

[श्री अटलबिहारी वाजपेयी]

आप ने कुछ डायरेक्शन, इसू किये हैं, जिनके अनुसार अगर आप चाहें, तो आप ध्यान-दिलाओ सूचना पहले ले सकते हैं। मैं आप के अधिकार को चुनौती नहीं दे रहा हूँ। आप के निर्देश स्पष्ट हैं कि अगर आप चाहें तो आप स्थगन-प्रस्ताव से पहले ध्यान-दिलाओ सूचना ले सकते हैं। लेकिन मेरा निवेदन है कि यह जो स्थगन प्रस्ताव लाया जा रहा है, वह उसी विषय से सम्बन्धित है, जिस पर ध्यान-दिलाओ सूचना दी गई है और जिस पर प्रधान मंत्री महोदय बतलवाते जा रही हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि स्थगन-प्रस्ताव पहले लेना चाहिए और प्रधान मंत्री महोदय जो कुछ कहना हो, स्थगन प्रस्ताव पर जो चर्चा होगी, उस में वह कह सकती हैं। इस समय उस के लिए समय दिया जाये, इस की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

MR. SPEAKER: The rules are very clear. Please see the Directions—Questions, Call attention notices, leave to motions for adjournment etc. These were not written today.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAEYEE: 'Unless the Speaker otherwise directs'. I want you to direct otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Patodia.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore): I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that she make a statement thereon:

The reported massive supply of arms including lethal weapons by the USSR to Pakistan and the resulting danger to India's security.

SHRI M. L. SONDHY (New Delhi): And to Mrs. Gandhi!

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—(SHRIMATI

INDIRA GANDHI): I have already publicly expressed my own and the

Government's concern at the Soviet intention to supply arms to Pakistan. This concern has been voiced throughout the country. We have also conveyed our feelings and reactions to the Soviet Government.

Before I refer to the exchanges which have taken place between the Soviet Union and ourselves on this subject, I should like the House to bear in mind that international relations, as a whole, are in a particularly fluid state at the present time. The old landmarks, the rigid divisions between rival blocs, appear to be in the process of disintegration, although they have by no means disappeared. Every nation, whether member of a bloc or not, is trying to assert its own individuality in the conduct of its policies. The USA and the Soviet Union, conscious of the need to reduce the danger of a direct clash between them, are evidently reshaping their policies in accordance with the changing conditions.

In these circumstances, our policy of peace and friendship with all, and of freedom to assess every issue on its merits, while firmly upholding our own national independence and dignity, which is the essence of non-alignment, has been fully vindicated.

SHRI RANGA (Srikulam): Question.... (Interruption).

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: About three weeks ago, we received an indication from the Soviet Government of their intention to supply some military equipment to Pakistan. I wrote to Chairman Kosygin expressing our concern and pointing out the possible consequences and dangers of such a move.

We had explained to the Soviet Union that Pakistan had no reasonable justification to seek the augmentation of its armed strength. We also pointed out that Pakistan had received, by way of gift, vast quantities of arms and equipment between the years 1964 and 1965 as a member of military alliances.

And, as we had apprehended, Pakistan did eventually use these against us.

The attention of the Soviet Government was also drawn to the fact that Pakistan was getting arms not only from her allies, but also from China, in large quantities. Inevitably, this accretion of strength had the effect of encouraging Pakistan in its intransigent and aggressive attitude towards India.

We further pointed out to the Soviet Union that Pakistan does not, in fact, face any external threat. During the last 20 years Pakistan had committed aggression against us on three occasions. Pakistan is accumulating arms only for use against India. We also pointed to our successive offers of a No-War Pact which Pakistan had repeatedly rejected. As for Pakistan's protestations of peaceful intentions, we have pointed out to the Soviet Union that in spite of the assurances given to us by the USA, Pakistan was not inhibited in using American arms against India in the Kutch conflict, and subsequently in August 1965. The USA could not prevent in from so doing.

In these circumstances, we cannot but view with concern this further accretion of armed strength to Pakistan. The unavoidable consequence would be to accentuate tension in the sub-continent and to add to our responsibilities in regard to the defence and security of our country. It will make Pakistan even more intransigent than she has been. Indeed, some recent pronouncements made by leaders of the Pakistan Government confirm this.

The Soviet Union, like any other country, is entitled to form her own judgement as to where her interests lie and how to promote them. But we are bound to express our misgivings and apprehensions to the Soviet leaders in all frankness. We do not question either the motives or the good

faith of the Soviet Union, but we are convinced that this development cannot promote the cause of peace and stability in the sub-continent.

The Soviet Union have reassured us regarding the firm foundations on which their friendship for our country is based. They have further assured us that they would not do anything to weaken friendship with our country or to injure our interests. They have also informed us that they have told the authorities in Pakistan that they will stand by their agreements with India and fulfil all their commitments to us.

The relations between India and the Soviet Union are many sided. They embrace many fields of our national endeavour. The new development should therefore be seen in the context of the totality of these relations.

We have to face this development as it presents itself. We do not know whether the Soviet Union has yet formalised an agreement with Pakistan for the supply of arms, nor do we have indications of the quantum or character of these arms or the terms and conditions of their delivery.

As I have earlier said, we view this development with concern. I have no doubt that Parliament and the nation will react to the situation with composure and dignity. As always, the defence and security of the country will remain our paramount concern. We are confident that we can ensure this with the full support of a united people.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: Sir, to say the least, the statement made by the Prime Minister has been most unfortunate because it ignores certain vital factors of this particular case. While the Prime Minister has recognised the changing attitude of powers like the USA and the USSR, she has bluntly refused to accept any change so far as India's policy is concerned, and, at its minimum, the policy of appeasement

(Shri D. N. Patodia).

of India has completely failed. Russia has learned how to ignore India and in that process the result is that the country which was considered to be the best friend of India is now supplying arms and ammunition to a country which is the worst enemy of India.

What is this non-alignment where a country like Pakistan which is so much aligned is getting arms and ammunition from all over the world, from CENTO, SEATO, from NATO, from the United States and China and now from Russia?

This is the policy; this cannot be considered in isolation. This is the terminating point of peaceful, appeasing policy of the Government of India from time to time.

Before coming to the question. I want to make a small observation. The Government of India had been pursuing a policy of appeasement. It is significant to note that as they have been following a policy of appeasement, the Russians have started neglecting, ignoring and even humiliating India on various points. For instance, take the case of Radio Peace and Progress. How many protests the Government of India had lodged with the Russian Government and what is their reaction? Even as late as in the month of June, they have started criticising on leaders. Another case is with regard to the world map published by the Soviet Union in 1967; the protest was lodged in 1955, 13 years back. In spite of protests, in spite of the letters of the Government of India, the Russian Government have again put the same things. Coming to the supply of arms, the Prime Minister said that they are not aware of the details, and the nature of the deal or the nature of the armaments. What is this? This affects both diplomacy as well as intelligence. Is our intelligence so weak? Secondly, are the Russians not prepared to take us into confidence even to this extent that they do not give us the information about arms and ammunitions?

I put it to the Prime Minister. These are the kinds of weapons which are supplied by Russia: under this agreement: radars, ground-to-air missiles etc. They are supplying armoured vehicles which will replace the tanks; they are faster and very suitable for desert areas. They are supplying anti-aircraft guns and they are supplying helicopters: and what type of helicopters? The helicopters which are being used by the United States in Vietnam: 24 seaters, and they are supplying TU-16. I want to know what is the Intelligence Department of the Government of India doing; they are not able to procure the information.

My question is this. May I know from the Prime Minister whether the policy of appeasement will now be stopped, and whether the Government will adopt a more realistic policy—an honest non-alignment. Will the Government be prepared to express in categorical terms the complete disapproval of the Russian move and will the Government tell Russia clearly that India will not tolerate interference of Russia in local affairs, like Novosti, like Radio Peace and Progress. Whether the Government of India is willing to terminate and cancel all such trade agreements which have gone against Indian interests and whether they are prepared to consider trade agreements on the basis of free trade agreements? These are the basic questions for which I would like to have a reply of the Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:
rose—

SHRI RANGA: Not ready for it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It is not a question of being not ready now because no new questions have been asked. These are the things which the Swatantra party have been saying on every single no-confidence debate, which, as you know, comes up in every session of Parliament.

Sir, I strongly protest when the hon. Member describe our policy as one of appeasement. It has never been one of appeasement. Had this been a foreign policy debate, I could have gone into the details. If you would like me to make a long speech I can do so now, but I am sure that this is not your intention. I am very glad that lately the Swatantra Party which was extremely allergic to the word 'non-alignment' seems to have adopted it had taken it to its bosom so to speak (*Interruption*). Their complaint now is not against our policy but that we are not following our declared policy. I think this is the complaint which they are making. I see the hon. Member, Shri Dange smiling. They have exactly the same complaint but the other way round. They say that while we say we are non-aligned in actual fact we are trying to appease the western powers (*Interruption*).

We have followed a particular policy and, as I said, and I most emphatically want to state, that policy has served the interests of this country (*An Hon. Member: Question?*). The friendship that we have had with the Soviet Union has helped us on many occasions whether in the Security Council or in other matters.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: What about the future?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The future is another matter. You have referred to the past. The question is, our policy has helped us. When Pakistan was getting, as I said in my statement, a very vast amount of military equipment as free gift—it was not a question of credit, it was not a question of sale of arms as it is now but free gift from its military allies—that was the time when we were helped by the friendship of the Soviet Union. As I have said, today the whole policy of alignments has weakened all over the world. Every nation is trying to build bridges with other nations (*Interruptions*). We are also building bridges with such countries with whom we

did not have them before. Some of my recent tours and the Deputy Prime Minister's tour are evidence of this fact (*Interruption*).

SHRI M. L. SONDH: If USSR sends troops across the border to Czechoslovakia, let the Prime Minister warn the Soviet Union that something will happen here in Delhi.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I hope the hon. Member will go there and help them to defend themselves (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: This is not proper. I would request all of you to resume your seats. This is not the way to conduct the proceedings here. Whatever may have happened, we have to discuss it in a calm atmosphere. One should ask questions after the other; not all of you getting up and shouting even though you may have differences of opinion. In a multi-party system we have our differences, but this is not the way to express our differences. I take it that the Prime Minister has replied to the earlier question.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi): Sir, I protest against this. When specific questions are put I do not want or expect the Prime Minister to beat about the bush. She should reply to them specifically.

MR. SPEAKER: That is all right.... (*Interruptions*) Order, order. I want peace in this House. Even after this Calling Attention, adjournment motion and other things are yet to come up. Let us proceed in a calm way. It is an important subject; there is no doubt about it. But let us not get excited. Now, Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: Sir, there has been no reply to my question. I am entitled to a reply. This is not fair. I seek your protection.

MR. SPEAKER: Whatever might have been asked by you, the main question is about the supply of arms

[Mr. Speaker]

to Pakistan. Though you have brought in so many other things, I am not prepared to accept them and the Prime Minister is not expected to reply to them. Even if the Prime Minister is prepared to answer them, I am not prepared to allow it. She may answer all those things when we take up the other subjects; not now in the calling attention. The Calling Attention is about arms supply to Pakistan and she has replied to it. All other things will come in the evening. Now, Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha,

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh): May I know what is the reaction of the Government to the fact that while referring to Indo-Pak relations the Indo-Soviet communique goes on record that "the Soviet side appreciated the mutual efforts made by both sides to improve Indo-Pakistan relations"? I am asking this question because this is the first time the Soviet Union is equating India with Pakistan. According to their own earlier pronouncements, they were always saying that Pakistan has consistently violated peace on our borders and has increased tension. Does it not indicate a shift in Soviet policy, which gets further high-lighted by the Soviet Prime Minister's letter to the Indian Prime Minister in which he mentions that Ganga water dispute could be settled more or less on the lines the Indus Water Dispute between India and Pakistan? Will Government clarify as to what exactly is the significance of these words in the Indo-Soviet communique issued during the visit of the Indian President? Also, what is the significance of the letter of the Soviet Prime Minister in which he says that the Ganga water issue should be settled more or less on the lines of the Indus Water between India and Pakistan?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Premier Kosygin has not made any specific suggestion, as has been mentioned by the hon. Member.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: These are the words from the joint communique.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am talking about the letter where reference to Indus water and Ganga water was made.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Why not place a copy of the letter on the Table of the House so that Parliament will know what it contains?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: This letter refers to several matters which require to be settled by mutual agreement. In the portion which refers to the Farakka barrage he expressed the hope that India and Pakistan would find a mutually acceptable solution. He has not suggested mediation by any third party.

SHRI RANGA: There is no such thing as mutual discussion..... (Interruption).

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The first part is regarding the communique in which they have equated India's and Pakistan's efforts at implementing the Tashkent Agreement..... (Interruption). I have already said that the Soviet Union is trying to be friendly with these other countries with which they were not so before. To that extent there is a move. That nobody denies. As I said, the Soviet Union are being friends with other countries but not necessarily at the cost of their friendship with us. It is the same with other countries. As I said in my statement, we have to look at this matter in that broader context that now every nation is trying to build bridges with other countries..... (Interruption). We also have, as I pointed out earlier in reply to my hon. friend's question there..... (Interruption).

MR. SPEAKER: She asked about equating Ganga waters and Indus waters.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: That I have replied. The equating is not with regard to the waters but with

regard to the implementation of the Tashkent Agreement. In most communiques, we state our views but that does not mean that the other side fully accepts our views. Here also, it is our view that we are implementing the Tashkent Agreement and many of our steps have been unilateral steps. There has not been the same response from the side of Pakistan. We have put this to them very clearly.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We failed to convince the Soviet.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The question is not whether we convince them on this matter or not but whether they consider that in order to influence Pakistan they have to take a particular stand.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: What I am concerned is about the Indo-Soviet communique. The Indo-Soviet communique was approved by the President and his advisers who went with him. These words find a place in the Indo-Soviet communique with which Pakistan had nothing to do. What we are concerned about is the Soviet attitude. For the first time the Soviet Union in the joint Indo-Soviet communique have said that these two countries are making mutual efforts for bringing about peace. This is in contradiction to the Soviet Union's earlier pronouncements in which they had already accepted a stand that Pakistan had been adding to the tension in the sub-continent and that Pakistan had consistently violated the Indian border. I would like the Prime Minister to clarify that point.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: No, Sir. I would like to correct the hon. Member. At no time have they made any such remark regarding the Tashkent Declaration... (*Interruption*).

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore): We feel that this arms deal has given a serious jolt to Indo-Soviet relations. Since 1965 to this date there has been a shift in the Soviet attitude towards India. I have no quarrel with Soviet Russia. Many in India would like that we should maintain better relations with Soviet Russia. But what I would say here is that this Government deliberately indulges in self-deception and puts the entire country under an illusion by not conveying the nation's anger, anxiety and indignation from time to time about the reported Pak arms deal. Without suppressing these vital facts from Russia, today we are in a soup. Therefore, this ignominious failure of quasi-setellitic foreign policy of the Government of India has landed up in a soup and the country will pay a heavy price for it. I charge this Government....

MR. SPEAKER: I want you to put a question.

SHRI S. KUNDU: What the country expected was that the Government should have, in right time, conveyed the goods of Moscow our strong feelings. These minimum things our Government has not done.

I would like to put three specific questions. Firstly, the Prime Minister said we are concerned about misgivings and misapprehensions. My comrade, Shri Nathi Pal, has given a resolution saying that the entire House regrets over this issue. Why did not the Prime Minister accept this resolution? If there is really a genuine desire to convey our misgivings and misapprehensions, the Prime Minister should have accepted the resolution.

Secondly, will the Prime Minister admit that from 1965 onwards till today there is a shift in the foreign India?

(Shri S. Kundu)

Thirdly, the Prime Minister has said that she does not know the quantum of arms which have been dumped into Pakistan or which have been promised to Pakistan. Still she has not said, by such, I should say, under-hand dealings, there is a possible threat to the security of India and peace in this sub-continent.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I thought I had explained the point about a shift in policy. I have twice repeated it here. I do not think there is any need for repetition. Regarding Shri Nath Pai's resolution, I think, there are very good reasons for not supporting the resolution. Firstly, we did not do any such thing in 1954 because we did not consider it necessary to formalise the opinion of this House the form of a resolution. It is quite incorrect to say that we have not protested or expressed, in very clear terms, the Government's reaction as to what might be the likely reaction of our people to any such move on the part of the Soviet Union.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai): Why don't you allow Parliament to express the reaction of the people? (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: No please. Please answer only Shri Kundu's question.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I have just said I did not see the need to formalise our views in this manner, when we have never done so before. This is not the first country that is selling arms to Pakistan. There are very many countries..... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. KUNDU: Not at our cost.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Our cost is Pakistan is getting more arms (*Interruption*). If a country has been friendly to us, it does not mean that we have to hit them harder when they do something like that. I do not think it will serve any useful purpose either here in India, or with regard to the many nations with whom we have dealings. About the

third part of the hon. Member's question, I am sure, the House would realise that no country wants to advertise what they are supplying to other countries. Even if we get to know something, it is not possible to declare it on the floor of the House, just as we would not like others to declare what we are supplied.

SHRI S. KUNDU: My last question has not been replied to. I would like to put it again. If she does not know the quantum of arms which is supplied to Pakistan, how does she say that the threat to India's security has not increased? (*Interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER: She said that even if she knows, she is not going to declare on the floor of the House and make it public. She also said what we are offered cannot be declared here.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur). This is not what was said. The question was....

MR. SPEAKER: No please. I have called Mr. Devgun.

SHRI NATH PAI: The question is this. If you do not know the quantum of arms and equipment supplied by the Soviet Union to Pakistan, how do you reach the conclusion that the threat to our security has not enhanced? How is this conclusion to be accepted?

MR. SPEAKER: I am satisfied with the answer. She said she does not know.... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI NATH PAI: It has not been answered to our satisfaction.

MR. SPEAKER: I am satisfied. She has said that even if she knows, she is not going to announce it here.

SHRI NATH PAI: You have not followed my question, Sir. We do not want to know the quantum... (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot allow this. If one question takes 15 minutes, then how can we proceed?

SHRI NATH PAI: Even you are misunderstanding.

MR. SPEAKER: This is supposed to be a call-attention, but this is turning out to be a one-hour debate.

SHRI HEM BARUA: On a point of order. How can she say this that even if she knows the quantum, she is not going to disclose? She can say that she cannot disclose it in public interest. But she has not said that.

MR. SPEAKER: That is alright. Mr. Devgun.

श्री हरबयाल बेवगुण (पूर्व दिल्ली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है उसमें कई बातों पर प्रकाश भी डाला है और कुछ बातें उन्होंने मानी भी हैं। सन् 54 से 65 पाकिस्तान को जो हथियार मिले उनके कारण तीन बार पाकिस्तान ने भारत पर आक्रमण किया, यह उन्होंने कहा है। इसका अर्थ यह है कि अब पाकिस्तान को जो हथियार मिल रहे हैं उससे भारत पर एक बार और आक्रमण होने की संभावना है। ऐसी जो भयंकर परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हुई है उसकी सूचना भारत सरकार को कब मिली जहाँ तक हमें जानकारी प्राप्त है, हमारे राष्ट्रपति जब रूस के गुडविल मिशन पर जा रहे थे तो उससे एक दो दिन पहले सूचना मिली थी। यह पहला उपहार हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी को, उनके यहाँ से जाने से पहले, रूस ने भेंट किया। यदि यह ऐसी गम्भीर परिस्थिति है जिस पर प्रधान मंत्री चिन्ता व्यक्त करती हैं तो फिर उन्होंने इसके विरोध स्वरूप राष्ट्रपति का रूस का दौरा स्थगित क्यों नहीं किया। यदि यह काम बह नहीं कर सकी और हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी वहाँ चले गए तो फिर राष्ट्रपति जी ने वहाँ पर जाकर भारत की जनता की चिन्ता रूसी नेताओं

पर व्यक्त क्यों नहीं की! जो संयुक्त वक्तव्य प्रकाशित हुआ है उसमें, भारत की जनता की भावनाओं को जो आघात पहुँचा है, उसका कोई उल्लेख नहीं किया गया है। राष्ट्रपति जी ने या हमारी सरकार ने यह काम क्यों नहीं किया? हम मांग करते हैं कि इस सम्बन्ध में रूसी सरकार से जो पत्र व्यवहार हुआ है उसे यह सरकार प्रकाशित करे।

पिछली बार बजट सेशन में हमारे माननीय सदस्य, प्रोफेसर बलराज मधोक ने कहा था कि रूसी नीति में शिफ्ट हो रहा है लेकिन सरकार ने कैटगारिकली उसका प्रतिवाद किया था और आज हमने उसको माना है कि उनकी नीति में परिवर्तन हो रहा है। साथ ही रूस ने एक नक्शा छपाया जिसमें हमारे क्षेत्र को चीन का भाग बतलाया। ऐसी स्थिति में मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या हम रूस के साथ रैसिकपोल नीति अपनायेंगे?

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पहले तो मैं कहना चाहूँगी कि हमें चिन्ता जरूर है लेकिन भयंकर जैसे शब्दों का प्रयोग हमें नहीं करना चाहिये। आज भारत की स्थिति पहले से बिल्कुल भ्रमल है, आज हमारी ताकत भी बढ़ी है हर एक तरह से जो भी स्थिति हो उसका हम सामना जोरों से कर सकते हैं। इस बात को हमें भूलना नहीं चाहिए।

हमें इसका खतरा नहीं है कि फौरन पाकिस्तान इन हथियारों की मदद लेकर हम पर आक्रमण कर देगा लेकिन जो हम ने कहा है वह यह है कि इस से उन को अपने भाषणों में जरूर ज्यादा हिम्मत मिलेगी। जैसे कि अभी एक, दो भाषण उन के हुए हैं उन में हम ने देखा है कि अब जरा बहुत जोर से बोलने लगे हैं। यह जाहिर है कि इसका असर बुरा होगा है। (व्यवधान)

उन्होंने एक बात राष्ट्रपति के रूस जाने के बारे में कही। अब राष्ट्रपति जी का वहाँ जाना तो काफी पहले से निश्चित हो चुका था

[श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी]

और वह कार्यक्रम बदलना बिलकुल ही ठीक नहीं था। ऐसे कार्यक्रमों को कैसिल करना बहुत खराब होता है। लेकिन राष्ट्रपति जी ने हमारी भावनाएं इस विषय में क्या थीं उन को बहुत जोरों से और स्पष्ट रूप से वहां पर रखा था।

एक बात उन्होंने और पूछी है और वह नकशे के बारे में है। वह भी जैसे ही हमें उस की खबर मिली तो उस बारे में हम ने मास्को स्थित इम्बैसी से कहा। जैसे कि मालूम है कि वहां पर कुछ वर्षों से ऐसे गलत नकशे निकलते आ रहे हैं रूस में और दूसरे देशों में भी, तो उस के बारे में भी हमने काफी उन का ध्यान उधर दिलाया था (व्यवधान) जैसा मैंने अभी कहा जैसे ही हमें उस की खबर मिली वैसे ही हमने मास्को के इम्बैसी से कहा कि वह इस चीज को वहां के अधिकाधिकारियों के सामने उठाएँ और जल्द से जल्द हम को भी उस एटलस की एक कापी भेजें ताकि हम भी यहां उसे देख कर आवश्यक कार्यवाही करें और ज्योंही वह यहां आई हम ने उस चीज को यहां पर उठाया

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK: Will that correspondence be published. That question also had been put

श्री हरबयाल बेबगुण : करसपॉडेंस पबलिश होगी या नहीं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री मधु लिमये।

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंबई) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, 6 साल पहले जब चीन ने भारत के ऊपर हमला किया और उस लड़ाई में हमारी हार हुई तब पुराने प्रधान मंत्री जी जो इन के पिता होते थे उन्होंने उस वक्त कहा था कि हम अवास्तविकता की दुनिया में रहते थे। लेकिन सवाल है कि 6 साल के बाद भी क्या अवास्तविकता, भ्रान्ति और परिकल्पना की दुनिया से हमारी विदेश नीति निकल पाई है ?

जहां तक हम लोगों का सवाल है जब कच्छ पर हमला हुआ था उसी समय से इस सदन में हम ने लगातार कहा है कि जब श्री खुश्चेव सोवियत यूनियन के नेता थे तब उन की हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में जो नीति थी उस में कोसीगन और ब्रेझनेव के नेतृत्व में बुनियादी परिवर्तन आया है। उस का प्रमाण सब से पहले हम को कच्छ में मिला जब विष्मन साहब के पीछे जानसन साहब की तरह कोसीगन साहब भी खड़े हो गये। फिर सितम्बर, 1965 में लड़ाई के समय कोसीगन साहब की जो नीति थी उससे भी पता चला और उस के परिणामस्वरूप ताश्कन्द में इन लोगों ने हमारे अंदरूनी मामलों में हस्तक्षेप किया। इस हस्तक्षेप को लेकर सोवियत यूनियन से ज्यादा दोष मैं इस सरकार को देता हूं क्योंकि इस सरकार ने हस्तक्षेप करने के लिए एक मांकी में दावत दी थी। हम दूसरों को बुलाते हैं कि आकर हस्तक्षेप करो और फिर हम बाद में चिल्लाने लगते हैं।

इसी तरीके से जबकि इस सदन के सामने और देश के सामने हम लोगों ने कहा कि हाजीपीर, उरी और तिथवाल यह सब हमारे हाथों से निकल जायेंगे तो शास्त्रीजी ने कहा था कि दुनिया में हमें अकेला भी क्यों न रहना पड़े लेकिन हम ऐसा नहीं होने देंगे। लेकिन कोसीगन के दबाव में आकर उन्होंने यह किया और उन सब को हम ने दे दिया।

हथियारों का जहां तक सवाल है यह आज का मामला नहीं है। ऐसी चीजें यकायक नहीं होती हैं। दो, तीन साल से पाकिस्तान की विदेशी नीति यह रही है कि रूस के साथ दोस्ताना बढ़ाओ और रूस से हथियारों को प्राप्त करने की कोशिश करो। दो साल पहले पाकिस्तान के ऐयर मार्शल जब सं मास्को गये थे तब से यह बातें चल रही हैं। जब कभी हम ने कहा कि क्या रूस की नीति में परिवर्तन हो रहा है तो कभी रूस ने नहीं कहा कि रूस की नीति में परिवर्तन नहीं हो रहा है। अलबत्ता भारत सरकार और इन के प्रवक्ता यह कहते रहे हैं कि रूस की नीति में परिवर्तन नहीं हो

रहा है। मैं पचासों कतरन आप के सामने रख सकता हूँ लेकिन चूँकि यह मापण का समय नहीं है इसलिए मैं उस में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ लेकिन यह हकीकत है कि भारत सरकार और उस के प्रवक्ता यह कहते रहे हैं कि रूस की नीति में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हो रहा है। ऐसा कौन कहता रहा? भारत सरकार के प्रवक्ता कहते हैं किन्तु रूस ने कभी नहीं कहा। लेकिन आज समय आ गया है कि एक अच्छा आदमी भी यह देख सकता है कि रूस की नीति में जो परिवर्तन होता आया है उसी का यह नतीजा हुआ है कि हमारे जो दुश्मन हैं उन को वह हथियार दे रहा है। इन का कहना है कि उस से कोई खतरा नहीं बढ़ा तो फिर मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि 1954 में जब अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिये थे तब हम क्यों चिन्तित थे कि उसमें तनाव बढ़ेगा और खतरा बढ़ेगा? इतना ही नहीं मैं आज याद दिलाता चाहता हूँ कि इन के पिता जो आजादी के पहले बराबर इस बात की नुक्ताचीनी करते रहे कि पूँजीवादी देशों में हथियार पैदा करने वाले लोग दूसरे देशों को हथियार बेच कर मुनाफा कमा कर युद्ध की और लड़ाई की आग भड़का रहे हैं। उस के लिए कहा जाता था कि यह मौन के व्यापारी हैं। मर्बैट्स आक डैय कहा जाता था। आज आजादी के बाद, इस पिछले 20 साल में हम ने देखा कि पहले जो यह व्यापारी लोग और कारखानेदार जो काम करते थे आज बड़े राष्ट्र वही काम कर रहे हैं। क्या अमरीका, क्या ब्रिटेन और क्या रूस, आज पश्चिमी एशिया में भी यह हथियार भेज रहे हैं और हिन्दुस्तान में भी उसी नीति को अपनाया है। उस का एक मात्र उद्देश्य है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान को लड़ाओ और तनाव की स्थिति कायम रखो और अपने प्रभाव को सारी दुनिया में बढ़ाओ। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा प्रधान मंत्री जी से सबसे पहला यह सवाल है कि क्या पिछले दो साल में आप के विदेश मन्त्रालय के प्रवक्ताओं ने इस की नीति के बारे में समय समय पर जो बयान दिये थे क्या

उस से देश में और विशेष कर सरकार में गलतफहमी व भ्रान्ति पैदा नहीं हुई? अगर यह बात सही है तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि उस के बारे में सही स्थिति से देश को कब अवगत किया जायेगा?

एक प्रश्न का उत्तर ये बिलकुल टाल रही हैं। हमारे राष्ट्रपति वहाँ पर गये थे। राष्ट्रपति ने और वहाँ के नेताओं ने जो संयुक्त वक्तव्य दिया उस में भारत, पाकिस्तान के सम्झौते का उल्लेख किया गया है लेकिन एक छोटा सा वाक्य उस में नहीं जोड़ दिया गया कि भारत की राय में रूस के द्वारा पाकिस्तान को हथियार देना तनाव बढ़ायेगा जो कि हमारे लिए चिन्ता का विषय है और उस से हमारी सुरक्षा के लिए खतरा पहुँचता है। हो सकता है कि रूस नहीं मानता तो वह उस संयुक्त विज्ञप्ति के नीचे रूस कह सकता था कि हम इस से सहमत नहीं हैं। हमारा कर्तव्य था कि कम से कम हम ऐसा करने। क्योंकि नहीं इस कर्तव्य को आग ने निभाया? इसलिए मेरे यह दो प्रश्न हैं और तीसरा प्रश्न उसी में जो निकलता है वह यह है कि हमारी विभिन्न राष्ट्रों के बारे में सारी जो नीतियाँ रही वह बिलकुल भ्रान्तिमूलक रहीं। ब्रिटेन के साथ विशेष रिश्ता हम कायम करना चाहते थे। ब्रिटेन, चीन, अमरीका और रूस इन चारों देशों के बारे में हमारी शुरु से गलत नीति रही है। देश को इन्होंने भ्रान्ति में और परिकल्पना की दुनिया में रक्खा है और हम ने बैठाया है। मेरे इन तीनों प्रश्नों का जवाब आना चाहिए।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गाँधी : माननीय सदस्य ने जो प्रश्न पूछा है उस में बजाय प्रश्न के उन्होंने अपने विचार रखे हैं।

श्री मधु लिंगये : दो प्रश्न पूछे हैं।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : उन के भाषण से मेरे ऊपर यह असर हुआ कि जब इतने देश हमारे खिलाफ हो गये हैं तो हम रूस से भी लड़ ले जिस में वह भी खिलाफ हो जाये। दूसरे उन को लगा कि 1954 में जो कुछ हुआ था उन्ही परिस्थितियों में अब की बार हमारा रिएक्शन भलग है। मगर तब से अब दुनिया बिल्कुल बदल गई है। उस समय रूस और अमरीका दोनों एक दूसरे से लड़ने को तैयार थे। उस वक्त उन दोनों के बीच में जो तनाव था वह अब बहुत कम हुआ है और बहुत से मामलों में वह संग संग काम कर रहे हैं। तो दुनिया की जो हालत तब थी वह काफी बदली है। जैसा मैंने पहले कहा हमारी भी हालत बदली है चाहे इस समय हम अपने पैगों पर पूरी तरह से नहीं खड़े हो सकते हैं लेकिन तब भी इस दिशा में हम काफी आगे बढ़े हैं और हम को प्रयत्न करना चाहिये कि हम जल्दी अपने लक्ष्य तक पहुँच जायें।

हमारे प्रेजिडेंट जो रूस गये थे उस के बारे में माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि जवाइंट कम्यूनिक में क्यों यह नहीं कहा गया। तो ज्वार्येंट कम्यूनिक में आम तौर पर डिसेंटिंग नोट्स नहीं होते हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : ऐसा होता है। प्रधान मंत्री का निवेदन में काट सकता हूँ। जब किसी चीज पर मतक्य सम्भव नहीं होता है तब हमेशा यह परम्परा रही है कि दोनों अपनी अपनी बातें रखते हैं।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : सवाल यह है कि इस समय हमारे देश के और विश्व के इंटरैस्ट में क्या है। जो भी हम कहे या करें उस को हमें इसी दृष्टिकोण से देखना है। यह नहीं कि गुस्ते में आकर कोई भी ऐसी बात करें जिस में हम को हानि हो। जैसा मैं ने कहा कि हम को यह पसन्द नहीं है कि रूस पाकिस्तान को हथियार दे लेकिन हम को कोई हक नहीं है कहने का कि वह हथियार न दे।

श्री मधु लिमये : वह दूसरी बात है। (व्यवधान)

श्री बलराज मधोक : अगर ताशकन्द न होता तो हक न होता, लेकिन ताशकन्द हुआ इस लिये हक है।

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरे पहले प्रश्न का जवाब आना चाहिये। मैं ने पहले कहा था कि सरकारी प्रवक्ता रूस की नीति के बारे में क्यों बयान देते थे। मेरे प्रश्न का जवाब नहीं आया।

MR. SPEAKER: If such a long speech is made, I am myself not able to locate the question.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने साफ शब्दों में कहा था कि सरकारी प्रवक्ता रूसी नीति के बारे में समय समय पर बयान दे कर कहते थे कि कोई परिवर्तन नहीं है। कभी रशियन्स ने ऐसा नहीं कहा। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि विदेश मंत्रालय गलतफहमी फैलाने का काम क्यों करता है।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : हम ने यह रूसियों ने ही कहा था, और जहाँ तक मुझे याद है जब भी मैंने यह बात कही तब मैं ने जरूर कहा कि हम को वह विश्वास दिलाते हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : हमारे अनामिक प्रवक्ता होते हैं जो सरकार की ओर से हमेशा इस प्रकार की वकवास करते हैं। अनामिक प्रवक्ताओं के बारे में मैं ने पूछा था। उस का जवाब आना चाहिये और विदेश मंत्रालय को भविष्य में जिम्मेदारी से काम करना चाहिये।

12.54 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT
SUPPLY OF ARMS BY USSR TO PAKISTAN

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received 22 notices of Adjournment Motion on supply of arms by USSR to Pakistan.