of tranquility, an India which unflinchingly and unswervingly carries the torch of peace, a message that from the time of the Buddha, we have lived and died for.

With these words, I support the Demands.

SHRI DAULATSINHJI JADEJA (Jamnagar): Sir I rise to support the Demands for the Ministry of External Affairs and in doing so, I shall restrict my observations to Chapter VII and that too the part containing South and Central American countries and the Caribbeans. Ever since our Prime Minister, Shrimati. Indira Gandhi's historic first-ever State visit to us many as ten major South American countries in 1968 India's image in that distant region has grown immensely. Alongside, the increasing interaction between India and several of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean in such multilateral United Nations' forums as the UNCTAD TCDC and the Conference of the Sea Laws, has also offered the South American countries opportunities not only to appreciate India's just stance on several of the critical issues that divide the 'north' and 'south' countries, but also at the same time to assess India's immense economic and technological potentials.

Under these favourable circumstances, quite appropriately our Minister

of External Affairs, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao organised in June 1980, for the first time, a very meaningful dialogue for promoting Indo-Latin American economic relations with the representatives of the UN Economic Commission for Latin America. The meeting reflected the earnest and keen desire of the Latin American countries to strengthen further trade and economic relations so as to translate our common interest and the identity of our common national and inter-national objectives into mutually beneficial endeavours such as trade exchanges, investments and economic collaborations.

The year 1981 marked a high point in the growing Indo-Latin American relations. Never before had two national leaders of Latin America ever visited India within a span of one year. I refer to the visits of His Excellency the President of Mexico, as our honoured guest on the Republic Day and subsequently in November of the visit of His Excellency the President of Venezuela. Both leaders in their talks had greatly stressed the need for diversifying and strengthening further their bilateral relations and cooperation with India. On a variety of international issues of common interest and concern, the views expressed by these two leaders were identical with that of ours.

During these exchange of visit, our Minister of External Affairs along with other Ministers of our Government discussed a variety of matters relating to both bilateral and inter-national relations. Also, mutually beneficial and meaningful initiatives and bilateral agreements have been concluded by India with Mexico and Venezuela. Opportunities and avenues that exist for further cooperation between India and these two countries were also assessed and identified during these exchanges.

Additionally two important trade agreements were concluded by India with two Latin American countries — one with Guatemala and the other with Argentina

Our Minister of Finance, the then Minister of Commerce, Steel and Mines, Shri Pranab Mukherjee's visit to Argentina and Brazil in late July last year and his discussions with the leaders of these countries were admittedly very useful for promoting further our relations with these two major Latin American countries.

In recognition of the potential that this region offers for development of meaningful relations and cooperation, two important regional meetings were organised by our Government — one, a conference of the Heads of Missions of India in Latin America presided over by our Minister of External Affairs in October and the other, a conference of India's commercial representatives in the region, presided over by Shri Pranab Mukherjee in July. Both these meetings are steps in the right direction to pave for further closer cooperation with the countries of the region. More such conferences at periodic intervals are welcome and even necessary in the future.

Other significant occasions, such as the Non-aligned Foreign Ministers' Conference held in New Delhi in February of 1981 as well as the very recent New Delhi Consultations Amongst Developing Nations organised by our Government in February of this year once again brought leaders and ranking officials of the various Latin American countries to India and their exchanges and interactions with our counterparts no doubt have proved very useful in the efforts to promote understanding and cooperation with the countries of the region.

Above, all, our Prime Minister's visit to Cancun, Mexico to participate in the Restricted Summit Meeting with the leaders of 'north' and 'south' countries and the views that she expressed both in the conference and outside to the press and other media have very greatly contributed to the building of a positive image of India in Latin America and the Caribbean.

I am sure this august House will join me in expressing our appreciation of

[Shri Daulatsinhji Jadeja]

the encouraging and concerted efforts that our Government has taken during these years in promoting our relations and in paying greater attention to Latin America.

While doing so, nonetheless I should add and underline that notwithstanding the increasing interest shown by our Government to further its relations with the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, it has become almost imperative today, more than ever, to evolve an even more imaginative and necessarily a more involved response towards the countries of the region. It is my considered view that such an effort has to be made at least with reference to a few of the major Latin American countries such as Mexico, Venezuela, Cuba, Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Chile and Colombia.

This does not, however, mean other nations of the region are unimportant. On the other hand, as these principal Latin American nation-States are increasingly taking charge of their own destinies and have shown in the past their keen desire to develop their relations with India, they must be shown the same deference and attention that all newly emerging countries receive from us.

Needless to state that countries of Latin America and the Caribbean are no longer an undifferentiated mass of countries. Moreover, the geopolitical and economic realities of the present decade require that we pay much more attention than we have done in the past. It, in fact, calls for a basic change undoubtedly in our approach to Latin America and the Caribbean.

Dramatic developments in the terms of which this region is increasingly relating itself to the rest of the world and the significant transformation within this region itself make it abundantly clear that if we tend to ignore this huge continent today, we should not be surprised if we cannot even understand it tomorrow.

I do not have to elaborate to this august House how the rigours of the

cold war have already reached the shores of this distant and once tranquil region, turning it into a raging sea of troubles.

The critical events in Central America and the incredible human carnage occurring in the region should be matters of very great concern to our Government and our people who have always reposed their unquestionable faith and commitment to world peace.

14 hrs.

Thanks to the pioneering efforts of late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and other like minded world leaders, today the policy of non-alignment is accepted widely by a large number of developing countries as the only rational approach and basis for their foreign policy.

It is not surprising, therefore, to note that whereas the non-aligned movement was essentially an Afro-Asian movement in the past decades, in recent times as many as twenty-one Latin American and Caribbean countries have either joined as full members or have sought observer status in the Movement. In the South American sub-continent except Paraguay all the other countries are either members or observers.

It is, therefore, our bounden duty that we, along with other members of the Non-aligned Movement take the necessary initiative and steps in concert with the countries of Latin America to bring about peace and resolve the Central American crisis before it assumes critical dimensions and thereby endanger world peace.

In doing so, more than ever, it calls for India's greater interaction at all levels with the major Latin American countries who also share with us our concern and objectives in respect of world peace and striving for a new international economic order.

One significant element of the foreign policy of the major Latin American countries is the increasing diversity of economic ties away from their traditional partners along with their pronounced independent stance in world affairs. In addition, these coun-

tries are also engaged in a variety of experiments that would hasten the pace of cooperation amongst them. The new ideas with which they are engaged in forging closer cooperation among themselves not only have been rewarding to them but may act as catalysts for similar such collective ventures elsewhere in the developing world.

One reality of the emerging situation in this region is that the Super powers will have a decreasing role to play in the decades ahead, a trend that is very welcome. Another reality is that the major powers of Latin America will have an increasing role to play in the decades ahead.

It should, therefore, be our endeavour to work more closely with emerging Latin American countries who not only understand their own responsibilities but are also looking forward to closer cooperation with like-minded developing countries of the world.

These changing realities suggest that India should adopt a more involved response towards Latin American countries, set indeed in the consistent pattern of our global policies structured as they are to make for a more stable and equitable world order.

India can no longer afford to ignore Latin America and the Caribbean. Common interests critically important to us do indeed exist in these countries. But mere recognition of these interests alone is not sufficient. These common interests need to be nourished further.

That apart, the issues of primary importance in Indo-Latin American relations in many respects are the main issues that both of us commonly encounter with the industrially advanced rich nations of the world. These include such problems as the terms and conditions of private investment, trade and tariff preferences, commodity supplies and prices, the oceans and their resources and security, and the transfer of technology between north and south countries as well as south and south countries.

The challenge here is to formulate policies which recognise the commonality of interests between India and Latin America, and restructure these interests in terms of the increasingly complex global network of relations among the rich and the developing countries.

In view of our vital common interest in helping to resolve serious political and economic problems facing the world today, ways and means have to be explored to work cooperatively with the nations of the region. In this effort, the role of Indian missions located in these countries is no less important. Every effort should be made to strengthen further the personnel and the facilities of our missions in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Government of India should arrange for visits of Indian leaders, parliamentarians and officials at more frequent intervals to meet their counterparts and exchange ideas on a variety of issues of critical importance both in bilateral and in international relations. In response to our Indian Parliamentary Delegation that visited Cuba during the year we have received Parliamentary Delegations from Ecuador, Brazil, and Colombia.

With a view to develop further the transfer of technology between India and the countries of this region, our Government should seriously consider exchange of scientific attaches to assess continuously the research and development activities in the various sectors of these countries. A systematic effort at assessing and monitoring the level of scientific research and indigenous technology in different economic and scientific sectors between India and Latin America would, in turn, offer opportunities for both to dispense and exchange appropriate technical and scientific assistance.

While there exists a very rich reservoir of goodwill for India in all the Latin American countries, poor communication and absence of adequate avenues to articulate our

[Shri Daulatsinhji Jadeja]

common objections and sentiments of cordiality have somewhat impaired our involved response to each others' problems and perspectives.

Educational institutions, the media and the general public in India pay insufficient attention to countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, and many of us to be frank, have very scant knowledge of these areas. Better understanding of Latin America is bound to have favourable effect upon the quality and degree of attention and response accorded to this region by our country.

Political, economic and diplomatic relations among nation-states ordinarily deal with concrete problems. Underlying these problems, however, are the intangible relationships that are general, rather than particular, emotional rather than rational, and certainly not related to day-to-day problems or issues. In promoting the intangible relationship imaginative and serious efforts with a view to understand history and culture, politics and people are obviously important.

Cultural and educational exchanges between India and Latin America provide an evenue for improving and promoting such understanding. In their present form, however, such exchanges are hardly significant and that is what indeed explains the lack of involved response between India and the countries of these regions. Whatever arrangements we have by way of cultural agreements with these countries, are not only scattered but also very narrow in scope. What is more, as I understand to my dismay, some of these agreements, for instance, with Mexico, it appears, have not been even renewed or reactivated. Efforts are to be taken forthwith to seek the renewal of our on-going cultural treaties, and also to explore and conclude similar agreements with other Latin America countries.

Although this is a matter that concerns more our Ministry of Education and Culture, nevertheless I

would like to reiterate the imperative need for establishing a Centre of Excellence for the study of Latin American affairs, which our Government had announced almost a decade ago. Such an effort is imperative because it is through such an endeavour that mutual understanding and valuable contacts of our educated public can be promoted, guided and broadened.

In short, the time is ripe for an energetic and earnest approach to our relations with countries of Latin America.

Our approach towards the countries of the region should no more be on the basis and belief that these countries are only of marginal importance to us in our international interactions. Rather, they are increasingly the more active participants on the world scene, nations whose friendship and co-operation are of great value in the present-day world context.

The establishment of peaceful world order and the redemption of our people from poverty are the twin goals that we share with the rest of the world, including importantly with Latin America and the Caribbean. And now, more than ever, we recognize that these objectives cannot be attained any more in isolation. All the more, therefore, we need to nurture further our common interest and pave the way for a mature partnership with the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean:

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (नई दिल्ली): सभापति महोदय, विदेश मंत्रालय की 1981-82 की वार्षिक रिपोर्ट मेरे सामने है। रिपोर्ट अच्छे रंग में छापी गई है। इसका आकार भी बड़ा दिया गया है। इसके भीतर कुछ फोटो भी बहुत सुन्दर हैं। सामग्री के बारे में भी मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति, भारत के विदेश संबंधी इनकी एक अच्छी समीक्षा इस रिपोर्ट में पेश की गई है।

मैं आगे भी इस रिपोर्ट का उल्लेख करूँगा। लेकिन यहां मैं एक वाक्य की ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। रिपोर्ट के पन्द्रहवें अध्याय में जो अध्याय प्रशासन और संगठन से सम्बंध रखता है, एक वाक्य बड़ा मजेदार है। वह वाक्य इस प्रकार है:

समीक्षाधीन वर्ष के दौरान श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव विदेश मंत्री बने रहे।

मैं नहीं समझता कि रिपोर्ट में यह लिखने की क्या आवश्यकता थी?

एक माननीय सदस्य: कुछ खतरा रहा होगा।

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी: अगर मंत्रालय को यह आशंका थी कि श्री नरसिंह राव हटने वाले हैं या बाहर अफवाहें फैल रही थीं कि उनको हटाया जाने वाला है तब इसका उल्लेख किया जाता, यह बात मेरी समझ में आ सकती है अन्यथा प्रशासन और संगठन में इसका उल्लेख करने की आवश्यकता नहीं थी। अगर मन्त्रालय में मंत्री का परिवर्तन होता तो इसका उल्लेख किया जा सकता था। लेकिन जो मंत्री बने रहे उनके बारे में इस तरह से उल्लेख न करते तो ठीक रहता। मुझे खुशी है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने जब मंत्रियों का परिवर्तन किया तो उसमें—

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): It is their way of writing. They write it in English also that such and such people are Secretaries and Joint Secretaries.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: That should not have happened.

मैं इस बात पर संतोष प्रकट कर रहा था कि जो परिवर्तन मंत्रिमंडल में हुआ उसमें विदेश मंत्रालय को नहीं

छुआ गया। ऐसा करके अच्छा किया गया। विदेश नीति के निर्धारण और संचालन के बारे में हमारे मतभेद हैं और उन मतभेदों को हम बड़ी प्रामाणिकता के साथ और सबल शब्दों में सदन में रखेंगे, देश के सामने भी रखेंगे लेकिन मुझे यह कहने में कोई संकोच नहीं है कि श्री नरसिंह राव जिस तरह से पिछले दो सालों से विदेश मंत्रालय को चला रहे हैं उसके लिये वह हम सब सबकी बधाई के पात्र हैं, उसके लिये उनकी प्रशंसा की जानी चाहिये। यह प्रशंसा करने का तब और भी ज्यादा औचित्य है जब और मंत्रालयों का हम बहुत बुरा हाल देखते हैं। मैं किन मंत्रालयों की ओर इशारा कर रहा हूँ इस समय मैं उसमें नहीं जाऊँगा।

श्री माधवराव सिंधीया यह आप पहले कह देते तो हम तालियां नहीं बजाते।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Let him withdraw his applause with retrospective effect.

1413 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी: अगर वह बैठे होते तो मैं शायद तारीफ नहीं करता जलते हुये सवालों की चर्चा में बाद में करूँगा। मैं पहले कुछ छोटे प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ।

इस समय लंदन में हम फैस्टीबल आफ इंडिया मना रहे हैं। नौ महीने तक यह महोत्सव चलेगा। इस महोत्सव पर हम जितना रुपया खर्च कर रहे हैं, विदेशी मुद्रा खर्च करने जा रहे हैं उसको करना जरूरी था या नहीं था इस सवाल पर देश में मतभेद है। ब्रिटेन भी महोत्सव में योगदान देगा। ब्रिटेन की आर्थिक स्थिति भी इस समय बहुत अच्छी नहीं है। ब्रिटेन के लोगों को भारत के बारे में अधिक जानकारी

[श्रो अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

देना इसे भी मैं उपयुक्त नहीं मानता। ब्रिटेन से हमारे कभी धनिष्ठ और कभी कटुतापूर्ण सम्बन्ध रहे हैं। उसके साम्राज्य के हम एक अंग रहे हैं। उनका अन्तर्बहिय हमें मालूम है। भात की भी ऐसी कोई बात नहीं जिससे ब्रिटेन अपरिचित हो। लेकिन मैं एक छोटा सा प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ। क्या यह जरूरी था कि महोत्सव का प्रारम्भ 23 मार्च से किया जाता? 23 मार्च को अंग्रेजों ने सरदार भगत सिंह को, राजगुरु को और सुखदेव को फांसी के तख्ते पर चढ़ाया था। मैं नहीं जानता किसने यह तिथि तय की? असावधानी हो गयी। 23 मार्च से उत्सव को प्रारम्भ नहीं करना चाहिये था। यह हमारे लिये भावनाओं का सवाल है। जिन्होंने भगत सिंह, राजगुरु, सुखदेव को फांसी के तख्ते पर चढ़ा दिया उस इंग्लैंड की राजधानी में जा कर फांसी वाले दिन हम महोत्सव का आयोजन करें, यह कोई भावनात्मक दण्ड से बहुत अच्छी बात नहीं हुई।

उत्सव के संबंध में एक छोटा सा उल्लेख मैं और भी करना चाहता हूँ दिल्ली में उस उत्सव की देखभाल कौन कर रहा है? मैं मानता हूँ कि विदेश मंत्रालय उससे सीधा जुड़ा हुआ नहीं है, लेकिन जिन परिस्थितियों में [निर्मल कुमार सिंह की मृत्यु हुई है उससे मुझे धक्का लगा है वह उत्सव की संचालन समिति की देखरेख की जिम्मेदारी निभा रहे थे। 4,5 दिन पहले उनको हटा दिया गया वह विदेश मंत्रालय में काम करते थे, एक अच्छे अफसर थे बाद में शिक्षा मंत्रालय के साथ जोड़े गये क्योंकि शिक्षा मंत्रालय सांस्कृतिक आदान प्रदान के दादित्वों का भी निर्वाह करता है। क्यों ऐसा हुआ यह मैं नहीं जानता। दूसरी बात.....

विदेश मंत्री (श्री पी. वी. नरसिंह राव): माननीय वाजपेयी जी, अभी अभी पता चला है कि 22 मार्च को हुआ था उद्घाटन उत्सव का। 23 मार्च को नहीं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: यहां 23 मार्च को खबर छपी थी।

श्री पी. वी. नरसिंह राव: हमारे गांव में 25 को भी नहीं छपी थी।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The result of the festival was hanging.

श्री पी. वी. नरसिंह राव: मैं इसका खुलासा इसलिए कर रहा हूँ ताकि फिर इस पर कोई टीका-टिप्पणी न हो।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: मैं और एक छोटा मामला उठाना चाहता हूँ। दिल्ली में जब साउथ-साउथ डायलाग का आयोजन हुआ उस समय एक थर्ड वर्ल्ड अवार्ड, तृतीय विश्व पुरस्कार, तन-जानिया के राष्ट्रपति, श्री नायरेरे को पेश किया गया था। उसके उपर भी बड़ा विवाद हो रहा है। एक साप्ताहिक ने तो यहां तक लिखा है, मैं उद्धत करना चाहता हूँ:

'The presentation of the so called Third World Award to Dr. Julius Nyerere at last week's glittering ceremony here has proved to be a calculated fraud by a cabal operating from London.'

....the Tanzanian leader, the distinguished recipient of the Third World award, and Indira Gandhi who made the presentation on behalf of the Third World Foundation were clearly taken for a ride. South Block cannot escape at least part of the responsibility, and the consequent odium for it."

PROF. N. G. RANGA: Dr. Nyerere is one of the distinguished statesmen in African world.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The objection has not been taken to the presentation of award to Dr. Nyerere but this foundation has come in for a great deal of criticism. I would like the Foreign Minister to find out whether this criticism is valid or not.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: This is irresponsible criticism. Why should you take notice of it?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Had the criticism been so irresponsible, I would not have taken notice of it.

सभापति जी, देश की विदेश नीति के प्रश्न पर एक आम सहमति रही है। हमारे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय संबंध कैसे हों सचमुच में इसका निर्णय जब हम अपनी स्वाधीनता को लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे तब निश्चित हुआ था। यह आम सहमति बनी रहे इस का प्रयत्न ज़हरी है।

मैंने प्रारम्भ में निवेदन किया कि विदेश नीति के कुछ पहलुओं से हमारा मतभेद है। हम उसकी आलोचना भी करते हैं, कई प्रसंगों पर। मैं कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की बात नहीं कहता जो इस बात से प्रसन्न होंगी कि भारत सोवियत शिविर में शामिल हो जाय लेकिन बाकि का सारा देश यह चाहेगा कि हम शक्ति गुटों से अलग स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति का अवलम्बन करें ऐसी नीति का जो विश्व शांति के हित में हो, जो उपनिवेशवाद के अवशेषों को समाप्त करते के पक्ष में आवाज उठाए जो रंगभेद के विरुद्ध लड़ने वालों के साथ कंधा जोड़कर खड़ा रहे और जो दुनिया में एक नई अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय अर्थ - व्यवस्था की रचना में योगदान दे।

इन प्रश्नों पर देश में आम मतव्य है, और इसलिए विदेश-नीति के संचालक

एक ऐसे दायित्व से बंधे हुए हैं, जो व्यक्ति और दल की सीमाओं को लांघ कर न केवल राष्ट्र के भूत और वर्तमान को बांधता है, मगर भविष्य के लिए भी एक जिम्मेदारी सौंपता है।

कोई इससे इंकार नहीं कर सकता कि पिछले कुछ समय से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति बिगड़ी है और तनाव शैयित्य की प्रक्रिया को गहरी ठेस लगी है। इसके लिए दोनों महाशक्तियों का रवैया जिम्मेदार है। अमरीका तेल की अपनी आपूर्ति को सुरक्षित रखने के लिए हिन्द महासागर में पहले से ही अडडे बना रहा है, अपने बल को बढ़ा रहा है। ईरान में जो राष्ट्रीय क्रान्ति हुई, मैं उसका इस लिए स्वागत करता हूँ कि वह क्रान्ति एक महाशक्ति के खिलाफ़ थी। ईरान अमरीका के चांगूल से निकाल आया, इसका स्वागत किया जाना चाहिए। लेकिन इससे अमरीका में जहर चिन्ता पैदा हुई होगी।

उसके बाद अफगानिस्तान रूसी सेनाओं के प्रवेश से तनाव और बढ़ा है। रिपोर्ट में ठीक कहा गया है कि विश्वतनाव का मुख्य केन्द्र यूरोप से हटकार एशिया में आ गया है। इस बात को डर है कि कहीं स्थिति और न बिगड़ जाए। हमारी सुरक्षा भी इससे जुड़ी हुई है। विकास के लिए हमें शान्ति की आवश्यकता है। हम अपनी सीमाओं को भी सुरक्षित देखना चाहेंगे। इसलिए मुझे इस बात पर खेद है कि इस तनाव शैयित्य की प्रक्रिया को जो धक्का लगा है उसको काम करते के लिए, या जिन घटनाओं की वजह से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति निरन्तर बिगड़ती जा रही है, उनको नुस्खियों को मुलझाने के लिए हमने कोई कूटनीतिक पहल नहीं की।

केवल इतना ही कहना काफ़ी नहीं है कि रूस की सेनाएँ अफगानिस्तान में निमंत्रण पर गई थीं। किसके निमंत्रण पर

[‘श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी’]

गई थीं ? और अगर निमंत्रण पर मिले भी, तो जिसे निमंत्रण मिले, क्या उसका जान, उहरी होता है और अगर निमंत्रण पर गई थीं, तो अब वापिस चली जाएं। आप अतिथि बनकर आएं थे, अब मालिक बनकर बैठने का प्रयत्न मत कीजिए। मगर इस एक महाशक्ति है और महाशक्तियों को अधिकार है कि मनमानी करें।

अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति का सबसे दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण पहलू यह है कि “जिसकी लाठी उसकी भैंस” चल रही है। अमरीका, लैटिन अमरीका में एल सैल्वाडोर और दूसरे देशों में क्या कर रहा है ? हमें उसके खिलाफ भी आवाज उठानी चाहिए। मैं इस मत का नहीं हूँ कि हम एक महाशक्ति की आलोचना करें और दूसरी को छोड़ दें। हस्तक्षेप को नापने का एक गज होना चाहिए।

मगर मैं सोवियत संघ से अधिक आशाएं करता हूँ। इस लिए सोवियत संघ का आचरण मुझे ज्यादा पीड़ा पहुँचाता है। मैं रिपोर्ट के एक पैराग्राफ को उद्धृत करना चाहूँगा :—

“इसी तरह अफगानिस्तान के मामले में भी भारत शुरू से ही यह कहते आया है कि विदेशी सैनिकों को वापसी हर प्रकार से बाहरी हस्तक्षेप को समाप्ति तथा अफगानिस्तान की स्वतंत्रता, प्रभुसत्ता, प्रादेशिक अखंडता और उसके गुट-निरपेक्ष दर्जे को अक्षुण्ण बनाए रखने के आधार पर सम्बद्ध पक्षों के बीच बातचीत के माध्यम से इस समस्या का राजनीतिक समाधान खोजा जाना चाहिए।”

मैं इससे शत-प्रतिशत संहमत हूँ लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि यह समाधान कौन खोजेगा

उस समाधान को खोजने में हमारी कोई भूमिका होगी या नहीं होगी। सोवियत संघ हमारा मित्र है, उससे हम कोई बात मित्रता के ढंग से कह सकते हैं क्या अफगानिस्तान की समस्या का राजनीतिक हल निकलने के लिए कोई ऐसा ऐसा फार्मूला दृढ़ना असम्भव है जिससे अफगानिस्तान में बाहरी हस्तक्षेप भी समाप्त हो जाए और सोवियत संघ की सेनाओं को वहां रहने के लिए कोई आवित्य भी न मिले ?

मैं मानता हूँ हस्तक्षेप समाप्त होना चाहिए। अगर पाकिस्तान गौरिला सैनिकों को शस्त्र दे रहा है, प्रशिक्षण दे रहा है और वे जाकर अफगानिस्तान की सीमा में गढ़बड़ी कर रहे हैं तो उन्हें रोका जाना चाहिए। क्या गुटनिरपेक्ष आनंदोलन इस संबंध में केवल भावनाओं का प्रकटीकरण करके चुप बैठा रहेगा ? क्या इस समस्या को हल करने के लिए हम कोई कूटनीतिक पहल नहीं कर सकते हैं ? क्या प्रधान मंत्री अपने व्यापक प्रभाव का उपयोग नहीं कर सकती है ?

आज अफगानिस्तान में इस की सेनायें हैं इसलिए अमरीका को बहाना मिल गया है। मैं “बहाना” कह रहा हूँ क्योंकि पहले भी पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिए जा चुके हैं लेकिन अब उन्हें एक नया बहाना मिल गया है कि पाकिस्तान फंट लाइन पर स्थित है और उसकी मदद करना जरूरी है। पहले वे हमें आश्वासन देते थे कि पाकिस्तान को दिये जाने वाले हथियार भारत के खिलाफ काम में नहीं आयेंगे लेकिन इस बार वे यह भी आश्वासन नहीं दे रहे हैं।

पुराना अनुभव साक्षी है, यह हथियार अफगानिस्तान के खिलाफ कभी में नहीं आयेंगे, पाकिस्तान का सोवियत संघ के साथ दो-दो हाथ करने का सवाल पैदा नहीं होता इसलिए यह हथियार

भारत के खिलाफ ही प्रयुक्त होंगे—इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है। लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता कि लड़ाई का खतरा हमारे दरवाजे खटखटा रहा है। हम अपनी तैयारी रखें लेकिन देश में युद्ध का जवर पैदा करना—यह ठीक नहीं है। राष्ट्र की स्वतन्त्रता अनमोल है, सीमाओं को अक्षण रखना आवश्यक है लेकिन एक गरीब देश क्या पहले कूटनीतिक उपायों से संघर्ष को टालने का प्रयत्न नहीं करेगा? और मुझे शिकायत है कि यह प्रयत्न नहीं हो रहा है।

पाकिस्तान ने नो-वार-पैक्ट का आफर दिया। उसे यह कह कर स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिए था कि हम उसपर विचार करेंगे। लेकिन मेरे पास कटिंग है—समय सीमित है, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जरा घंटी से अपना संबंध दूर रखें तो मुझे आसानी होगी....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You want me to ring the bell?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I do not want you even to touch the bell.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are the former External Affairs Minister. Therefore, you must be given more time.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Thank you, Sir.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Even if the bell is rung, it will be expunged!

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेये : यह अखबारों के कुछ शीर्षक हैं, मैं और अधिक विस्तार में नहीं जाना चाहाता :

"Pindi never responded to India's initiative; Pak No-War offer curious, implications will be studied says Rao; P.M. doubts sincerity behind the offer intriguing; the offer is the offer is a propaganda play."

पाकिस्तान प्रचार का खेल खेल सकता है लेकिन हमने जो रवैया अपनाया उससे पाकिस्तान के प्रचार को मदद ही मिली। हमें नेगोशिएटिंग टैबल पर बैठ कर, अगर पाकिस्तान केवल प्रचार में सच्चि रखता था, तो उसे बेनकाब करना चाहिए था। लेकिन हमने ऐसा नहीं किया। हमने कहा पहले हम आफर करते थे उन्हे पाकिस्तान ने नहीं माना। ठीक है, उस समय पाकिस्तान ने नहीं माना लेकिन आज जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति है और इस भूखण्ड में जो स्थिति बदली है उसके कारण पाकिस्तान यदि नौ बार पैक्ट का आफर दे रहा है तो क्या यह ज़रूरी नहीं है हमारे लिए कि हम उसकी तह में जा कर देखे कि सचमुच मैं पाकिस्तान ईमानदार है या नहीं? क्या हमारे ऊपर यह जिम्मेदारी नहीं है कि हम पाकिस्तान को एक महाशक्ति के चँगल में फँसने से रोकें? इस भू-खण्ड के देशों की मुरक्का जुड़ी हुई है, उसे हम अलग करके नहीं देख सकते हैं।

मुझे लगता है कि 1949 के नो वार आफर का उल्लेख नहीं किया जाना चाहिए था। 1949 का नो-वार-पैक्ट का आफर स्व० पंडित जवाहर लाल ने किया था। उसमें भीडिएशन की बात थी, आविद्रेशन की बात थी। यह तो अच्छा हुआ कि पाकिस्तान ने उस समय नहीं माना और हम बच गए, वरना फँस जाते। काश्मीर का सवाल दुनिया की पंचायत में जाकर और बिगड़ जाता। उस समय पाकिस्तान का जो जवाब था, वह भी मेरे सामने है। वह कहता है कि जब कुछ मसले तय होने वाकि हैं, तो फिर नो-वार-पैक्ट कैसे हो सकता है, जब तक उन मसलों को तय करने को प्रक्रिया निर्धारित न की जाए। अगर पाकिस्तान ने अभी भी यही कहा है तो आपको प्रतिक्रिया ठीक है। शिमला सझौते के अनुसार सभी मतभेद

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

द्विपक्षीय आधार पर तय होंगे। मध्यस्थता का सवाल नहीं है, किसी तीसरे पक्ष को आने नहीं दिया जाएगा। मगर हम पाकिस्तान के साथ यह बात आमने-मामने कह सकते थे। क्या पाकिस्तान के इरादों पर शक करना जहरी था और अगर शक है भी तो सार्वजनिक स्वर से प्रकट करना नितान्त अनावश्यक था?

श्री एम. राम तोमर रेड्डी: यह अच्छी हिन्दी है।

श्री प्रभाल बिहारी वाजपेयी: कूट-नीति का मामला है।

बाद में पाकिस्तान के इस प्रस्ताव पर बातचीत करने का फैसला कर लिया गया। लेकिन जब पाकिस्तान ने ह्यूमन राइट्स-कमीशन में काश्मीर का मामला उठाया तो हमने बड़ी तेजी से, तुर्शी से तय कर दिया कि विदेश सचिव इस्लामाबाद नहीं जायेगे। मैं मानता हूं कि पाकिस्तान को ह्यूमन-राइट्स-कमीशन में काश्मीर का सवाल नहीं उठाना चाहिये था, लेकिन पाकिस्तान काश्मीर का सवाल यूनाइटेड-नेशन्स में आंरांश्य जगहों पर उठाता रहा है। वह एक कर्मकाण्ड है, जो वह करते रहे हैं। कमी हमने उसका नोटिस लिया है और कमी उसका नोटिस नहीं लिया है। श्री भगत बाद में बोलने वाले हैं...

श्री एब. के. एल० भात: आपने अन्दाजा लगा लिया।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: मैं आप भगत की बात नहीं कर रहा हूं, यहां पर कई भगत बैठे हुये हैं। वे प्रकाश डालेंगे, मार मैंने जो एक बैंजे ज हुए हैं, उनको देखा है और मैं मानता हूं, मुझे लगता है कि हमने ओवर रीएक्ट किया है। उपां-

च्यक्ष महोदय, आप मुझे समय दें, तो मैं यह पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूं। पाकिस्तान ने जो पहले उल्लेख किया है, मैं मानता कि वह गलत है यह मामला ह्यूमन-राइट्स कमीशन में नहीं आना चाहिये था। लेकिन यह मामला हमने यह कहकर नहीं उठाया है कि यह मामला ह्यूमन-राइट्स कमीशन में क्यों लाया गया। शिमला समझौते में यह हमने मान लिया है कि काश्मीर के बारे में दोनों देशों का आना स्टैंड है, वे कायम रहेंगे। अपनी-अपनी पो-जीशन मेंटेन की जायेगी, मैं नहीं जानता हूं कि यह क्यों माना गया। मुझे तो अकसोस है कि शिमला समझौते के समय हमने काश्मीर के मामले को हमेशा के लिये तय करते पर जोर क्यों नहीं दिया। आप कह सकते हैं कि यह बात पुरानी हो गई। लेकिन फिर भी मैं मानता हूं कि पाकिस्तान को वहां काश्मीर का प्रश्न नहीं उठाना चाहिये था। पाकिस्तान ने जो कहा है, वह मैं उद्धृत करना चाहता हूं।

"Even the dispute pertaining to Jammu & Kashmir should be resolved similarly in the light of the Simla Agreement."

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: In what context has he said?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: आप इसको छोड़िये, जो हुआ वह गलत है। मुझे अकसोस है, श्री माधवराव सिधिया जी, आपने इसको पढ़ा नहीं है।

श्री माधवराय सिधिया: मैंने विलक्षण पढ़े हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: नहीं—नामिकाया की बात, पेलस्टीन की बात बाद में कही गयी।

श्री माधवराय सिधिया: मेन-रिजोत्यूशन जिसमें यह डिस्कशन हुआ है, वह कौन

सा था ? किस हैंडिंग में, किस रिजोल्यूशन के अन्तर्गत डिस्कशन हुआ है ? I do not want to interrupt you. I am sorry.

श्रोता अटल बिहारी वाजपेये : सैल्फ-डिटरमिनेशन की चर्चा को गई है। पाकिस्तान का यह स्टैंड है, कि काश्मीर को सैल्फ डिटरमिनेशन का अधिकार नहीं मिला है। यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में पाकिस्तान ने कहा है, आप उससे मतभेद रख सकते हैं। आप अपना मतभेद प्रबल शब्दों में प्रकट कर सकते हैं। मगर श्री भगत ने जो जबाब दिया—मैं उद्धृत कर रहा हूँ :

Surely the Delegation of Pakistan does not believe that the rights of self-determination and self-expression can best be exercised under martial law."

यहाँ तक जाना जरूरी नहीं था। फिर वही प्रक्रिया शुरू हो गयी, बात बिगड़ गई। मेरा निवेदन है हम फिर से उस गात को शुरू करें। केवल पाकिस्तान के साथ ही नहीं, नेपाल के साथ, बंगला देश साथ, श्री लंका के साथ, केवल सुरक्षा के मामले पर नहीं, सहयोग के मामले पर भी।

मुझे प्रसन्नता है—प्रधान मंत्री जी ने दोस्ती को संधि का प्रस्ताव रखा है, लेकिन यह पहले भी रखा जा सकता था, हमें उसे दाहराना चाहिये। हिन्दुस्तान में कोई ऐसा नहीं है जो पाकिस्तान का बुरा चाहता है भारत के हित में है कि पाकिस्तान रहे, मजबूत हों। आज जो ज्योपेंलिटीकल सिवृशन पैदा हो गई है, उसके लिये अविश्वाश को दूर करना पड़ेगा। पाकिस्तान को भी अपना स्वेच्छा बदलना होगा। जब जनता सरकार थी उस समय भी हुये इस्लामिक सम्मेलन में जनरल जिया ने पेदस्टान के साथ काश्मीर के मामले को जोड़ा था हमने विरोध किया था। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ—काश्मीर के सवाल पर पाकिस्तान

से बातचीत करने में संकोच क्यों होना चाहिए ? हमने शिमला समझौते में माना है—“फाइल-सैटिलमेट आफ जम्मू एण्ड काश्मीर” अभी बाकी है। मैं उसे दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ, लेकिन मैंने उस समय भी विरोध किया था। आप पाकिस्तान से कहें कि आइये, काश्मीर पर बात कीजिये। यह ठीक कि जब काश्मीर पर बात होगी तो एक ही बात होगी, पाकिस्तान काश्मीर के जिस हिस्से पर कब्जा जमाये बैठा है, उसको खाली करे। इससे बात बिगड़ेगी तो बिगड़े.....

श्रोता पौ. बा. नरसिंह राव : आप भी वही कह रहे हैं, हम भी वही कह रहे हैं।

श्रोता अटल बिहारी वाजपेये : आप कुछ उधर से कह रहे हैं, हम कुछ इधर से कह रहे हैं।

श्रोता राम सिंह पादव (अलवर) : ये देर से कहना चाहते हैं।

श्रोता अटल बिहारी वाजपेये : देर से नहीं कहना चाहते हैं, यह आप नहीं 2R रहे हैं। कहिये, हम काश्मीर पर बात करने को तैयार हैं।

मैं जब पाकिस्तान गया था तब भी एक बार यह चर्चा चली थी कि काश्मीर का सवाल अभी बाकी है, आप तारीख तय कर दीजिये मैंने कहा तारीख क्यों आज ही बात करनीजिये। कहने लगे—तैयारी करना जरूरी है। मैंने कहा—हमारी तैयारी है, बात कीजिये।

वर्णिय मन्त्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री शिवराज बो. पटिल) : यह आप की पार्टी का स्टैंड है।

श्री ग्रटल बिहारी वाजपेयों: मेरो पार्टी में पाकिस्तान के सवाल पर कोई मतभेद नहीं है। ऐसा लगता है आपको किसी समाचार पत्र के सम्पादकीय लेख को पढ़ा हुआ है। यह ठीक है, अलग-अलग सदस्य बोलते हैं, उनके बात रखते का ढंग अलग-अलग होता है, लेकिन कोई मतभेद नहीं है। काश्मीर के सवाल पर समझौता नहीं हो सकता।

भूटटो साहब शिमला आये थे। उन्होंने क्या कहा था—यह विदेश मंत्री को मालूम है और “भूत” के नाते मुझे भी कुछ जानकारी है। श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी को वह आश्वासन दे गये थे, लेकिन पाकिस्तान जाकर वह उस आश्वासन से पलट गये। हम काश्मीर का मामला तय करने को तैयार हैं, मगर मैं ऐसा नहीं समझता कि पाकिस्तान लड़ाई में काश्मीर ले सकता है। वह लड़ाई में पहले काश्मीर नहीं ले सकेगा और अब भी नहीं ले सकता। 1971 की लड़ाई लड़ी थी तो उन्हें बंगला देश स्वेच्छाकार करना पड़ा। अब अगर पाकिस्तान लड़ाई करेगा तो फिर बाद में लड़ाई करने के लिये पास्तान इस रूप में बचा हुआ नहीं रहेगा। मगर हम नहीं चाहते कि लड़ाई हो, हमारे सीमित आर्थिक साधन युद्ध की ओर झोके जाय, यह देश के लिये, देश की गरीब जनता के लिये बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात होगी। पाकिस्तान के साथ हमें बातचीत का सूत्र फिर से ढूँढ़ना चाहिये, बातचीत आरम्भ करनी चाहिये।

चीन के साथ हमारी चर्चा चल रही है, उस में थोड़ी तेजी लाने की जरूरत है। सीमा का प्रश्न एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है। इस रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है—“केन्द्र

विन्दु है।” हम चीन के सामने फिर प्रपत्ते प्रस्ताव को दौहराएं कि पैकेज ट्रैनिंग में उन्हें जोर देने को आवश्यकता नहीं है, पहले हम उत्तरो सीमा पर तमझौता कर सकते हैं, लद्दाख के बारे में आगे बातचीत हो सकती है। लेकिन बातचीत करते हुये भी यह भावना प्रकट नहीं होने देनी चाहिये कि हम पैर पीट रहे हैं। बार-बार पीकिंग से तिथियों के मुझाव आ रहे हैं, हम उन्हें जवाब देने में देर कर रहे हैं। यह ठीक नहीं है। चीन के साथ ममत्वाधीयों का सामान्य बताने की प्रतिया चलनी चाहिये। अन्य पड़ोसी देशों के बारे में भी मैंने कहा। लेकिन यह तभा हो सकता है। जब हम बराबरी के दर्जे पर और हम सहयोग के आधार पर उनके साथ बातचीत करें। भारत पड़ोसी देशों के साथ अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों का सुरक्षित रखता हुआ, किस तरह से मैंनी सम्बन्ध बढ़ा सकता है। यह हमारी विदेशी नीति का क्रमांक है।

पाकिस्तान की बात मेरी समत में आती है। लेकिन बांग्लादेश? आज बंगलादेश में सैनिक शासन आ गया है। पिछले दिनों जियाउररहमान की हम और अधिक मदद कर सकते थे। मैं किसी रहस्य का उद्घाटन नहीं कर रहा हूँ। बंगलादेश के राष्ट्रपति जियाउररहमान जब दिल्ली आये थे तो वे निराश हों कर गये। यह पिछले दो सालों की कहानी है। मैं नहीं जानता कि ऐसा क्यों है? श्रीलंका की सरकार की भी गिरावट है। छोटा-सा देश मारीशस भी यह अनुभव करने लगा है कि भारत के साथ जो बात पहले थी, वह अब नहीं है।

हम शक्ति में बड़े हैं, आकार में बड़े हैं, जनसंख्या में बड़े हैं। हमारे पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों का जो छोटे छोटे हैं संवेदनशील

होना, भावुक होना, स्वाभाविक है। उनमें विश्वास पैदा करने को जिम्मेदारी हमारी है।

हमने साउथ-सम्मेलन का आयोजन किया। उसमें हमने नेपाल को बुलाया नहीं। वह सम्मेलन बुलाने की ज़रूरत क्या थी? कानून के सम्मेलन से कुछ बहीं निकला। 77 का ग्रुप युनाइटेड नेशंस में पहले से बना है। 127 देश उसमें शामिल हैं। 27 देशों का एक इन्फार्मल ग्रुप युनाइटेड नेशंस में है। 44 देशों का दिल्ली में आने की तकलीफ देने को क्या ज़रूरत थी? कई देश उसमें छूट गये, वे नाराज हैं।

श्री माधव राव सिन्धिया : बातचीत होना बहुत महत्वपूर्ण वात है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : तो चलाइए बातचीत। उपाध्यक्ष कहांदय, मैं कह रहा था कि पहले नेपाल का न बुलाने का फैसला हुआ था।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : वाजपेयी जी ने जो कहा है उससे फर्क पड़ता है। एक सूचा तैयार का गई था: जिसमें अमुक अमुक देश थे, वाकी देश नहीं थे। यह एक स्टेटमेंट है। दूसरा यह कहना कि फलां फलां देश को न बुलाने का फैसला हुआ था। (व्यवधान)

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं आपका संशोधन मान लेता हूँ। नेपाल को बुलाने का फैसला नहीं हुआ था। परिणाम एक ही था। क्या नेपाल में यह भावना पैदा नहीं हुई कि उसकी उपेक्षा को जा रही है?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : ऐसी बात नहीं थी। मैंने नोट कर लिया है। मैं आपको बताऊंगा।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हमने 44 देश बुलाए ग्रुप 77 में 127 देश हैं। हम सब को नहीं बुला सकते थे, कुछ को छोड़ना ज़रूरी था लेकिन इस में से निकला क्या? हमने अनावश्यक रूप में कुछ लोगों को दूर कर दिया किन्तु प्राप्त हमने कुछ नहीं किया।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अमेरिका में इस समय जो शासन है, उस शासन से हमें ज्यादा आशा नहीं करना चाहिए। यह शासन जिस इंडस्ट्रियल मिलिट्री काम्पलेक्स का रिप्रेजेण्ट करता है। उसको विश्व को देखने को जो दृष्टि है उसके साथ हमारा मेल नहीं बैठ सकता है। इस दुनिया पर कोई शक्ति या महाशक्ति छा जाय इसे हम कभी स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते। लेकिन अमेरिका एक लोकतंत्रवादी देश है। वहां कांग्रेस है अलग अलग दल हैं, स्वतन्त्र प्रेस है, पब्लिक, आपिनियन जैसी चीज़ है और हमें अमेरिका को जनता से सीधी बातचीत करने को चाहिए। रेगिन साहब के दो साल बाकी हैं। (व्यवधान) कांग्रेस यहां भी है, वहां भी है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वहां आई नहीं है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हां, आई नहीं है।

लेकिन मेरा कहना यह है कि महाशक्तियां जो चाहती हैं वह करती हैं। इजराइल ने गोलन हाईट्स को निगल लिये र क्या प्रस्ताव पास करने के अलावा औ

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

कोई रास्ता नहीं है ? क्या अमरीका को मनमान की लेटिन अमरीका में रोकने को कोई दिशा नहीं है ? क्या अफगानिस्तान से रुस की सेनाओं की निकालने का कोई ढंग नहीं है ?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : आप बता दीजिए—उदाहरणार्थ ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : नहीं-नहीं, हमें पहल करना चाहिए। यूनाइटेड नेशन्स, नान एलायण्ड मूवमेंट में और रोजनल स्टार पर . . . (व्यवधान) ।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : ये तो मैंने नोट कर लिया है, इनके तो मैं जबाब दूंगा, इसके अलावा और कुछ होता बताइए।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आपने नोट कर लिया है तो ठीक है। मेरी गाँवी आगे चलने दीजिए, आप ब्रेक क्यों लगा रहे हैं ?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : मैं ब्रेक नहीं लगा रहा हूं कोई और तरीका पूछ रहा हूं ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं विदेश मंत्री को कहूंगा कि वे सदन की विश्वास में ले ।

ईरान-इराक का जो युद्ध चल रहा है उसे समाप्त कराने के लिए कुछ गुट निरपेक्ष देशों ने पहल की थी उसमें सफलता क्यों नहीं मिली ?

अफगानिस्तान का मामला उलझा हुआ है मैं मानता हूं। यह मामला महा-शक्ति से जुड़ा हुआ है मगर ईरान-इराक द्वेषी गुट निरपेक्ष देश है और पड़ोसी देश है। हमारे आर्थिक सम्बन्ध उनके

साथ निकटस्थ हैं। मगर मुझे ऐसा लगता है, हो सकता है कि मैं यहां बैठा हूं इसलिए मुझे ऐसा लगता है और विदेश मंत्री “श्रम एवं जयते” के आधार पर परिश्रम कर रहे होंगे, लेकिन कहीं न कहीं गुट निरपेक्ष देशों को पहल में कमो है। क्या इसका कारण यह है कि गुटनिरपेक्ष देशों की महा-शक्तियों पर निर्भरता बढ़ रही है ?

इस मामले में भारत की स्थिति भी कोई बहुत अच्छी नहीं है। हम हथियारों के लिए एक महा-शक्ति पर निर्भर हैं और आर्थिक-क्षेत्र में कज़े के लिए दूसरी महा-शक्ति पर निर्भर हैं। गुट-निरपेक्षता पर अगर चला जा सकता है तो स्वावलंबन के आधार पर ही चला जा सकता है।

आज स्थिति यह है उपाध्यक्ष महोदय कि हम अमरीका की आलोचना करने से संकोच करते हैं और सोवियत स्स की तारीफ करने में हिचकिचाने लगे हैं। अभी “आम्स-लिमिटेशन” के सवाल पर सोवियत रूस ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, उसका स्वागत किया जाना चाहिए। रीगन एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन से साफ कहना चाहिए, लेकिन हमने नहीं कहा, चूप रहे देखा जाएगा। सऊदी अरबिया ने एक इनिशियेटिव लिया था। सीरिया हमारा मिल है। रूस और सीरिया के बहुत गहरे सम्बन्ध हैं। सीरिया नहीं गया, इसलिए वह सम्मेलन नहीं हुआ। आखिर अरब देशों का इलाका उनको वापिस मिलना चाहिए। एक अलग राज्य की स्थ पना होनी चाहिए। लेकिन गोलन-हाइट्स को निगल कर बैठ गए।

मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हम ईरान और इराक के मामले में पहल कर सकते हैं।

एक और भाँ गुत्थी है जो उलझी हुई —कपूचिया को। विदेश मंत्री गए थे, वे वहां का प्रतिनिया से सदन को अवगत

कराएंगे। कंपुचिया से वियतनाम की सेनाओं को हटना चाहिए। कोई नहों चाहता कि पोलिस को सरकार वापिस आए, लेकिन हमारी मिति क्या हो गई है। जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन हुआ था, हम उस सम्मेलन में भाग लेने के लिए नहीं गये। मगर क्या हम आधिकार के नाते नहीं जा सकते थे? यह ठीक है कि उस अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन में हैंग मिसेमरिन को सरकार को मान्यता नहीं दो गई थी, हम उसको मान्यता दे चुके हैं—मान्यता देने के सबाल पर मतभेद रहा है, लेकिन आधिकार के नाते वहां जाने में कोई एतराज नहीं होना चाहिए था। वियतनाम और आसियान के बढ़ते हुए मतभेदों को कम करने में और विश्व के उस भूखंड में महाशक्तियों वो बढ़ते हुई प्रतिस्पर्धा में इस या उस देश को एक या दूसरी महाशक्ति के पीछे लगने के लिए मजबूर होने से रोकने में हमारी कोई भूमिका होगी या नहीं? यह ठीक है कि हमें किसी ने मीडी-एटर नहीं बनाया। लेकिन हमारी कोई तो भूमिका हो सकती है।

कंपुचिया के बारे में एक और बात मैं कहना चाहता हूं। प्रधान मंत्री ने दक्षिण एशिया की यात्रा की थी। अपनी यात्रा के दौरान उन्होंने एक बक्तव्य दिया था जिसमें उन्होंने कहा कि थाइलैंड को सेनाएं...

श्री पी. बा० दरसिंह राव : उसका कंट्रोडिक्षन किया जा चुका है। आप दोहराना चाहते हैं तो दोहरा सकते हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेये : मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता। लेकिन कंट्रोडिक्षन करने में देर हुई है।

श्री पा० बा० दरसिंह राव : जब हमारे व्यान में बात लाई गई तभी हमने कंट्रोडिक्षन कर दिया था।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेये : क्या लाई गई? याइलैण्ड को सरकार ने एक आफिशल स्टेटमेंट दिया था...

श्री पा० बा० नरसिंह राव : फौरन बाद कंट्रोडिक्षन किया था।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेये : प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा था या नहीं कहा था?

श्री पा० बा० नरसिंह राव : गलत रिपोर्ट है। आप चाहें तो मैं आपको भेज दूँगा कि क्या कंट्रोडिक्षन हुआ था।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेये : मेरा निवेदन है कि नामिविया का आजारी के लिए जो प्रयत्न हो रहे हैं उनको तेज करने को जरूरत है। बड़ी शक्तियों का उदाहरण मैंने दिया है कि वे चाहें जब दखल देतो हैं। साउथ अफ्रीका भी जो चाहे कर रहा है। वह तक नामिविया के लोग स्वाधीन होने के अपने अधिकार से वंचित रहेंगे? हमें बड़े पैमाने पर उनकी सहायता करना चाहिए। मैं जानता हूं कि हम सहायता कर रहे हैं। लेकिन अंगोला को भुक्ति के संघर्ष में हमने जैसा योगदान दिया था कि उतने बड़े पैमाने पर नामिविया की मुक्ति में हिस्सा बनाने का बक्त नहीं आ गया है?

एक बात का और उल्लेख मैं करना चाहता हूं। हम शस्त्रों को होड़ नहीं चाहते। हम दुनिया में शस्त्रों को दौड़ का निरुत्साहित करने वीं कोशशि कर रहे हैं। लेकिन अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति में परिवर्तन और विदेश नीति के त्रुटिपूर्ण संचालन के कारण हम खुद उस दौड़ में पड़ गए हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि सरकार और देश का एटमिक वैपेंज के बारे में एक बार अपना दिमाग बना लेना चाहिए।

[[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयीः]]

क्या हम न्युक्लियर आप्शन हम रखना चाहते हैं ? अगर रखना चाहते हैं तो किस पाकिस्तान के एकमप्लोशन का विरोध करने के जो हमारे तेवर हैं वे उतने तेज नहीं रह सकते ।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगतः (पूर्व दिल्ली) : आपका राय क्या है ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयीः अपनी राय बताने के लिए मैं खड़ा नहीं हुआ हूँ । मेरी राय पूछी जाएगी तो मैं बताऊंगा । आपको नहीं बताऊंगा । भगत जी के साथ मैं दिल्ली के बारे में बात करने के लिए तैयार हूँ ।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगतः ध्वराते क्यों हैं ? इतना बड़ा सवाल है, जवाब देने को तैयार नहीं हैं ।

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I am prepared to hold constituency level talks with my friend, Mr. Bhagat.

मुझे याद है नेहरू जी ने एक बार कहा था कि भारत कभी अणु अस्त्रों का निर्माण नहीं करेगा । याद में श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री आए । उन्होंने कहा । उन्होंने कहा इतनी बड़ी बात तो मैं नहीं कह सकता हूँ कि कभी नहीं करूँगा लेकिन मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि अभी नहीं करूँगा । बाद में श्रीमन् इन्दिरा गांधी ने अणु विस्फोट करके सारी दुनिया में एक धमाका कर दिया । हम उनका स्वागत करने वालों में थे ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, you have left Morarji Desai....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Again you are participating in the debate.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are coming from Lal Bahadur Shastri;

you have left Morarji Desai; I am trying to remind you.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT: I am trying to refresh his memory.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I remember everything.

कोई जहरत नहीं है मेरी याददाश्त को ताजा करने का । मगर केवल पाकिस्तान नहीं, इजराइल, साउथ अफ्रीका, लैटिन अमेरीका के अन्य देश भी न्युक्लीयर क्लब में शामिल करने के तैयारी कर रहे हैं । अब हम एक फैसला कर सकते हैं कि अगर पाकिस्तान ने अणु विस्फोट किया तो हमें सारी स्थिति पर पुनर्विचार करना पड़ेगा । लेकिन जब हम अपने लिए यह रास्ता खुला रखना चाहते हैं तो हम इस बात का न भूलें कि दूसरे देशों को उस खुले रास्ते का लाभ उठाने से हम नहीं रोक सकते ।

मैं मानता हूँ कि इस सवाल पर एक राष्ट्रीय मतैवय की आवश्यकता होगी । क्या यह पार्टी का सवाल है ? जहां तक न्युक्लीयर टेक्नालोजी का सवाल है हमें उसका विकास करना है, निर्माण के काम में उसका उपयोग करना है ।

आज जब दुनिया विश्व युद्ध के कगार पर खड़ी है, जहां महाशक्तियों के स्वार्थ आपस में टकरा रहे हैं, जब दुनिया को कमाई का बड़ा भाग हथियारों पर खर्च हो रहा है और मानवता रोटी के लिए, दवा के लिए, मकान के लिए बिलख रही है तो भारत का आह्वान क्या है ? यह ठीक है कि हमें अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय तकाजों और राष्ट्रीय हितों में मेल बैठाना पड़ेगा । मगर दोनों में कोई ऐसा अन्तर-विरोध नहीं है कि मेल नहीं बैठाया जा सकता । मगर एक बात का ध्यान रखना होगा, विदेश नीति का संचालन घरेलू परिस्थितियों से जोड़ने के लोभ का संवरण करना बहुत आवश्यक है ।

कभी कभी ऐसा लगता है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय खतरे की बात, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय खतरा है, मगर उसका जहरत से ज्यादा बढ़ा चढ़ा कर कहने में कहाँ यह भावना तो काम नहीं कर रहे हैं कि देश की जनता अपने अधिकार के लिए न लड़े, देश पर खतरा है, सब एक अंडे के नीचे आ जाओ, प्रधान मंत्री के हाथ मजबूत करो। प्रधान मंत्री के हाथ किसने कमज़ोर किये हैं? प्रधान मंत्री के हाथों का और कितनी शक्ति चाहिए? जहाँ तक राष्ट्र की रक्षा का सबाल है 68 करोड़ देशवासी, एक साथ है। लेकिन हम अपने घर ठीक नहीं रख पा रहे हैं। जो आम सहमति विदेश नीति पर पैदा हुई थी उसे मजबूत नहीं कर पा रहे हैं, उसे ताकत नहीं पहुंचा पा रहे हैं। थोड़ा मा मतभेद होता है, आलोचना होती है तो नीयत पर शक किया जाता है। बोलो नहीं, विरोध प्रकट मन करो देश खतरे में है।

प्रधान मंत्री का जब बाहर स्वागत होता है तो हमको भी प्रसन्नता होती है। यह न सोचिए कि हमका इच्छा होती है। मगर एक बात न भूलिए कि श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी का इसलिए स्वागत होता है कि वह भारत को प्रधान मर्दः है। एक महिला के नाते वह बड़ी चतुर हैं, बड़ी योग्य हैं, इसमें कोई संदेह नहीं। लेकिन अगर श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी छोटे से देश की प्रधान मंत्री होतीं तो यह शिकायत नहीं होती।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): This is left-handed compliment. You are not able to accept the realities.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You don't accept the reality.

देश को पीछे रख कर और रचनात्मक आलोचना को भी, जिस भावना से आलोचना की जाती है, उसको ग्रहण करने से इन्कार

कर के हम विदेश नीति जैसे नाजुक मसले पर जो एक नेशनल कंसेन्शस है और जिसे मैं समझता हूँ कि मजबूत करने की ज़मरत है, उसे मजबूत करने का काम नहीं कर रहे हैं। आखिर आपके दल में भी ऐसे लोग हैं जो उस कन्सेन्शस की तोड़ता चाहते हैं। विरोधी दल में भी ऐसे लोग हैं, हम उनसे भी अपरिचित नहीं हैं। मगर जो देश में समझदार लोग हैं, उनके ऊपर यह दायित्व है कि वर्तमान परिस्थिति में राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के सबाल को प्रायमिकता देते हुए भी अन्य प्रश्नों पर जो जुड़े हुए हैं, एक आम सहमति बने। गृह मंत्रालय को मांग पर बोलते हुए भी मैंने आम सहमति को बात की थी, माननीय नरसिंह राव यहाँ मौजूद थे।

हमें इस देश में लोकतन्त्र चलाना है। इसलिए मुझे हथियारों पर जहरत से ज्यादा खर्च करने में सकोच होता है।

15. hrs.

गरीबी में लोगों में असतोष पैदा होता है। एक फौजी शासन उस असतोष को बन्दूक से दबा सकता है, हम नहीं दबा सकते। इसलिए हमारे लिए शांति की आवश्यकता सर्वोपरि है। यह ठीक है कि हम अपनी सीमाओं पर आंच नहीं आने देंगे, लेकिन कूटनीति लड़ाई का टालने का सबसे प्रभावी औजार है। जब लड़ाई थोप दों जायेगी तब तो हमके उसका सामना करना होगा, मगर क्या हम लड़ाई टाल सकते हैं, क्या इस भूखंड में नया बातावरण पैदा कर सकते हैं, क्या विश्वास की टूटी हुई कड़िया जोड़ सकते हैं, क्या हम महा शक्तियों के चंगुल से इस भूखंड को बचा सकते हैं? यह चुनौतियां हैं जिनका हमें सामना करना है। विदेश मन्त्री इन चुनौतियों का सामना कर रहे हैं। आने वाला कल उत्तर देगा कि हम इन चुनौतियों का उत्तर दे पाते हैं या नहीं दे पाते हैं।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Sitamarhi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Prime Minister in her kindness and generosity named me to lead the Indian Delegation to the 38th Session of the Human Rights Commission held in Geneva from 1st February to 12th March. Sir, when I went there, I was very much surprised that the distinguished representative of Pakistan Shri Agha Hilali sought me out on the first day and invited me to an exclusive lunch. I said "well, we will be here for six weeks and we will meet some time later" and during the course of the first week, almost every day he wanted me to come and join him for lunch because he wanted to talk to me on some urgent matters. So, on the 10th, that is, ten days after the Session had started, he came to my delegation seat just a few minutes before 1.00 P.M., when the morning session was to end, he said, "I have found out that you are free for lunch today. Will you come with me in my car and we will go to a restaurant and we can talk". I could not say 'No'. So we went there and he took me to a restaurant. He spoke to me for more than two hours, discussing very sensitive matters about the Indo-Pakistan relations. A meeting like this in the parlance of diplomacy is done for a certain purpose. It was not a courtesy meeting. I took it normally that there were certain matters which he wanted to communicate to me to be communicated to Delhi here and this, he was doing on the express wish of the highest in the Government of Pakistan. And towards the end of the lunch, I asked him a question. I did not do much of the speaking, he did almost 99 per cent of the speaking. But at the end of the lunch, that is, after 1-1/2 hours, I asked him a casual question which was unconnected with anything because this was on the Agenda of the Human Rights Commission. On the very first day when the Item No. 1 of the Agenda was taken up, that is, "Organisation of work" the Pakistan Delegation wanted that Item No. 9 to be discussed separately.

Item No. 9 deals with the self-determination of peoples. This is for the benefit of my esteemed colleague, Mr. Vajpayee, because he said that Pakistan did not say a word on behalf of Palestinian and Namibia. But this item is there. This item is regarding the right of the people to self-determination under colonial rule, alien domination and foreign occupation. These are the three subjects which come under Item No. 9 and Kashmir is raised under these headings. This clearly establishes the link—so far Pakistan is concerned—with situation in Palestine and Namibia. Pakistan wanted this item to be discussed separately. This item is discussed along with item 4 or some other item also, which deals generally with the elimination of racialism, occupied Arab territory, Namibia and other matters. Pakistan wanted item No. 9 to be discussed separately and this was granted, because when a delegation wants such a thing that much courtesy is given and, therefore, this year this item was discussed separately. I asked him, why he wanted this item No. 9 to be discussed separately. That was my question. He came out with the answer: "I do not want to raise any bilateral issues between us under this; I have asked for a discussion separately, because I want to discuss only Afghanistan and the presence of 2 1/2 million refugees in Pakistan; this is a question of life and death for us." On item 9 every year, Pakistan had been raising the Kashmir issue. Therefore there, was no doubt that any bilateral issue under item No. 9 can only be Kashmir, and which was raised by Pakistan in this forum on this very item. Now, my esteemed friend Shri Vajpayee quoted my reply and said that it was over-reaction and this had done the damage. Pakistan press is saying the same thing; even the Pakistan Ambassador, in his speech in Bangalore has said that my reference to martial law is an internal matter. Now, they put the entire blame on me and say that the Indo-Pak talks have been postponed because of me. Actually, I have been

made the villain of the piece. Pakistan press has even said that in my zeal to curry favour with the Prime Minister, I have deliberately gone along the line of action leading to this postponement of talks. Pakistan press is a controlled press; whatever they write or say reflects the opinion of the Government there. It is unlike the press here; the press here is free and can write whatever they feel about it. Conscience is their guide, but it is not so in Pakistan. I would like the House to know one or two aspects of this question.

Firstly, I did not ask Shri Agha Shahi, representative of Pakistan for any assurance; and normally you do not ask for an assurance from a representative of a sovereign country. It was in answer to a question; in fact, he himself volunteered; it is his own statement, it is his own voluntary statement, that he was not going to raise the Kashmir issue this time in the Human Rights Commission. In the background of the long talks that we had together, he emphasised on the friendship, he expressed great satisfaction that the Delhi talks had gone on very well and he looked forward to an era of friendship and cooperation. In this background, I took it that his statement for not raising the Kashmir issue in the Human Rights Commission was very much in line with the building up the correct atmosphere of friendship between the two countries that had been generated as a result of successful talks in Delhi.

On the basis of my long experience, I did the correct thing, that immediately after that I made a written report to the Foreign Minister here. When you open an informal channel of diplomacy, it is easier for any Government, if it suits their purpose to make denials sometimes. Since my written report is there on record, they cannot go back on what they said to me.

This was on the 10th February, and a week later, he made the statement on 17th February on item No. 9. He spoke at length on Afghanistan and at the end of that statement, he made this reference about Kashmir which

Shri Vajpayee has quoted. Now, Pakistan describes it as a moderate statement. And they have described my reaction as immoderate. But the point is: why did they make a reference on the 17th? My impression is this: We were together for 6 weeks. I had several talks with Mr. Agha Hilali. I don't want to divulge the private nature of the talks, but this is my impression—i.e. that when he made the statement of 10th February to me, he did it because this was the policy of Islamabad Government, not to make a reference to Kashmir, in pursuance of, and to build friendly relations and good atmosphere between India and Pakistan. It was in pursuance of that, that he made the statement.

On the 17th, when he did refer to it, there had been some change in Islamabad in policy. What led to that change I do not want to speculate. But obviously there had been two developments subsequently. One; Foreign Minister Agha Shahi who had successful talks in Delhi, resigned. There is a speculation. He has said that he resigned on health grounds. But there is a speculation, not only here but in the Western Press also—in London and other places, that he has resigned on account of some policy differences with the President of Pakistan.

The fact is that the Foreign Minister there has changed. The second is—which came out more later—the internal situation. About this, Agha Hilaly talked to me; and I have reported it to the Foreign Minister; it is on record. The internal situation took to the worse. You know what happened recently, i.e. a week or two later. Several thousands of people have been arrested. Every political person has been arrested. So, these were the two factors, because it is well known that whenever Pakistan is faced with some internal difficulties, they cannot take the risk of not raising an emotional issue like Kashmir. Therefore, according to me, this change had taken place. He got new instruction; and that is the reason why he raised it.

This is about his assurance and his subsequent going back upon it. The

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

other factor is the reaction. Was it moderate? It is for the Pakistani Press or for the Government of Pakistan to say that their reference was moderate. But the question is one of propriety. As I have referred to in my statement, my objection and protest was not only because they have raised it.—We have been saying this—but because by raising this, they are vitiating the good atmosphere for friendship, for cooperation that has been generated in the Delhi talks. As a matter of fact, it is like torpedoing the good work that has been done; and that was the reason—I emphasized it—why are they raising it? This will vitiate the atmosphere about impending talks in Islamabad.

Now about the reference to Martial Law. Vajpayee Ji said that I had over-reacted. Pakistan's Ambassador says that it is an internal matter. Pakistani Press is blaming me. But I have used only one line, when I replied and when I raised this matter about this right of self-determination. We have said that we have had six elections, free and fair elections in Jammu and Kashmir. The whole world knows that elections in India are free and fair. If there is any democracy, strong, vibrant, free and fair, it is in India along with some other countries. Therefore, on that account, or on the matter of human rights, nobody can challenge India's record. India's record is the best in the world; and when Pakistan challenges that and says that election cannot be said to have decided the right of self-deter-

mination because they are not free and fair, then I only asked one question. I said: "Does the distinguished representative of Pakistan feel that the right of self-determination can better be exercised under Martial Law?" It is in connection with the question of self-determination that I referred to the Martial Law. How is self-determination exercised, except through free and fair elections? Has it been exercised anywhere in any other manner? Therefore, I asked this natural question; when I asked this question, I was not discussing about Matial Law as an internal matter of Pakistan at all. It was a necessary argument to meet Pakistan's charge of denial of self determination to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. It did not over-react at all or I did not refer to any martial law as a system of a government, but only saying that self-determination can only be exercised through fair and free election, and not under martial law.

I am grateful to the House for giving me a large measure of support. It was discussed in this House in my absence and also in the other House. There was a fair degree of consensus on the line which I took, because that is the only line which we have been taking on the basis of the past record and principles. The point is that the atmosphere has been vitiated. Subsequently, Pakistan did another thing; although it had been corrected, because in the draft Report of the 38th Session of Human Rights Commission Jammu & Kashmir reference was made. I took it up with the representative of Pakistan. I said. "If this reference goes into the report, then the atmosphere will be further vitiated." Both of us want that a good atmosphere that prevailed after Delhi talks—and it had not got a setback after the reference about Kashmir here—should not be further vitiated. Therefore, It is in the interest of good relations between India and Pakistan and in the interest of creating a proper climate and good atmosphere is so that the postponed talks, the Islamabad talks can take place in future, this reference should be deleted.

Then they said, "We will seek instructions," and they did seek instructions from Islamabad; and they got instructions at the last moment not to object to the deletion and this reference was finally deleted. Therefore, what happened in the Human Rights Commission had happened because the Government of Islamabad has a definite policy and they gave definite instructions to its representative. The representative did not act *suo motu* either in the beginning when he made that statement to me that they will not raise it or on the 17th, a week later, when they did raise it or later when they agreed to the deletion of the reference to Jammu & Kashmir in the Report, they always acted under the instructions from the Government; and therefore, what happened had happened under the direct policy instructions of the Government of Islamabad.

Therefore, in this context, this is very important and the Foreign Minister has said rightly that the talks have been postponed only for the time being because the atmosphere has been vitiated and no useful purpose can be served by holding the talks. I am happy that all sections of the House want good relations with Pakistan. It has been our policy right from the beginning, since independence that we must have good relations, co-operation and friendship with Pakistan and with other neighbours; there are no two opinions about it; there is a complete consensus about it. Therefore, in the interest that the talks should begin, it is better that the atmosphere must improve; because if the atmosphere is not proper, if the next talks run into difficulty or a stalemate, there will be a further setback in relations. In that view, it is necessary and I want to emphasise that for good relationship again Pakistan has to make up its mind, because when I made this statement that Simla Agreement provides for the resolution of all questions in a bilateral framework, the Government of Pakistan in a press statement said, "This is an unaccepted position." I know the precise wording of the Simla Agreement. But there it is—even a reference to an arbitration or any third party under the Simla Agreement can

only be made as a result of mutual agreement. This is very important—there is bilateralism about Kashmir also. Therefore, Pakistan has to make up its mind whether they accept the principle of bilateralism in their relations with India or not. They cannot take the position that they can go on raising Kashmir in any forum they like, regional, international or elsewhere, in any manner they like and then they can say, 'that we are prepared for the talks, we are prepared for friendly relations, we are prepared for good relations'. Therefore, this is absolutely important and I want to emphasise this, that unless that assurance is given,—actually, it is not a question of assurance, it is a wrong word I said—unless Pakistan says that they are willing to accept the Simla Agreement *in toto* i.e. to settle all questions through bilateral negotiations—they do not accept it—the principle of bilateralism is the true essence, the core of Simla Agreement even with regard to Kashmir. Unless they accept it, there is no point in holding a talk about a No-War Pact, or any treaty of friendship, or joint commission or anything else. As long as this area is still hazy and Pakistan keeps on trying to put the blame on India for the postponing of the talks we should keep the true and clear perspectives of Indo-Pak relations before the people. The hard core of the matter of Indo-Pak relations is that an atmosphere of trust is created, the reference to Kashmir in any forum, Pakistan has to give up. And they have to accept the principle of bilateralism in setting all disputes including Kashmir. That is the conclusion and I think the whole House agrees, that, the essence of the foreign policy in a democratic system is that there is a consensus behind this. And I was very very agreeably listening—it was heart warming to listen to Shri Vajpayeeji emphasising on this very consensus behind the foreign policy. This is the difference in foreign policy in a democratic country and a foreign policy in a non-democratic country or a country under dictatorship.

Well, the entire stream of our national consensus has been that we have had the

(Shri B. R. Bhagat)

democratic support, people's support behind our national policy and in this respect also in building up a framework of a stable bilateral relationship with Pakistan and other neighbours we had to pursue that policy despite the various factors that come in the way and although the difficulties have come, our objective is clear; we want a strong and stable Pakistan, we want a progressive Pakistan and we want to have good relations with Pakistan, but Pakistan has also to realise the sensitivities of these matters in this country and they have to desist once and for all from this kind of thing and they have to sit together and settle all their disputes through bilateral negotiations, without the induction of any third party or trying to internationalize the disputes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri R. R. Bhole.

SHRI R.R. BHOLE: (Bombay South Central): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I heard with very great interest the speech of our friend Shri Vajpeyeeji, and after hearing him at length I found that with a bit of sweet criticism here and there, he agrees almost with every piece of our foreign policy which we are following.

We all agree that we have certain aims and objects and we are making an effort to achieve those aims and objects. We have to preserve our independence and sovereignty, we have to improve our economy and standard of life and for the purpose of succeeding in this we have to do it in an environment and atmosphere which brings us peace and which brings us security not only to the people at large but also to the whole of our country. The point at issue, therefore, is that if we want to exist peacefully to bring up our economy and make ourselves a developed nation, we have to take certain steps. In the present universe, we have naturally to look to our neighbours, but the world today has become very small and therefore, we have to counter the

different forces in the different countries surrounding us. May be after fifty or a hundred years, when Mars, Saturn, Jupiter and other planets are also known, we may have to make an effort to exist after also countering the forces and attitudes of those planets. But today we have to see not only nations which are developing like us but also nations which are already developed. It is a good thing that in the world in which we live today, we have two big powers and not one. Before World War II, there was only one big power, namely, USA. After the second World War, we have also the USSR. Besides these two great powers, we have as our neighbours Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, Burma, Sri Lanka and also the Indian Ocean which surrounds our country. We have south-east Asian countries and also eastern Asian Countries like China, Korea, Japan, Mongolia and other countries. We have also to see the West Asian countries like Israel, Iraq, Iran, PLO and other Islamic countries. Then, we have our great friends in Africa. We have also to see what is going on in South Africa, the South African liberation movement and the part played by SWAPO, the Namibian people's movement. We have also to see how the West European people are moving and also how the East European people, who are friends of USSR are also moving. Then, of course, we have Great Britain. Therefore, considering the external affairs policies of all the neighbouring countries surrounding us, and also countries which are near us and which are far from us we must try to see how we can remain as peaceful and as secure as possible. We have, however, certain hurdles in the way of our achieving our peace and security. Those hurdles are the gap and disparity—and a very big disparity—between the standard of living of the people in the developed and developing countries. The developed countries are rich. Their standard of life is good. They have lots of money to spend on other things than food, health and education. In fact, some of them are spending mountains of money on armaments and selling those armaments to many of the developing countries and making the developing

countries unstable and poorer and poorer. It is very necessary, therefore, Sir, for countries like ours to see that these armament manufacturers or their Governments are not allowed to sell armaments to other countries, but to spend those billions of dollars for food, health and for raising the economy of the poorer countries. But their lobby is big. It is unfortunate that with all these disparities, there is confrontation between the two great powers and competition as to who is big. However, the strategic doctrines and ideologies of these two countries are different.

There is a great difference between what the United States wants to do and what Russia wants to do. It is, however, difficult for us to see why they are trying to have confrontation and why they do not have *detente*. The difference between one power and the other is this. In the last great war, Russia suffered a lot. There was blitzkrieg on their country and on their hearths and homes. Its towns, cities and villages and a great part of the country were demolished and razed to ground. Therefore, the Russians know what war can do to the people, to their families, to their towns and to the country. The United States was, however, lucky. Fortunately for them, war did not come to their country until now. Their country was not a place where war was fought. Their men, however, did suffer. And perhaps, millions of their sons died for saving democracy. But the differences is there. Therefore, the feeling which, perhaps, the Russians have against fighting or waging the war, because they themselves suffered and their country suffered, may be different from the feelings which the Americans have. It is bound to be different. But the Americans, I know and we all know, do not also want war.

The dangerous tension spots today are the Indian Ocean, the West Asian countries and Namibia. In fact, even Europe has now become a tension spot. These are places where anything might happen and we will have also to suffer.

The supply of nuclear weapons by America and other countries to our

neighbours, as well as others, is fraught with very dangerous consequences. Taking into consideration the increasing arms supply to Pakistan, we must know how to remain peaceful while, at the same time, defending ourselves. Pakistan started increasing its arms and developing its nuclear activities, not today but as early as 1972. As rightly mentioned by Shri Vajpayee, the situation in Afghanistan referred to by Pakistan appears to be a mere pretence. Even Bhutto stated during his days that he wanted to develop nuclear weapons. He has stated in his book that during those days he had purchased armaments worth one million dollars with Arab money and another million dollars worth of armaments from China. It is rather very dangerous... (*Interruptions*) Pakistan is getting now armaments to the extent of \$ 3.2 Billion from the United States, who are supplying sophisticated weapons like F-16 fighter bombers and M-60 tanks. Naturally, this has grave and irreversible consequences on our defence.

According to most of us, these activities cannot be for peace and security, or even to defend themselves. Even the Americans, who are supplying armaments to them, feel that they cannot trust them. US Senators and Congressmen, even Western observers, even though they sympathize with them, are not convicted of their nuclear programme. Mr. Eugene Rostov, Heads of the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has stated on 20th March that Pakistan's and South Africa's nuclear activities are very suspicious. Mr. Roger Kirk, Deputy US representative at the International Atomic Energy Agency stated that KANUPP reactor of Pakistan is dangerous. While giving testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the US House of Representatives, he said that he could not give an assurance that the nuclear activities of Pakistan were for peaceful purposes. As was rightly mentioned just now by Shri Bhagat, they cannot be relied upon because in one breath they say they are wedded to the Simla Agreement, and yet in another breath they raise the issue of Kashmir. So, these are the things which we have to bear in mind.

We must also consider the threat to our country by induction of nuclear weapons

[Shri R. R. Bhole]

in the Indian Ocean. Of course, President Reagan's approach to foreign policy is entirely militaristic. Naturally, we will have to take into consideration all these aspects and circumstances, if we want security and to exist. I am sure our efforts which are in right direction will bring us some fruit. The non-alignment movement is gathering momentum. The strenuous efforts of our Prime Minister in the Commonwealth Conference, in the Cancun Summit, and in the Committees of the United Nations had their impact on several countries in Europe, South Western and South Eastern Asia. So, I am sure they will bring peace in the world, because they are efforts, in the right direction and for a right cause. We are trying in all these another manners to prevent the powers from drifting towards war. We are trying in our own way, in the United Nations and in the Commonwealth Conference and other forums, to also arrest the nuclear armaments race.

I am glad that we have one good ray of hope by a right move and that is USSR's unilateral declaration of temporary freeze on deployment of intermediate range missiles in Soviet Europe—Eastern Europe. Its impact is good, not only in the European countries but also in America. We know that, big demonstrations and peace movements have started in Washington and also in the capitals of various countries in Europe. It is a movement for peace.

Since we are all peace-loving people, most of us are followers of Lord Buddha; if we move in the direction with right steps in which we are already moving, I am sure we will play a great part in bringing about peace in this country. With these words, I support the Demands for Grants relating to this Ministry.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are many hon. Members from both the ruling party and the Opposition who want to speak on this Ministry. The Minister will reply to the debate tomorrow at 4 p.m. Some of the hon. Members from the opposition have expressed their desire to speak tomorrow. They will be allowed to speak tomorrow within the time allotted to them.

If other hon. Members of both sides are prepared to sit late, I am prepared to sit here and everybody will be given a chance. Now I call Mr. Nagarajnam.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: When will the Minister reply?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: At 4 p.m. tomorrow. That has already been announced.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: Let not the sitting be prolonged after 6 o'Clock.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If those who want to speak sit, I am prepared to sit.

SHRI T. NAGARATNAM (Sriperumbudur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry for the year 1982-83. This Ministry is responsible for the conduct of India's external relations with foreign countries to project our image and enhance our prestige abroad.

I welcome the Budget Estimates for 1982-83 for External Affairs, and I congratulate the External Affairs Minister for he has been tackling so many problems with foreign countries and neighbouring countries like Pakistan, China, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka and other super power countries.

Sir, I recall to my memory that my beloved leader, late Arignar—Anna, who was then the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, before starting for America met and consulted our Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. When he was in America most of the people asked him, 'What is your foreign policy?' My beloved leader categorically stated that 'my foreign policy is the same as my country's foreign policy. The ale University people, most of whom were literate people, asked him again: "You are coming from Tamil Nadu, you have one Party, that is, DMK. But you stated that your foreign policy is the same as your country's foreign policy. Should you not differ from the foreign policy of the Centre?" My leader again categorically stated, "My country's foreign policy is the same as our foreign policy. That is, foreign policy is a national policy. We are united together as Indians. Therefore, our foreign policy is the same.". Therefore, I would like to draw the attention of the House and the Members who have participated in this debate to this aspect. The

Members who have participated in this debate so far said that Pakistan inducted sophisticated arms which were purchased from U.S.A. I say that during the time of Janata Government, about two-and-a-half billion dollars worth of military aid was extended to Pakistan and Pakistan acquired arms and ammunition worth about two billion Dollars from America and other western countries.

Now, in the present circumstances, arming of Pakistan is a dangerous game. We must cooperate with all countries which believe in peace. We have been trying to have relationship with all countries. Irrespective of arms build up in Pakistan, if Pakistan shows sincerity in signing the No-War Pact, we should appreciate the extension of the hand of friendship.

Our country is providing economic and technical aid to Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh and other developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America through bilateral agreements under specific programme.

The Ministry has taken stupendous task to improve the publicity programmes in other countries. I request the Minister to add more programmes for the Tamil culture and heritage.

I welcome that the Budget estimates in 1982-83 provide Rs. 2.52 crores for assistance to Bangladesh as against Rs. 1.35 crores provided in the Revised Estimates 1982-83.

We have been assisting in technical programmes for Bangladesh which mainly consisted of scholarships in various disciplines—education, training facilities, small scale industries, parliamentary studies. Bangla Desh produces jute which has been sold to China and in return Bangladesh have purchased arms and ammunition. Therefore, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister so as to say that we should prefer to make purchases from Bangla Desh also.

I would like to state the unpleasant incidents which happened in Sri Lanka last August and September, 1981. I have been listening very carefully the observations made by elderly Members who have taken part in the debate—including Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. He has not made a mention of the un-pleasant incidents that took

place in Srilanka last year. Most of the people who were Tamilians were effected. They were tortured by Singalies. Most of the Tamilians were buried. Their properties were set on fire. The modesty of most of the ladies was outraged. From Tamil Nadu one Shri Dhanavathi who went for an excursion to Ceylon was murdered.

Last year I spoke on the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry. I drew the attention of the hon. Minister. He assured to give protection to the Tamilians in Ceylon.

15.53 hrs.

[SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV—in the Chair]
My beloved leader Dr. Kalanjar and others who agitated against Ceylon were sent to jail. So many Tamilians including my leader are in jail. The long pending problems must be solved. As per 1964 Agreement, the supplementary agreement granting extension for two years is over. Once the agreement is over, no stateless people of Indian origin in Srilanka should be taken back. It is the responsibility of Srilanka to remove their statelessness.

In Rameswaram most of the community is that of fishermen. They are tortured. Nobody questions Srilanka people. Even in the Indian territorial water the Indian shermen are not allowed to fish. Therefore, the Minister must take up the matter with the authorities of Srilanka and the problem should be solved.

I draw the attention of this House to the USA warship base in Indian ocean. Srilanka Government stated that they have created recreation ground. But they have denied that a war-ship base is formed in the Indian Ocean.

Our Ministers, dignitaries and other delegates used to go to foreign countries and also the foreigners visit our country. We have been following the traditional way of democratic and cooperative relationship and strengthening the integrity of our relationship with each other.

According to the Government policy regarding the implementation of Hindi language in official work in foreign countries through Missions

[Shri T. Nagaratnam]

and posts abroad, and there are large segments of population comprising people of Indian origin, the Annual Report says that our Official Language Implementation Committee of the Ministry kept a close watch on the actual implementation of the policy in the matter of increasing the use of Hindi in official work. So many books in Hindi were sent abroad. But I request the hon. Minister that the South Indian language books, like Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Kannada may also be sent abroad, particularly, wherever the South Indians are abroad. For example, in Fiji and Mauritius Islands, most of the people are Tamilians. I request that Tamil literature like Thirukkural, newspapers and magazines in Tamil may be sent to their libraries.

In regard to issuing of passports to our people who go abroad, particularly for job purposes, the Government must be vigilant to see that unless the person has been given a guarantee for giving the job, the passport may not be issued. Otherwise, when a person goes abroad and he does not get a job, becomes a vagabond and a beggar.

The Annual Report shows an increase of work in the Passport office. The work-load has increased by 55 per cent during 1981. In 1981, 13.54 lakh new passports were issued which was the highest figure recorded so far in any given year.

As regards the External Publicity Division of the Ministry is concerned, it should improve and it should interpret all aspects of India's foreign policy to the public and the media of the countries of their respective accreditation.

The 41 countries which attended the Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference at Melbourne from 29th September to October 30th were represented by their Presidents and

Prime Ministers. The Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Malcolm Fraser presided over the Conference. The Melbourne Declaration recognised:

"The inequality of wealth in the world and specially the cycle of poverty of the millions in developing countries are fundamental sources of tension and instability in the world".

The North South issues were also discussed. Our Prime Minister enhanced the prestige of our country before the eyes of other countries.

The Non-Aligned Conference was held in New Delhi from 9th to 13th February. It was attended by 93 member countries. The Conference was inaugurated by our Prime Minister. She welcomed all and said:

"The realities of the world situation, the possibility of a nuclear Armageddon by a single lapse or rash act reinforce the relevance of non-Aligned demand for re-dedication to peace.

She also called the big countries and appealed to them to de-escalate belligerent rhetoric attitude, to reduce pressure in the Indian Ocean and in the various parts of Asia and Africa to resume the earnest search for understanding and peace.

Once again, I congratulate our External Affairs Minister who was elected Chairman of the Conference with acclamation.

The learned Hon. Member, the ex-External Affairs Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, when he spoke in the debate, at that time, the Hon. Minister was just away from the House.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee commented in the beginning of his speech:

"Chapter XV: Administration and organisation."

"Annual Report 1981-82".

The mistake should have been pointed out to Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee while he was quoting. I may be enlightened for not finding fault with the remarks of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

The Chapter deals with 'Administration and organisation.' It goes on:

"Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao continued as the Minister of External Affairs".

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has forgotten the title "Administration and Organisation" and he has conveniently omitted the latter portion, that is:

OO

"There was no change at the level of Foreign Secretary and Secretary.

"At the level of Additional Secretary, Shri J. R. Hiremath took over as Additional Secretary (Administration) and Dr. J. S. Teja as Additional Secretary Policy Planning".

I think that the sentence: "continued as the Minister of External Affairs".

is not a mistake. It is correct. This sentence is carefully drafted in this report.

In the end, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to participate in this debate.

With these words, I conclude my speech.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT (East Delhi): I am sorry that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is not here. I wish the Hon. Member were present here.

Now, I have very great respect for 'Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. He was the Minister of Foreign Affairs and, therefore, he can naturally claim that

he has greater knowledge of foreign affairs and relations and such matters and so on and so forth.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was making certain observations in this House which prompted me to speak now. He was posing certain questions, certain posers, to the present Minister of External Affairs. I just wanted to request Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to answer the posers himself.

I would say that it was a bit too self-presumptuous on the part of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to say that he can answer a question from me only if it relates to Delhi.

With great respect to Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee I say that every Member of this House is a Member of Parliament and it would be too much to say that one can talk about Delhi and not about foreign affairs.

(Interruptions)

Well, fortunately or unfortunately, both of us are ex-Ministers and fortunately you, Mr. Chairman, are also an ex-Minister. We are safe because ex-Ministers remain at least ex-Ministers always.

I am trying to say that I represent this historic capital city of India in no way less than Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee not only in terms of the strength of ruling party but in votes also. I do not want to be small by saying this.

But, anyway, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has prompted me to speak. Otherwise, I had no intention to speak.

I am just taking up his last argument first.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee posed a question to our Minister of External Affairs and said about nuclear options.

I am taking up his last talk.

Well, all of us, politicians and parliamentarians are, generally speaking, in a way, something like and somewhat like jugglers.

[Shri H. K. L. Bhagat]

I would not say that I am a juggler. I would say that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is an ace juggler.

Therefore, I am just submitting that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee posed a question to our Foreign Minister saying "Well why don't you make your nuclear options clear irrespective of the fact what Pakistan stand is?"

Well, everybody knows it and we have always said it and this Government has always said it that we stand for nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Everybody knows, and this is being talked everywhere in the world that Pakistan is going to produce the bomb, and so on and so forth. Some evidence has also come. I think, the Government's stand here has been well taken; our stand is, for peaceful purposes' but we shall watch the situation. Now what does Mr. Vajpayee want our hon. Foreign Minister to say? That we are going in for the bomb irrespective of whether Pakistan does or does not do? Jugglery is alright. But in a serious matter like this, Mr. Vajpayee poses this question. That shows how on partisan grounds the debate on international affairs can be taken by him. I do not want to imitate him, I wanted to refresh his memory but he said that he did not need it. I wanted to remind him that he and his party asked for a nuclear bomb. When the nuclear explosion for peaceful purposes was conducted by our Government at Pokhran they welcomed it. When Mr. Morarji Desai became the Prime Minister, Mr. Vajpayee was the Foreign Affairs Minister. Mr. Morarji Desai, as Prime Minister, denounced that explosion saying that he could not say that it was for peaceful purposes. He became a witness for our opponents in the world. Mr. Vajpayee kept quiet then. He did not say anything against it at that time. Mr. Morarji Desai went further and said that India would not have any nuclear explosion even for peaceful purposes in future. I do not know whether this matter was considered by Parliament

then, whether this matter was considered by the then Cabinet Mr. Morarji Desai gave the opinion on behalf of the nation. Mr. Vajpayee, who was a Cabinet Minister then, did not say a word about it. Now he wants our hon. Foreign Minister to give a straight answer as to what we are going to do. The answer has been very clearly given. What I am saying is this. I know that all political exercises are very complex and delicate, particularly in international affairs, and on delicate matters like this, Mr. Vajpayee speaks so light-heartedly, only trying to play to some galleries which is very unfortunate.

Now let us take up his other references to certain other delicate matters—with regard to Pakistan and other things. I am not attributing any motives to him. I believe that he is as much a patriot as we are. But, whatever his intentions might be whatever might be in his mind, the net effect of all his arguments amounts to advocacy of Pakistan's arguments as against the arguments of India. This is very unfortunate. I say this with full sense of responsibility that anybody hearing what Mr. Vajpayee had said would get the impression that Mr. Vajpayee feels—well, if Mr. Vajpayee genuinely feels so, it is alright—that what Pakistan is saying on various issues has substance and that the Indian attitude is wrong. If Mr. Vajpayee feels it genuinely and honestly, he is free to say that; there is no bar. Merely because we do not agree with his views, I would not say that he should keep quiet. But let it be known clearly that what he has said amounts to strengthening Pakistan's arguments. I was shocked when I heard him observing, "Why should we create a 'war fever' in India?". He has used the term 'war fever'. Who is creating that in India? Mr. Chairman, you are aware. Is any one in India creating any war fever? Does any war fever exist in India? Are our newspapers creating a war fever in India? Who has created it? No war fever exists in India. It is the Pakistani lobby,

those elements which are charging us that we are creating a war fever in India, and it is very unfortunate and shocking that Mr. Vajpayee is supporting that argument; it is a matter of shame, I would say, that he is supporting it.

Let us take up his other arguments. He spoke about the Simla Agreement. As I have said, I am not imputing any motives, but I must say certain things very candidly. When the war between India and Pakistan took place, foisted by Pakistan, Mr. Vajpayee's Party strongly opposed the Simla Agreement. He went to Rajasthan, took a portion of the dust, put it on his forehead, went on a camel and said. 'I swear

भारत मां, भरती मां का एक कचरा भी हम जाने न देंगे ।

This was Mr. Vajpeyee's jugglery. Then what happened when he became the Foreign Minister? He said, 'Nothing like the Simla Agreement'; he gave the impression that he was a greater and warmer advocate and supporter of the Simla Agreement than the architect of the Simla Agreement, Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

This was his pose. This is what he said and I am surprised that this is the impression he gave when he went to Pakistan. There he tried to give the impression. When a question was put to Mr. Vajpayee as to 'what did you say before?' he said 'Forget it' Now to-day he said, 'Forget what I then said.' To-day, Sir, I am surprised. Well it is true—I know—in the Simla Agreement there is a reference that all matters will be discussed bilaterally. But it is a question of emphasis. Now Pakistan's emphasis is on Kashmir. Is it necessary for us to fall in their trap and accept that emphasis and Mr. Vajpayee said, 'Discuss Kashmir' and they said, 'Discuss. What is wrong in that?' There also he is supporting the argument of Pakistan, that Kashmir should be discussed in this manner. There it was not discussed bilaterally, there is was mentioned in an international forum, to which we took objection.

Therefore, what I am respectfully trying to say is that all his arguments actually in effect amount to a support of Pakistan's case and their arguments. Now is it not a fact that Jawabarlal Nehru made a no-war offer not conditioned by this or that? The fact is that Jawararlal Nehru made an unconditional no-war pact offer. Is it wrong on the part of our Government to say that we sincerely felt this way? Was this Simla agreement also not a no-war agreement? It was and India always stood for that. When Pakistan says suddenly, 'Well, we want a no-war pact', is it wrong on our part to say that we always stood for that? Should we leave it to Pakistan Government and join in the argument that they were the first to say while in fact we were the first to say. Is it wrong? How is it wrong if we remind them and if we become cautious? Now, let me be candid, Sir. The imperialists forces, in my opinion, are trying to militarily encircle India in various ways and it is a pity that knowing the situation we do not understand and realise the gravity. Therefore to say these things is rather, I would say, very improper.

Now, therefore, in the totality of circumstances, what Mr. Vajpayee said amounted to advocacy of viewpoint of others. Now he accused us without using that word of a big brother attitude towards our small neighbouring countries. He did not use these words, but it amounts to this—which again is totally wrong. India's stand has been right from the beginning and particularly, during the Congress rule, that we have tried our best to be friend all neighbouring countries including Pakistan. I want to know an example in the world where a country which conquered a territory has turned it over peacefully in a short time as India did. To accuse India that 'You are doing this thing with Nepal, and 'You are doing that with Bangladesh' and so on is contrary to facts. It is a fact, an unfortunate fact that during Vajpayee's tenure as Foreign Minister, India was being

[Shri H. K. L. Bhagat]

taken for granted by everyone. As a result of that India's position, India's stature and image suffered. We do not want any hegemony. We do not want to dominate or boss over our neighbours. No, India does not want to become a super power. India wants to help the cause of peace. India wants to protect its own interest. India wants to protect the interests of its neighbours. Have I to remind him that it was during their time, those who have fought for the liberation of Bangladesh, a number of them, were handed over, as a token of what they call friendship to Bangladesh authorities and they were killed mercilessly by the then regime. We want friendship with Bangladesh and we wanted it. But what they, Janata were trying was not friendship. Their whole thing was that they were drifting and it was drift where India was losing its image. That we all know. Leave aside President Reagan. Mr. Carter when he came to India—what did he say about Mr. Morarji Desai, the then Prime Minister. He said he was happy that Indiraji is welcome as Prime Minister of India. 'We know she is as great Prime Minister of a great country.' They were happy. I do not want to make a comparision. I also wanted Mr. Morarji Desai to be welcomed as the Prime Minister of India. But, unfortunately, he was not. Therefore, what I am saying is that his arguments are not based on realities and facts.

It is very interesting for him to say, 'Look, why cannot the non-aligned nations take intiative on Afghanistan?' Why could not they do this or that?' Then I put a question to him to answer, 'What should they do? What India should do and what should Mr. Narasimha Rao do?' He himself said, 'Well it is a complex question.'

Then he says that it appears that the non-aligned nations also are under the pressure. He was made the Minister. I do not want to say that they were

under the same pressure—some a little more and some a little less. But, the non-aligned nations, with the initiative taken by India and certain other leaders of the non-aligned world had been under very difficult circumstances. That is a fact, he has tried to belittle the Conference which was held in New Delhi very recently. The most shocking thing that he said was this. I consider that an insult to the nation when he said that India is dependent on the two Super-Powers. Therefore, India is weakened to take a decision in a manner we like thereby we get arms from the Soviet Union and money from the other Super-Power. It is an insult, I say, to this House and to India and the Indian people to say that we got money from America. We got the money sanctioned by the IMF despite the fact that there was opposition from America. This is a fact. We are purchasing arms from the Soviet Union and other countries. If we need arms, the Soviet Union had been consistently our friends to support. If we need arms, where should we go? Let him say that. We have been purchasing arms from the Soviet Union and the other countries. In fact, there has been now more diversification of purchase of arms. He goes on saying that India has become a dependent nation. It might have been during their time. We all know and the whole world knows not to speak of this country. In fact, Shri Vajpayee was talking of consensus. There is a consensus minus his party, the reactionary party. This is the supporter of the Imperialists forces. In fact, there is a consensus in our Parliament. There are friends sitting here—friend of the Leftists and others who differed with many things but there is a total consensus as far as India's foreign policy is concerned from the CPM, CPI and other groups. They have said that India's foreign policy is all right. But, my friend goes on saying or giving a contrary impression about India's foreign policy. He is giving an impression that we are being run by Americans and the Soviet Union. The

Soviet Union pressurised us to sign a non-proliferation treaty. We did not do that in spite of the pressure from America also. However, we should not forget what happened when Dr. Kissinger wrote about India. He said that Indira Gandhi was a statesman where we could not bend. She would not forget what was the interest for her country. The whole world knows that. I do not want to tell that. These are historical facts. India's foreign policy to-day is being conducted under the leadership of our Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi and our able Foreign Minister Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao so very ably and effectively for which the whole nation is proud. In fact, the world is proud of that. I was in Australia and I read a newspaper there. Japan has a different policy. I went there. I got views of the people. The people officially have one view and unofficially a certain other view. I found they had the appreciation of our foreign policy.

Now about China, Shri Vajpayee said something. He wants us to follow in the manner he wants. There was a war in Viet Nam going on. He was dining there. I am only using the word 'dining'. Why did he not react on that? You know that with China we want to improve our relations. Our Government is taking all possible steps in that direction. We should not do anything in haste. I am for the friendship with them. Our Government is, I think, going in the right direction. Mr. Vajpayee, you were Foreign Minister. You did not do anything more or better than what Mr. Rao is doing to-day in regard to Namibia. Coming to Afghanistan it is a political problem. We have good relations with Russia. He tells us why should we not persuade them to do something in the matter. He thinks that the American arms will be used against India. He also says that at least America has got the excuse to arm Pakistan because of the happenings in Afghanistan. I would say that by so saying he indirectly gives support to the American and Pakistan's

points of view. There is no cause and really no justification whatsoever. He admitted that America was arming Pakistan even previously. Sir, America's policy has been to curtail us and, if I may say so, even to de-stabilise us. For Mr. Vajpayee to give these arguments amounts to supporting the viewpoint of Pakistan and America.

Sir, he said about Golan Heights having been devoured and whether anything more could not be done except passing a Resolution. I asked him to tell what more could be done but he kept quiet. My hon. friend has reminded me that he said that Muslim countries must get their rights but it was during the time he was the Foreign Minister that a secret visit of Moyshe Dayan had been permitted. What does it show? It only shows duplicity and deceit. Then he said who is against Pakistan. Sir, we want Pakistan to exist but it is his party which created anti-Pakistan fever in this country. It was his party who created the atmosphere resulting in the murder of Mahatma Gandhi. It was his party, his supporters and his friends who created communal atmosphere in the country and continue to do that. They are supporting anti-Pakistan organs even now but they are saying something here and doing something else outside. By their jugglery they are trying to paint a pigeon as a crow and it is consistent with their game of trying to create difficult conditions internally. I do not want to impute any motives to them.

Sir, with these words I wish to conclude. I support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs and congratulate the Foreign Affairs Minister for the excellent manner in which the foreign affairs of the country are being conducted.

श्री अशफाक हुसैन (महाराजगंज):
मौतरम चेयरमैन साहब अभी बाजपेयी जी को पुरजोश तकरीर और भगत जी के उससे ज्यादा जोशीले जवाब के बाद जो आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया है, मैं कुछ खास बातें कहना चाहता हूँ।

[श्रोः अशफाक हसैन]

कल से हो रही खारजा पालिसी को बहस में अपनी पार्टी की तरफ से हिस्सा लेते हुए में चन्द अहम बातों की तरफ खासतौर से इशारा करना चाहूँगा । हमारी खारजा पालिसी का बुनियाद हमारे आजाद होने की बाद नहीं पर्दा, बल्कि आजादी की लड़ाई के दौरान भी इस सिलसिले में हमारे छ्यालात और खद्दोखाल बहुत बाजे थे । आज भी हमारी खारजा पालिसी को कुछ लोग गैर-जानिबदार कहते हैं । और कुछ लोग नावाबस्ता कह कर हमारी गैर-जानिबदारी और नावाबस्तगों का तरह-तरह का मतलब निकालते हैं ।

यह सच है कि हम किसी खेमे में शामिल नहीं हैं और हम किसी के पिछलगू नहीं हैं, लेकिन यह भी हकीकत है कि हमको अपने दोस्त और दुश्मन पहचानने की तमीज जरूर होनी चाहिए ।

हम सुपर पावर राइवलरी की बात करते हैं। हर बड़ी ताकत के अपने अलहदा अलहदा मुकाद हो सकते हैं और हमारे भी कुछ अपने मुकाद हैं लेकिन सोवियत यूनियन और यू० एस० ए० को हर मौके पर बराबर खड़ा करना हक्क कत से मुह मोड़ना है। दूर क्यों जाते हैं, इंडियन ओशन, बहरेहिन्द को अमन का जोन बनाने और लड़ाई का अडडा न बनाने के लिए एक तहरीक चल रही है।

डिएगो गार्सिया से अमरीकी जन्मी अड्डे को हटाने की तहरीक हिन्दुस्तान, श्री लंका, हमारे पड़ोसी देशों और यूरोप के कई देशों में चल रही हैं। हमें देखना चाहिए कि इस सिलसिले में हम क्या कर रहे हैं। क्या हम इसमें गैर-जानिबदार रह सकते हैं? क्या हम इस तहरीक से अवाबस्था रह सकते हैं? जंग और अमन के सवाल पर हमको बाजेह तौर पर अमन

का जानिबदार रहना हैं और जंग का मुख्या-
लिफ्ट ? हम अपने आप को अमन के खेमे
से नावाबस्ता नहीं रख सकते ।

जब सोवियत यूनियन के सदर ब्रेजनेव न्युकिलयाई हथियारों समेत हर तरह के अस्लहात को तबक्कीफ और कटौल की बात करते हैं, तो उनकी आवाज में आवाज मिलाने से हसारी गैर-जानिवदारी को कोई ठेस नहीं लगती। वह हमारी अपर्ना आवाज है। जब अमरीका सदर रीगन डिएगो-गार्सिया के अमरीकी अड्डे को मजबूत करने का कदम उठाते हैं या बहरे-हिन्द में मजीद अड्डे की तलाश करते हैं, या इस इलाके में पाकिस्तान समेत दूसरे मुल्कों को हथियार फ़राहम करते हैं, तो हमें खुल कर अमरीकी सदर रीगन के नापाक डरादों को मुख्खालिकत करनी ही चाहिए।

मैं एक बात साझ़ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि हमें मुख्तालिफ़त उस ताकत की करनी चाहिए, जो कम्पूचिया और वियतनाम से ले कर पाकिस्तान, सऊदी अरब और मिश्र तक और निकार्गुआ और एल सैल्वाडोर तक हर तरह की दखल-अन्दाज़ी करने से बाज नहीं आ रही है और दूसरों के कंधे पर रख कर अपनी राइफ़ल चलाना चाहती है। उस कंधे की मुख्तालिफ़त करने से कोई फ़ायदा नहीं है, जिस पर राइफ़ल रख कर जंगबाज चलाना चाहता है। हमें बन्दूक चलाने वाली और बंदूक फ़राहम करने वाली ताकत की मुख्तालिफ़त करनी चाहिए, जो हमारी असली दुश्मन है, जो अमन की दुश्मन है। पाकिस्तान और सऊदी अरब को खतरनाक अस्लहां फ़राहम करने वाली ताकत हमारा मिशाना होना चाहिये, न कि पाकिस्तान और सऊदी अरब के अवाम या द्वक्षमत।

पाकिस्तान को अमरीकी अस्लहा की फ़राहमी के मामले में हमने पाकिस्तान को अपना दुश्मन माना है, जिसके कंधे पर अमरीका अपनी बंदूक चलाना चाहता है। यह बात हमारे लीडरों की तरफ से दिये गये बयानात से जाहिर होती है। लेकिन हमें उसं बंदूकची को हर तरह से कन्डेम करना चाहिये, जो पाकिस्तान को अपने जंगी मंसूबों का हिस्सा बनाना चाहता है। मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि 1953 में जब पहली बार अमरीका में पाकिस्तान को बड़े पैमाने पर अस्लहा फराहम किया था, तो मरहूम वजीरे-आजम जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने खुल कर अमरीकी इकदाम की मुखालिफ़त की थी और मुल्कगीर पैमाने पर अमरीका-मुखालिफ़ जल्से और रैलियां करने का नारा दिया था।

मौजूदा हालात ने हमें पाकिस्तान के नाज़ंग मुआहदे की पेशकश और उसके साथ-साथ वजीरे-आजम की तरफ से दोस्ती के मुआहदे की पेशकश, इन दोनों का खैर-मकदम करना चाहिये। लेकिन हमें यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि वजारात खारिजा में कुछ ऐसे अनासिर हैं, जो अमरीका के इशारे पर पाकिस्तान से हमारी दोस्ती में रखना डालना चाहते हैं। हम इस बात को भूल जाते हैं कि पाकिस्तान से हिन्दुस्तान की दोस्ती ही उसको अमरीका से दूर रखने की जमानत हो सकती है।

इस सिलसिले में हमारे बुजुर्ग, श्री बी० आर० भगत, ने अभी जो वजाहत की है, उससे मामला और वाजेह होने के बजाय और कांप्लिकेटिड हो गया है। मैं उनकी दो बातें दोहराना चाहता हूँ। एक जगह उन्होंने कहा कि माहौल खराब हो गया है, इस लिये, पाकिस्तान से बातचीत स्थगित की गयी। मेरा इतना

ही कहना है कि माहौल को खराब करने में पहली जिम्मेदारी पाकिस्तान की है, यह मैं मानता हूँ, लेकिन दूसरी जिम्मेदारी हमारी भी है, क्योंकि हम प्रोवोक हो गये। पाकिस्तान या उसके नुमाइंदे को—या हो सकता है कि जो उसके कंधे पर बंदूक रख कर चलाना चाहते हैं, उनकी यह चाल रही हो कि वह हमको प्रोवोक कर दे और हमारे बीच जो दोस्ती की बातचीत चल रही है, उसमें कुछ रखना पैदा कर दें। तो थोड़ी देर के लिये ही सही, वह अपनी चाल में कामयाब हो गये। इस सिलसिले में मैं कुलदीप नैयर साहब का एक जुमला कोट करना चाहता हूँ:

However the transcript of observations of the Indian and Pakistan Delegates at the Commission indicate that one reacted to what the other said and both exceeded the limits which their Governments had placed on them.

मैंने इसलिये कोट किया कि मैं समझता हूँ हमारे बुजुर्ग, मोअर्जिज भेस्वर, भगत साहब, जो लिमिट रखी गई थी, उसको एक्सीड कर गये और वह सब कुछ कह गये जो उन्हें कहने की जरूरत नहीं थी। उनको मुखालिफ़त जरूर करनी चाहिये थी लेकिन प्रवोक नहीं होना चाहिये था। प्रोवोकेशन दूसरे का गेम था और प्रोवोक होकर वे दूसरे के गेम में आ गये और इस तरह से उन्होंने अपना खेल बिगड़ा दिया। हमारी हूँकूमत ने भी, बजाये इस के कि बात को वहीं पर खत्म कर देती, उसको उसी तरह से सीरियसली लिया और जो हमारा आला सतह पर खारजा मोहक्मे के सेक्रेटरी की सदारत में एक डेलिगेशन बात-चीत को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये पाकिस्तान जाना चाहिये था, उसको मुल्कबी कर दिया। मैं एक बार फिर इस बात को दोहराना

[श्री अशक्काक हुसेन]

चाहूंगा कि पाकिस्तान से दोस्ती ही पाकिस्तान को अमरीका के खेमे से निकाल सकती है, कोई और दूसरी चीज नहीं। इसलिये हमको बहुत ठंडे दिमाग से इस सिम्प्ट कदम उठाना चाहिये और कोई भी मौका हाथ से नहीं जाने देना चाहिये।

पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू के जमाने में, जब वे हमारे मुल्क के प्राइम मिनिस्टर थे, तो काफी अरसे तक वे बजीरे खारिजा भी रहे। उस वक्त से अफ़्रीकी की और अरब मुल्कों की खसूस अहमियत वजारते खारजा में रही है। अफ़्रीकी रही है। अफ़्रीकी और अरब देशों में जो हमारे चुनिदा नुमाइंदे भेजे जाते थे उनको बहुत अहमियत दी जाती थी। मुझे योड़ा अफसोस है,

हालांकि मैं अपने नुमाइंदों पर कोई हमला नहीं करना चाहता, कोई आक्षेप नहीं करना चाहता लेकिन यह जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो अहमियत हमको अफ़्रीकी और अरब मुल्कों को देनी चाहिए थी वह हम नहीं दे रहे हैं। जितने अच्छे नुमाइंदे हमें अफ़्रीकी और अरब देशों में भेजने चाहिए थे वह हम नहीं भेज रहे हैं। इन देशों से ताल्लुकात बढ़ाने में पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी हमेशा जाती दिलचस्पी लेते रहते थे। हमें भी उन देशों के साथ ताल्लुकात बढ़ाने में खासी दिलचस्पी लेनी चाहें हमें नहीं भूलना चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान को असला फराहम करने में अमरीका का निशाना न तो अफगानिस्तान है और न सोवियत रूस है, बल्कि अमरीका का निशाना हिन्दुस्तान है। वह ईरान और ईराक की जंग की तरह हमारे बाह्य हाई को भी तबाह करना चाहता है। अब जो हम तरक्की के रास्ते पर आगे बढ़ रहे हैं और जो तेल

के बोंहरान से निकलने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं उसके लिए अमरीका की नियत है कि हमारी तरक्की की रफ्तार को ढीला कर दे। हमें अमरीका की इस बाल को अच्छी तरह से समझ लेना चाहिए।

अमरीका जब यौमे अफगानिस्तान मनाना है तो उसकी जरा भी हमदर्दी अफगानिस्तान या वहाँ के अवाम से नहीं रहती है। पिछले 21 मार्च को बड़े जोश व खरोश से यौमे अफगानिस्तान मनाने की तैयारी की गई। सारी दुनिया में यौमे अफगानिस्तान मनाने को तहरीक सब से पहले अमरीकी सीनेट में खुद सदर रींगन ने पेश की जिसकी हिमपत बरतानिया के दोनों एवान और यूरोपिय एकिंसादी विरादरी ने को लेकिन जिस इजरायल ने अमरीका की शह पर गोलान पहाड़ियों पर एकतरफा कब्जे का एलान सीनाजोरी से कर दिया तो इनमें से किसी ने यौमे गोलान मनाने का एलान नहीं किया। कहाँ गई उन को इस्लाम और मस्लिम देशों से हमदर्दी खुशी की बात है कि अब कट्टर इस्लामी नजरियात रखने वाले लोग भी अमीरीकी चाल से वाकिफ होते लगे हैं। जमायते-इस्लामी का हफ्त-रोजा “दावत” भी “यौमे-अफगानिस्तान” को मगरिब का नया सियासी स्टंट मानने लगा है और यहाँ तक कहने लगा है—

अमरीका और दूसरे मुल्कों के इस मामूल और तरीके-कार से यह अन्दाजा होता है कि वह रूस के खिलाफ अपनी गुहाज-माराई के लिए अफगानिस्तान के मसले को सिर्फ जिन्दा रखने से ही दिलचस्पी रखते हैं। “—दावत मौजूदा-हफ्ता।

इस बात से किसी को इन्कार नहीं होगा कि जनता दौरे-दूकूमत में पासपोर्ट

हासिल करने में आसानियां फराहम को गई थीं और अब कल इस सिज़सिले में धीरे-धीरे कुछ सहती लाई जा रही है। कुछ तो यह भी बात है कि पासपोर्ट को दरखास्त देने वालों को तादाद में भी खासा इजाफा हुआ है। रीजनल पासपोर्ट अफिस को अगर मजोद स्टाफ को जरूरत हो तो उसे फराहम करना चाहिए। हो सकता है सरकार को पालिसी में कुछ तब्दीली हुई हो, लेकिन मेरा कहना यह है कि जो लोग सही तरीके से अपने मुल्क से बाहर जाना चाहते हैं, चाहे वह किसी ख्वाहिश से जाना चाहते हों, उन को जाने का मोका देना चाहिये, उन को सहूलियात देनी चाहिए। पासपोर्ट हासिल करने के रास्ते में जो भी मुश्किलत हों हमें उन्हें दूर करना चाहिए।

चेयरमैन साहब, अब ने एक ऐसे मसले को तरफ अपने लायक वज़ीर-खारजा की खसूसी तबज़ह दिलाना चाहूंगा जिस को तरफ इस बहस में शायद कभी तज़किरा भी न हुआ हो। हज मुसलमानों के लिए एक अहम मजहबी फरीजा है और हिन्दुस्तान मुसलमानों को तादाद के लिहज से दूसरे नम्बर पर है लेकिन यहां से हज को जाने वाले मुसलमानों को तादाद को देखा जाये तो हिन्दुस्तान से जाने वाले हाजियों को तादाद दूसरे मुमालिक से जाने वालों के मुकाबले बहुत कम है। मिशन के तौर पर इण्डोनेशिया से 69002, मलेशिया से 22704 और पाकिस्तान से जहां मुसलमानों को आबादी हम से कम है 69343 हजाज 1981 में हज के लिए सऊदी अरब गये जिन के मुकाबले में हमारे यहां से 21280 हाजियों को

इजाजत-नामा मिल सका। इस तादाद में हजाई जहाज और बहरी-जहाज से जाने वाले सभी हाजों शामिल हैं। 1979 में हिन्दुस्तान से बहरी रास्ते से 15005 हाजों तशरीफ ले गये थे। 1981 में यह तादाद घट कर 13245 हो गई और अब 1982 के लिए यह तादाद 9915 रह गई।

पहले मुगल लाइन्ज की तरफ से चार बहरी-जहाज इस काम के लिये लगाये जाते थे, अब ये दो कर दिये गये हैं। यह सच है कि सऊदी अरब हकूमत की तरफ से किब्ले-रमजान हाजियों की रवानगी पर पाबन्दी लगा दी गई थी, लेकिन इस पाबन्दी से पहले भी हर साल हजारों की तादाद में दीनदार-मुसलमान अपने इस मुकद्दस मजहबी फरीजे को अदरह करने से महरूम रह जाते थे और इस साल तो इस तादाद में करीब चार हजार को और कमी आ गई है। दुनिया में मुसलमानों की दूसरी सब से बड़ी आबादी हिन्दुस्तान में रहती है और यहां से पाकिस्तान के और इण्डोनेशिया के 69000 और मलेशिया के 22000 के मुकाबले 21000 हाजियों में भी 4000 मजोद कम कर दिये जायें, यह हमारे लिये शर्म की बात है। कम-अज़-कम तीस-हजार (30000) हाजी हर साल भेजने का इन्तज़ाम करना हमारी जिम्मेदारी है। सऊदी अरब हकूमत पर इन्तज़ाम लगा कर हम अपनी जिम्मेदारी से बरी नहीं हैं सकते। भारत के मुसलमान बराबर के शहरी हैं और उन को से उन के मुकद्दस मजहबी फरीजे की अदायगी में हर तरह की सहूलियत पहुंचना हकूमत-हिन्द की जिम्मेदारी है। अगर हमारे पास अपने बहरी-जहाज की कमी है तो इस खास काम के लिये हमें बहरी

[श्री अशफाक हुसेन]

जहाज चार्टर करने चाहिये । हमारी अपनी कमी और कोताही की वजह से हाजी न जा सकें और हम सऊदी अरब हुक्मत पर इल्जाम लगा कर वह कह कर कि जो लोग बहरी रास्ते से न जा सकें वह हवाई जहाज से चले जाएं, यह ठीक नहीं है । जिन को हम रोटी नहीं दे सकते क्या उन को हम केक खाने की सलाह देंगे या उन की केक का इत्तजाम करेंगे । आप जानते होंगे कि रोटी में यह इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि बहरी रास्ते से जाने में पैसा कम लगता है और हवाई रास्ते से जाने में पैसा ज्यादा लगता है और मुसलमानों की ऐसी बहुत बड़ी तादाद है, जो कम पैसा खर्च कर के हैं; अपने इस फर्ज को अदा कर सकती हैं ।

हज कमेटी की सतेह पर जो गड़बड़ियां हैं चाहे वह मरकजी हज कमेटी हो या रियासती हज कमेटी, इन की तरफ भी खसूसी तवज्जह की जरूत है । यू०पी० की रियासती हज कमेटी की कारकर्दगी से तो हम बेइतमिनानी हैं । उर्दू अखबारात इस से भरे पड़े हैं और इन की तफसील में जाने का वक्त नहीं है । हज कमेटी की तरफ से 100 रुपये और 50 रुपये की हाजी हर साल वसूल किया जाता है हाजियों को बम्बई में रिहायश की सहूलियतें पहुँचाने के लिए लेकिन हाजी जिस परेशानी की हालत में अपना वक्त गुजारते हैं, वह बयान के बाहर है । हाजियों के लिए बम्बई में मजीद मुसाफिरखाने की तामीर अशद जरूरी है ।

हज के ऐयाम में जहा में, मक्का शरीफ रें, मदीना मुनब्बरा में और सिना

में हाजियों की देखभाल पूरे तौर पर मुम्लिम के जिम्मे छोड़ दी जाती है । हिन्दुस्तानी सिफारतखाने को जो खेरखबरी करनी चाहिए, वह नहीं होती है । दूसरे मुमालिक का भी सिफारिती अमला ऐयाम हज इन जगहों पर रहता है और उन लोगों की तरफ से अपने अपने मुल्क के हाजियों को हर तरह की सहूलियतें फराहम की जाती हैं लेकिन हमारी तरफ से तिक्की सहूलियत भी नाम के लिए ही है । डाक्टर अगर मिल भी जाएगा, तो दवा मिलने का कोई सवाल ही नहीं है । अगर अमले की कमी हो, फंड की कमी हो, तो उसे पूरा किया जाए या अगर बदइतजामी है, तो उसे दूर किया जाए । इस से हमारे मुल्क के हाजियों को तकलीफ और परेशानी उठानी पड़ती है और दूसरों की नजर में हिफारत, जिल्लत और रुसवाई का सामना करना पड़ता है । इस की तरफ खसूसी तवज्जह हमारे बजीर देंगे, ऐसी हमें उम्मीद है ।

एक बात और कह कर मैं अपनी बात खत्म करना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि अभी यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की डिसअर्मेंट कान्फेन्स में हमारी सरकार ने अपना रोल अदा किया था और मुझे उम्मीद है कि दूसरी कान्फेन्स जो जल्दी होने वाली है, उस में भी अपना रोल अदा करने में हम कभी नहीं हटेंगे ।

[شُرُّی اشْفَاق حسَن (مہادِجِ کلیج):

مُسْتَدِرِم جِنْهُرِمُون صاحب اہم
وَاجْهَائِی جی کی پُرزوں تقویٰ اور
بِهِمَت جی کے اس سے زیادہ جوشے
جواب کے بعد جو اپنے مکان بولنے
کا موقع دیا ہے میں کچھ خاص
پانیں کہدا چاہتا ہوں -

کل سے ہو دھی خارجہ پالیسی
کی بعثت مہن اپنے پادتو کو
طرف سے حصہ لیتھے ہوئے مہن چند
اہم باتوں کی طرف خاص طور سے
اشارة کونا چاہتا ہوں - ہماری خارجہ
پالیسی کی بندھاں ہمارے آزاد ہونے
کے بعد نہیں یہی - بلکہ آزادی کی
روادی کے دو ایک بھی اس سلسلے میں
ہمارے خوالات اور خدا و خال بہت
واضم تھے - آج ہو ہماری خارجہ
پالیسی کو کچھ لوگ غیر جانبدار
کہتے ہیں - اور کچھ لوگ ناوابستہ
کہ، کہ ہماری غیر جانبداری کی اور
ناوابستگی کی طرح طرح کا مکملہ
نکالتے ہیں -

یہ سچ ہے کہ ہم کسی ختمے
میں شامل نہیں ہیں - اور ہم کسی
کے پیچھا لگو نہیں ہیں - لہکن بے
بھی حقیقت ہے کہ ہم کو اپنے دوست
اور دشمن پہنچانے کی تھیز ضرور
ہونی چاہئے -

ہم یہ پاورد دائولو کی بات کوئی
ہیں - ہر بھی طاقت کے ائمہ الہادہ
الہادہ مفاد ہو سکتے ہوں - اور ہمارے
بھی کچھ اپنے مفاد ہیں - لہکن
سویت یونین اور یو ایس - اے -
کو ہو موقعہ پر بوابر کووا کونا
حقیقت سے ملھے مرونا ہے - دو د
کاون جاتے ہیں - اندیں اوشن
بھر ہلد کو امن کا ڈون بلانے اور

لڑائی کا اڈہ نہ بنانے کے لئے ایک
تبصریک چل دھی ہے -
تھیک گویشہا سے امریکہ اسے ہٹانے
کی تحریک ہندوستان - شدی المکا
اور پیوسی دیشوں اور یورپ کے کئی
دیشوں میں چل رہا ہے - ہمیں
دیکھنا چاہئے کہ اس سلسے میں
ہم کیا کر رہے ہیں - کیا ہم اس
میں فہر جانبدار رہ سکتے ہیں -
جلگ اور امن کے سوال پر ہم کو
واضم طور پر امن کا جانبدار رہتا ہے -
اور جلگ کا مخالف ہم اپنے آپ کو
امن کے ختمے سے ناوابستہ نہیں
رکھہ سکتے -

جب سویت یونین نے ملارہ مہذابوں
ہتھوہداں سماحت ہر طرح کے اصلاحات
کی تخفیف اور کنٹرول کی بات کر
دے تھے تو ان کی اواز سے آواز ملنے
میں ہماری فہر جانبداری کو کوئی
تھیس نہیں لگتی - یہ ہماری اپنی
آواز ہے - جب امریکہ صدر دیگن
قیمکو گویشہا کے امریکو اسے کو
محدود کرنے کا قدم اٹھاتے ہیں یا
بھر ہند میں مذہب اسے کی تلاش
کرتے ہیں یا اس علاقے میں پاکستان
سماحت دوسرے ملکوں کو ہتھیار فراہم
کرتے ہیں - تو ہمیں کھل کر امریکی
صدر دیگن کے ناپاک ارادوں کی
مخالفت کرنے ہی چاہئے -

میو ایک بات صاف کر دیکھا
چاہتا ہوں - کہ ہمیں مخالفت

[شہری اشلاق حسہوں]

اس طاقت کی کوئی چاہئے جو کم ہو چکا اور پیتلام سے لے کر پاکستان سعودی عرب اور مصہود تک اور نہ کاگروں اور سہلوا اور انک ہر طرح کی دخل اندازی کرنے سے بعد نہیں آ رہی ہے۔ اور دوسروں کے کمدھے ہو رکھہ کو اپنی دائیل چلانا چاہئی ہے۔ اس کمدھے کی مخالفت کرنے سے کوئی فائدہ نہیں ہے۔ جس پر دائل رکھہ کو جنگ باز چلانا چاہتا ہے۔ ہمہوں بلدوں چلانے والی اور بلدوں فراہم کرنے والی طاقت کی مخالفت کرنی چاہئے۔ جو ہماری اصلی دشمن ہے۔ پاکستان اور سعودی عرب کو خطوناک اسلحہ فراہم کرنے والی طاقت ہمارا نشانہ ہونا چاہئے۔ نہ کی پاکستان اور سعودی عرب کے ہمارا یا حکومت۔

پاکستان کو امریکی اسلحہ کی فراہمی کے بارے میں ہم نے پاکستان کو اپنا دشمن مانا ہے۔ جس کے کمدھے پر امریکہ اپنی بلدوں چاہتا ہے۔ یہ بات ہمارے لہڑوں کے دئے کئے بھانات سے ظاہر ہوتی ہے۔ ایکن ہمیں اس بلدوں قبضے کو ہر طرح سے کلام کونا چاہئے۔ جو پاکستان کو اپنے جنگی ملصوبوں کا حصہ بلانا چاہتا ہے۔ ہم ہاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں گے ۱۹۵۳ میں جب امریکہ نے پہلی بار پاکستان کو ہوئے پہمانے پر اسلحہ فراہم کیا تھا تو

مدحوم و زید اعظم جواہر لال نہرو نے کہاں کو امریکی اقدام کی مخالفت کی تھی۔ اور ملک کہہ پہنچانے پر امریکی مخالف جلسے اور دیباں کرنے کا نامہ دیا تھا۔

موجودہ حالت میں ہمیں پاکستان کے نا جنگ مخالفے کی پوشکھن اور اس کے ساتھ ساتھ و زید اعظم کی طرف سے دوستی کے مخالفے کی پوشکھن ان دونوں کا خود مقدم کرنا چاہئے۔ لیکن ہمیں یہ نہیں بھولنا چاہئے کہ وزارت خارجہ میں کچھہ ایسے عذاصر ہوں جو امریکہ کے اشارے پر پاکستان سے ہماری دوستی میں دخل ڈالنا چاہتے ہوں۔ ہم اس بات کو اہول جاتے ہوں کہ پاکستان سے ہندوستان کی دوستی ہی اس کو امریکہ سے دو دکھنے کی ضمانت ہو سکتی ہے۔

اس سلسلے میں ہمارے بڑے شہری ہو۔ آد۔ بھگت نے ابھی جو وضاحت کی ہے اس سے معاملہ اور واصحہ ہونے کی بھائی اور کمہایکہ تھے ہو کہا ہے۔ میں ان کی دو ہاتھوں دھوانا چاہتا ہوں۔ ایک جمہہ انہوں نے کہا کہ ماحول خراب ہو کہا ہے۔ اس لئے پاکستان سے بات چھوڑ اس بھگت کی کئی۔ مہرا اتنا ہی کہدا ہے۔ کہ ماحول کو خراب کرنے کی پہلی ذمہ داری پاکستان کی ہی ہے۔ کیونکہ م

پردوک ہو گئے - پاکستان یا اس کے نمائندے کی - یا یہ ہو سکتا ہے کہ ہو اس کے لئے پر دکھنے بندوق چلانا چاہتے ہیں ان کی یہ چال ہی ہو - کہ وہ ہم کو پردوک کو دے - اور ہمارے بھیج جو دوستی کی بات چھٹ چل دھی ہے اس میں کچھ دخلہ یہا کو ہیں - تو تھوڑی دیر کے لئے ہی سہی وہ اپنی چال میں کامہاب ہو گئے - اس سلسلے میں شری کلدیپ نہ صاحب کا ایک جملہ کوت کونا چاہتا ہوں -

However the transcript of observations of the Indian and Pakistani delegates at the Commission indicate that one reacted to what the other said and both exceeded the limits which their Government had placed on that.

میں نے اس لئے کوت کیا کہ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہمارے بزرگ معزز میو بھگت صاحب جو لہمتوں کو کئی گئی تھی اس کو اکسیڈ کر گئے - اور وہ سب کچھ کہے گئے جو انہیں کہلے کی فردوست نہیں تھی - ان کو مخالفت فرود کرنی چاہئے تھی - لیکن پردوک نہیں ہونا چاہئے - پردوکشن دوسروں کا گھم تھا - اور پردوک ہو کر وہ دوسروں کے گیم میں آگئے اور اس طرح سے انہوں نے اپنا کوہلی بکار لایا - ہماری حکومت نے بھی بھائے اس نے کہ بات کو ہمیں ختم کو دیتی اس کو اسی طرح سے

سپریسائی لیا - اور جو ہمارے ہائی سلطنت پر خارجہ محتکہ کے سپریسائی کو مدارک میں ایک تیلہ بھائی بات چھٹ کو آگئے بڑھانے کے لئے پاکستان جانا چاہئے تھا اس کو ملتا ہی کر دیا - میں ایک باد پر اس بات کو دھوانا چاہوں گا کہ پاکستان سے دوستی ہو پاکستان کو امریکہ کے خلاف سے نکال سکتی ہے - کوئی اور دوسری چھڑ نہیں - اس لئے ہم کو بہت تھاڈے دماغ سے اس سمت قدم اٹھانا چاہئے - اور کوئی بھی موقعہ ہاتھ سے نہیں جائے دیتا چاہئے -

پلڈت جواہر لال نہرو کے زمانے میں جب وہ ہمارے ملک کے ہڈاں ملستہ تھے تو کافی عرصہ تک وہ وہ خارجہ ہی دے - اس وقت سے افریکی اور عرب ملکوں کی خصوصی اہمیت وزارت خارجہ میں دھی ہے - افریکی اور عرب دیشوں میں جو ہمارے جمیلہ نمائندے بھیجے جاتے تھے ان کو بہت اہمیت دی جاتی تھیں حالانکہ میں اپنے نمائندوں پر کوئی حملہ نہیں کرنا چاہتا کوئی آرپ نہیں لکانا چاہتا لوگوں یہ فردوکہدا چاہتا ہوں کہ جو اہمیت ہم کو افریکی اور عرب ملکوں کو دیلی چاہئے تھی وہ ہم نہیں دے دے - جتنے اچھے نمائندے ہم کو افریکی اور عرب دیشوں میں بھیج لے چاہئے تھے وہ ہم نہیں بھیج دے دیں - ان دیشوں سے تعلقات بوہانے میں پلڈت

[شہری اشراق حسنه]

جو اہر لال نہرو جی ہمہ ذاتی
دلچسپی لہتے رہتے تھے - ہمیں بھی
آن دیہوں کے ساتھ تعلقات بوجہانے
میں خاصی دلچسپی لہلی چاہئے -
ہمیں نہیں بھولنا چاہئے کہ پاکستان
کو اسلحہ فراہم کرنے میں امریکہ کا
فشار نہ تو افغانستان ہے اور نہ
سویت دوس ہے - بلکہ امریکہ کا
نشانہ ہندوستان ہے - وہ ایران اور
عراق کی جنگ کو موجہ ہمادے
بمعنوں ہالی کو بھی تھا کہنا چاہتا
ہے - آج جو اس نرگی کے دستے پر
انگے بڑھے رہے ہیں - اور جو تہل کے
بھولن سے نکلمہ کی کوشش کو دھے
ہوں اس کے لئے امریکہ کی نیت
ہے کہ ہماری توقی کی دیگار کو دعویٰ
کر دے - ہمیں امریکہ کو اس چال
کو اچھی طرح سے سمجھو لیتا چاہئے -

امریکہ جب یوم افغانستان میانہ
ہے تو اس کی ذرا بھی ہمدردی
افغانستان یا وہاں کے عوام سے نہیں
دھتی ہے - پچھلے ۲۱ مارچ کو ہے
جوش و خروش سے یوم افغانستان
میانہ کی تھا دی کی گئی - سادی
دنیا میں یوم افغانستان میانہ کی
تحمیک سب سے پہلے امریکی سیلت
میں خود صدر دیکن نے پیدھ کی ہے -
جس کی حمایت برطانیہ کے دونوں
ایوان اور یورپیں اقتصادی بروادی نے
کی لہکن جس عزائل نے امریکہ کی

شہ پر گولان یہ زیوں پر اک طرفہ
قہصہ کا علان سہلہ ذوقی سے کر دیا
تو ان میں سے کسی نے یوم گولان
میانہ کا علان نہیں کیا - کہاں کئی
ان کی اسلام اور مسلم دیہوں سے
ہمدردی - خوشی کی بات ہے کہ جب
کئی اسلامی نظریات دکھلے والے لوگ
بھی امریکی چال سے وافق ہونے لگے
ہیں - جماعت اسلامی کا ہفت دوڑہ
'دعوت' بھی یوم افغانستان کو عرب
و نیا سیاسی ستھت ماننے لکا ہے -
اور یہاں تک کہتے لکا ہے -

امریکہ اور دوس سے ملکوں کے اس
مسلسل اور طرفہ قدر سے یہ اندازہ
ہوتا ہے کہ وہ اس کے خلاف اپنی
مددز آدائی کے لئے افغانستان کے سلسلے
کو صرف ڈنڈہ دکھنے سے ہی دلچسپی
دکھتے ہیں -

"دعوت موجودہ ہے"

اس بات سے کسی کو انکار نہیں
ہوگا کہ جلتا دود حکومت میں
پاسپورٹ آسانیاں فراہم کی گئی تھیں
اور آج کل اس سلسلے میں دھرے
دھیرے کچھ سختی لائی جا رہی
ہے کچھ تو یہ بھی بات ہے -
پاسپورٹ کی درخواست ہیلے والوں
کی تعداد میں بھی خاصہ اضافہ
ہوا ہے - دیجیتل پاسپورٹ آفس
کو اگر مزید مستاف کی ضرورت ہو
تو اسے فراہم کرنا چاہئے - ہو سنتا

ہے کہ سرکار کی ہدایتی میں کوئی تهدیاں ہوئی ہو لیکن مہدا کہنا یہ ہے کہ جو لوگ اس طرح سے اپنے ملک سے باہر جانا چاہتے ہیں ان کو جانے کا موقع دیتا چاہتے ہیں ان کو سہولت دیتی چاہتے ہیں پاسپورٹ حاصل کرنے کے دستے میں ہو بھی مشکلات ہی انہیں دو دُرنا چاہتے ہیں ۔

چھوٹے میں صاحب اب میں ایک انسانی حصے کی طرف اپنے لائق وزیر خارجہ کا خصوصی توجہ دلانا چاہوں گا جس کو طرف اس بحث میں شاید کہی نہ ہو بھی نہ ہو اور ہر سال مسلمانوں کے لئے ایک قریبی فرض ہے اور ہندوستان مسلمانوں کی تعداد ہے لفاظ سے دوسرے نمبر پر ہے ۔ لیکن یہاں سے حج کو جانے والے مسلمانوں کی تعداد کو دیکھا جائے تو ہندوستان سے جانے والے حاجیوں کی تعداد دوسرے ممالک سے جانے والوں نے مقابلے بہت کم ہے ۔ مثال کے طور پر اندونیشیا سے 69002 ملکیتیا سے 22704 اور پاکستان سے جہاں مسلمانوں کی آبادی ہم سے کم ہے ۔ 69343 حجاجت 1981 حج کے لئے سعودی عرب کئے جن کے مقابلے میں ہمارے ہاں سے 21280 حاجیوں کو حجاجت نامہ مل سکا ۔ اس تعداد میں ہوائی ہواں جہاں سے بھری جہاں سے جانے والے سبھی

حجاجی شامل ہیں ۔ 1979 میں ہندوستان سے بھری دامتہ سے 15005 حاجی تشریف لے کئے تھے ۔ 1981 میں یہ تعداد کوت کو 3245 اور 9915 کی اور 1982 کے لئے یہ تعداد 9915 کئی ہے ۔

پہلے ذون لائیں کی طرف سے چاد بھری جہاں اس کام کے لئے لکائے جاتے تو ۔ اب یہ دو کر دئے کئے ہیں ۔ یہ سچ ہے کہ سعودی عرب حکومت کی طرف سے قبل دھنمان حاجیوں کی دوازگی پر پابندی لکا دی کئی تھی، لیکن اس پابندی سے پہلے بھی ہر سال ہزاروں کی تعداد میں دہمداد مسلمان اپنے اس مقدم قریبی فرض کو ادا کرنے سے محروم رہ جاتے تھے اور اس سال تو اس تعداد میں قریب چاد عزاد کی اور کمی اکٹھی ہے ۔ دنیا میں مسلمانوں کی دوسری سب سے بڑی آبادی ہندوستان میں دشی ہے ۔ اور یہاں سے پاکستان کے اور اندونیشیا کے 69000 اور ملکیتیا کے 22000 کے مقابلے حاجیوں میں بھی بھی 4000 مزید کم کر دئے کئے ہیں ۔ یہ ہمارے لئے شرم کی بات ہے ۔ کم از کم (30000) حاجی بھی جلی کا انتظام کرنا ہماری ذمہ داری ہے ۔ سعودی عرب حکومت پر الزام لکا کہ ہم اپنی ذمہ داری سے بھی نہیں ہو سکتے ۔ بھارت کے مسلمان براہر کے شہری

[شیو اشراق حسین]

ہم اور ان کو ان کے مقدم مذہبی طریقہ سے ادا نہیں کیں ہیں مگر طرح کی سہولت پہنچانا حکومت ہند کی ذمہ دادی ہے ۔ اگر ہمارے پیاس اپنے بھروسی جہاز کی کسی ہے ۔ تو اس خاص کام کے لئے بھروسی جہاز چادر کرنے چاہئے ۔ ہماری اپنی کمی اور کوتاہی کی وجہ سے حاجی نہ جا سکتے اور ہم سعودی عرب حکومت ہر الزام لتا کر یا یہ کہہ کر کہ جو لوگ بھروسی داستے سے نہ جا سکتے وہ ہوائی جہاز سے چلے جائیں ۔ یہ توهہ ک نہیں ہے ۔ جن اور ہم دوسری نہیں دے سکتے کہاں کو ہم کوک کہانے کی صلاح دیں گے ہماں ان کی دوسری کا انتظام کریں گے ۔ آپ جانتے ہوئے کہ میں یہ اس لئے دوسرے دعا ہوں کہ بھروسی داستے سے جانے میں پہسہ کم لگتا ہے ۔ اور ہوائی داستے سے جانے سے پہسہ زیادہ لگتا ہے ۔ اور مسلمانوں کو ایسی بہت بڑی تعداد ہے جو کم پہسے خروج کر کے اپنے اس اہم فرض کو ادا کر سکتی ہے ۔

حج کمیتی کی سطح پر جو کوئی ہے چاہیے وہ مرکزی حج کمیتی ہو چاہئے دیاستو حج کمیتی لن کی طرف بھی خاص توجہ کی ضرورت ہے ۔ جو ۔ پر ۔ کی دیاستو حج کمیتی کارگردگی سے تو عام پر اطمینانو ہے ۔

اردو اخبارات لس سے بہرہ پڑے ہیں ۔ اور ان کے تصدیل میں جانے کا وقت نہیں ہے ۔ حج کمیتی کی طرف سے 100 روپیے کی 50 روپیے کی حاجی ہر سال وصول کیا جاتا ہے ۔ حاجیوں کی بیٹھی میں ہمارے تک سہولتیہیں پہنچانے کے لئے لہائی حاجی جس پریشانی کو حالت میں وقت گزارتے ہیں وہ بیان کے باہر ہے ۔ حاجیوں کے لئے بیٹھی میں مزید مسافر خانے کی تعمیر اہم خروجی ہے ۔

حج کے ایام میں جدہ میں مکہ شریف میں مدیلہ مادورہ میں اور سہلہا میں حاجیوں کی دیکھی بھال پرے طور پر مقوم کے ذمہ چھوڑ دی جاتی ہے ۔ مددوستگانی سفارت خانے دو جو خوب خہرو کریں چاہئے وہ نہیں ہوتی ہے ۔ دوسرے ممالک کا بھی سفارتی عملہ ایام حج ان جگہوں ہر دھننا ہے ۔ اور ان لوگوں کی طرف سے اپنے اپنے ملک کے حاجیوں کو ہر طرح کی سہولتیہیں فراہم کی جانی ہیں ۔ لیکن ہماری طرف سے طبی سہولت بھی نام کے لئے ہے ۔ فاکتو اگر مل ہو جائے کا تو دوا مملے کا دوسری موال ہو نہیں ہے ۔ اگر عملے کی کمی ہو ۔ فلڈ کی کمی ہو تو اسے پورا کوئی جائے ۔ اگر بد انتظامی ہو تو اسے دود کہا جائے ۔ اس سے

ہمارے ملک کے حاجوں کو تکلیف
اور ہدیشانی اپنائی ہوتی ہے - اور
دوسروں کی نظر میں حقاری ذلت
اور دسوائی کا مامنا کرنا ہوتا ہے -
اس کی طرف خصوصی توجہ ہمارے
وزیر ہیں گے - ایسی ہمیں امید ہے -

ایک بات اور کہہ کر میں اپنی
بات ختم کرنا چاہتا ہوں - اور وہ
یہ ہے کہ اپنے یونائٹڈ نیشن کی
تس آرمامنیت کانفرنس میں ہماری
سرکار نے اپنا دول ادا کیا تھا اور
محکمہ امید ہے دوسری کانفرنس جو
جلد ہوئے والی ہے اس میں ہی
اپنا دول ادا کرنے میں ہم کسی نہ
کو ہیں کے -

SHRIMATI JAYANTI PATNAIK (Cuttack): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the discussion on Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs assumes importance in the background of the difficult and complicated international situation prevailing in the world today. Cold War is in fever pitch, thanks to the continued confrontation of super powers and the intransigence of the United States of America. The oil crisis and galloping inflation have become serious problems affecting international relationships. Tension moulders in various parts of the world including the Middle-East. Arms build-up by developed countries—even many developing countries—is in an alarming scale. Many smaller nations intend acquiring nuclear teeth. Across our own border, the spectre of war preparations is evident. Protectionism in global trade and commerce has affected economic relationships among nations to a great extent. In the prevailing circumstances, external relation is a very delicate responsibility. Diplomacy is important for a nation's pre-

servation and economic well-being as it was never before. The meaning of diplomacy is shrewdness defined by Chanakya, yet it takes into account the larger perspective and far-sighted vision and national interest. India has to consider its position on the map, the countries which are its neighbours, the policies it adopts and the action it takes. These are the things that the country has to take into account in its foreign policy.

I must congratulate the Prime Minister and the Minister for External Affairs for being alive to the situation prevailing today. We are acquiring many new friends and we have also stabilised our relationship with the existing friends. Our relations with our old friend, the Soviet Union, contrary to the opinion of many new self-styled analysts, are cordial as before. It happens so even in the event of the fact that India had made known its views on the Soviet presence in Afghanistan. In spite of the differences in their political systems, the relationship between these countries is being maintained on very friendly terms. The recent visit of General Ustinov reiterates this relationship. Our political and economic relationship with the United Kingdom and France is better than ever before and we have been able to successfully negotiate, bilateral trade, economic and industrial ventures including defence ventures in these two countries. Our success in negotiating the I.M.F. loan in spite of the violent opposition by the U.S.A. is an indication of our new relationship and influences brought about through subtle diplomatic manoeuvres.

Here, the question with regard to our relations with the European countries also arises. During President Reagan's rule, a rapture had taken place in Indo-American relations though such a thing never happened in the past in spite of disagreements between the two countries in many fields. It is not only India but other countries also, who did not support President Reagan's policy, were cold shouldered. Many of the third world countries come in this cate-

[Smt. Jayanti Patnaik]

gory. These countries are told by the United States that either they should support President Reagan's line of thinking, or they should go their own way.

One might say that India needs American market and technology. It is true, but it is not *vice versa*. India cannot, therefore, afford to perpetuate the Indo-American estrangement. I might also say that India cannot align itself with the American view, as it is in direct conflict with India's regional interests. One might say that balance should be maintained. Such a balance was struck all these years with some advantage to India, but with Reagan Administration deliberately downgrading India, such a balance has become irrelevant to America. India had endeavoured to establish better mutual understanding. The meeting between our Prime Minister and the U.S. President at Cancun and between our Minister of External Affairs and the U.S. Secretary of State contributed to this process. But America's supply of arms to Pakistan and its decision to suspend further shipments of fuel for Tarapur Atomic Power Station have aroused apprehension and disagreement.

One bright spot for India in this context is that India's policy on a number of issues is increasingly becoming similar to the policies of America's European allies, specially after the election of Mitterand as the French President. Europe's perceptions on detente, arms spending, positioning of nuclear missiles in Europe and the neutron bomb are very different from America's. Besides, Europeans do not see the North-South issues wholly on East-West lines.

In view of this, India in her own interest may have closer links with European international forums, at least for countering America's current devaluation of India's strategic role.

In the wake of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, there might be pressure

on Pakistan from Soviet side, that Pakistan is going too far in aiding and abetting the U.S.-backed insurgency in Afghanistan. Pakistan, while asserting that it has not sold itself to America, might try to be nearer America to strengthen its army to fight another war with India, or against secessionist forces like the Baluchis. India might not have expressed its distress on Soviet intervention loudly, but it has made that distress plain in more direct ways. This has not been appreciated by America, unlike the European nations.

India maintains that friendship with the Soviets is not incompatible with amicable ties with other countries, and it would indicate to America that India has a more strategic role to play; and, therefore, it cannot just be written off.

Coming to our neighbours unfortunately the military regime in Pakistan has created a problem across the border. Its trying to arm itself with sophisticated weapons and achieve nuclear capability with the help of America has changed the whole concept of stability of the Indian sub-continent. It is strange that Pakistan pays lip service to No-war Pact with India, while building up sophisticated arms supply and unleashing adverse propaganda from time to time. Recent occurrences in the Human Rights Conference in Geneva and unfortunate references to Kashmir where the people and the leadership have cemented their relationship permanently with India, is an example of Pakistan's intentions. The Prime Minister has rightly recognized the No-war Pact to be ruse to lull us into a false sense of security.

However, it is the right stand for India to press on the fact that both the countries are to settle their differences bilaterally, and through peaceful means. The Minister has rightly announced the fact, to wait before we go to Pakistan until the vitiated atmosphere improves.

India has pursued the policy of positive non-alignment from the time of

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru; and non-alignment has completed more than 30 years and has come to a stage where it has attained a certain maturity on the basis of which we can go ahead with greater confidence. The aligned ones are preparing for the destruction of the world. To preserve our sovereign independence, maintain the freedom of judgment and action, to promote internal peace and stability reduce world tensions and proceed towards the building of new international economic order is the essence of non-alignment. Non-alignment is of greater relevance today because the non-aligned nations can exert great influence on the two power blocs to defuse global crises both in the political and economic fields. India must accept the leadership of non-aligned third world countries as the choice naturally falls on her. We admit that the Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs have taken some positive steps in this direction. Earlier in Cancun and recently in New Delhi we have used the forums to project our viewpoints successfully.

Projection of India's image abroad is one of the most important objectives. I believe that present efforts in this direction have to be strengthened and enhanced specially in the area of Latin American countries, Middle East and South-East Asia. Latin America is an area where India has to be known much more. Of course, the relations between India and Latin American countries were somewhat formal to start with but had undergone change to reach the present level of friendship, cordiality and mutual respect. Shrimati Indira Gandhi, during her stay at Cancun had met many heads of the government of the countries of this region. The Minister of External Affairs participated in the International Conference in economic cooperation among the developing countries held at Venezuela. The Minister of State for Energy also attended the independence celebrations of the British colony of Belize. A Parliamentary Delegation led by the Speaker had also gone to Cuba. The Minister of Commerce had

gone to Argentina to preside over the Conference of the Indian commercial representatives in Latin America and the Middle East. I am saying about these things, still, India has to be much more known in these countries, because these nations are rapidly emerging and offering vast potential for trade and commerce. The Middle East is our market for petroleum and a possible focus of international conflagration. For strategic and some other reasons, we should also not like South East Asian countries to be a close preserve only of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and China. I would request that a comprehensive strategy be worked out to increase our involvement in these areas. The strategy should consist of strengthening our Embassies and Consular offices, effective dissemination of information about our policies, programmes, culture and heritage, strengthening of trade relationship and visits

17 hrs.

and we must be in a position to respond to the developing situation in these parts taking a definite view at the earliest opportune moment. Such a response is often the beginning of an enduring relationship. Our Embassies in these areas should be fully geared to achieve these objectives.

Another point I would like to emphasise is the strengthening of technical aid to our neighbouring countries and other Afro-Asian countries. At present our technical and economic aid to these countries is not very appreciable. While due to obvious resource constraints, we cannot go in for large economic aid programmes, there is no reason why our technical aid programmes should not be intensified. In various scientific and technical fields, India has already achieved high degrees of excellence. Our Embassies and Consular offices should explore the areas of technical cooperation and we should be able to send our technical personnel and make available our expertise to these countries. I would

[Smt. Jayanti Patnaik]

request that a conscious policy be worked out in this direction.

Before I conclude, I would like to speak a few words about our role in the United Nations. A time has come when we should use this forum more aggressively to win friends and influence nations. Ambivalence or defensive attitude would not help. A stand has to be taken at the right time in keeping with our policy of positive non-alignment on various bilateral and global issues. I am happy that during the last two years under the direction of our Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs, we have been making effective use of the forum of the United Nations. We are facing challenges today. The main object of our foreign policy is to promote our ideals, preserve our national interests in the prevailing global situation and to strengthen our non-alignment movement, disarmament, elimination of colonialism and racism and march towards the new international economic order.

With these words, I support the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.

17.05 hrs.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: CANCELLATION OF SITTING ON 2ND APRIL, 1982

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR (Hamirpur): There is an important thing that we want to request. Ramnavami is coming and the House is scheduled to meet on that day. We must have a holiday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you mean, by saying, it is coming?

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR: It is on 2nd April.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to know from the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, because time has been allotted for discussion of the Grants of the various Ministries. And if the House does not sit for one day, may be, there will be certain problems. In this connection I want to know whether he has consulted some Opposition Leaders on this issue or if the Opposition Members....(Interruptions).

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : सभापति जी, संसद्-सदस्य के नाते हम तो किसी भी दिन काम करने को तैयार हैं, मगर संसद् में बहुत से कर्मचारी भी जुड़े हुए हैं, रामनवमी की छुट्टी न हो, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता।

श्री मान भाई बारोट (अहमदाबाद) : यह तो हम भी जानते हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : आप मान तो रहे हैं, मगर आपने फैसला कर दिया कि नहीं होगी।

श्री नारायण चन्द्र पारागर : मान रहे हैं हम।

सभापति महोदय : ठीक है, अगर किसी को और इसमें एतराज नहीं है तो मैं पालियामेंटरी अफेयर्स के मिनिस्टर से जानना चाहता हूँ कि उनकी राय क्या है?

संसदीय कार्य तथा निर्माण और आवास मंत्री (श्री भीष्म नारायण सिंह) : यह बात सही है कि सदन इस बजट पर विचार कर रहा है और डिफरेन्ट मिनिस्ट्रीज की डिमांड्ज चल रही हैं, लेकिन ऐसा कभी नहीं हुआ कि